

Chapter 22

RECOMMENDED PROOF OF GOD'S EXISTENCE

I ask that all people read and question what I write, and especially those who do not believe in God.

I was raised a Protestant, joined the Church, and was baptized at the age of eight. I believed in God because I had been taught to do so.

My ever-questioning mind would not be quiescent, however, and as the years passed I began to doubt there was a God. The major reason: my inner being was deeply hurt when I witnessed the misery and injustice throughout the world, especially in the eyes of young children born into misery.

I asked myself the question: "If I hurt so deeply inside, how could a God (who would be infinitely more sympathetic to such suffering than I) permit such merciless injustice to occur?" I was unable to find a satisfactory answer to my honest question. Consequently, as the years passed, I ceased to believe in God. I did not desire a "pie in the sky," and I did not wish to hold a false belief. My sole purpose was to do good, and I had vowed to myself that I would not be content until I had achieved a beneficial improvement for humanity. [Refer to my letter to President Johnson in 1967 at the beginning of Chapter 20.] At the time, I also continued to question and to seek proof or disproof of God's existence — not for others, but for myself. Such questioning stimulated me to write a discussion on the "Soul," dated May 16, 1978:

THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF THE "SOUL"

1. The soft mass of the adult brain is perfectly motionless. It does not contract, divide or grow — yet it consumes up to 25% of the body's oxygen supply and 20% of the body's blood supply — while it comprises only 2% of the body's weight. Evidently, great amounts of energy are consumed in the production of mental life, but exactly how is not known!

2. All material parts of the body can be efficiently affected by touching an electrode in a limited portion of the brain — such as sight, sound, thirst, hunger, sex drive, fear, anger, body movements, etc.

"I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life."

— Thomas Paine
from his book, *The Age of Reason*

2A. However, memory and thought cannot be pinpointed or efficiently affected by touching an electrode in a limited portion of the brain. Experiments have even been conducted on rats that were previously taught to go through a maze, and then systematically remove more and more of the brain — the rats would still always attempt to stumble through the correct path of the maze!

2B. The conclusion I draw from these experiments implies that the brain is considerably more unique in acquiring meaningful knowledge than in the functions of the material body.

3. I, therefore, conclude that the brain is considerably more concerned about gathering and retaining knowledge in the brain than it is in the functions of the material body that are the mode of motorization for the brain. I have personally experienced a body temperature drop on many occasions when in deep creative thought.

4. This is, indeed, scientifically curious.

4A. Is the brain seeking, finding and retaining knowledge for better protection of the material body or for some other unobvious reason?

4B. This raises the question — is the body better protected by most of the brain devoted to speed, strength, and repairing of cells and bones or as the brain exists today which is superior to such a limited function?

4C. Looking around the world, it is very obvious that there are many animals faster and stronger than humans; however, there are none that can protect their physical bodies as efficiently as humans.

4D. Therefore, I draw the conclusion that the brain senses that the body is better protected by the gaining of knowledge and, therefore, stimulates the body to find knowledge. This is easily observed in most all small animals, as they are always curious.

5. The gaining or seeking of Wisdom is less motivated in most human or animal brains. Most humans gather

knowledge for the betterment of their material bodies.

5A. This is very curious because it is very obvious from all of the vast evidence presented in life that material things or possessions, such as food, cars, planes, boats, houses, fame, sex, etc., do not make the human brain content very long or give it a feeling of tranquility for any length of time.

5B. It is also very obvious from all of the vast evidence presented in life that meaningful thoughts, such as love, deep creative thinking and constructive religion does make the human brain content and gives it a feeling of tranquility for infinite time, so long as these thoughts are uppermost in the brain.

5C. Scientifically, this is very interesting! It appears that the human brain is only truly satisfied in those thoughts that are beneficial for a lasting time to more than one brain! Does this mean that the brain seeks to produce — invent — goodness and then multiply or reinforce this goodness with the merging with other sources of goodness — knowing that the desired feeling is increased?

5D. Looking at these facts, I draw the conclusion that if there were made available an energy source that would eliminate the need for the human mind to feel the necessity of spending the largest portion of its time working for material gain, there would be a resulting increase in desire for the human mind to produce those creative thoughts most conducive to a lasting feeling of tranquility, if given the proper guidance.

6. It has been my own personal observation of myself that when the brain is learning knowledge — study, experience, etc. — the brain absorbs this knowledge without a “High-Elated Feeling,” at this point it has a more computerized attitude.

6A. However, when the brain then takes this knowledge and strives to be creative, thereby entering into deep thought — the brain then experiences a “High Elated Feeling.” I have experienced this feeling to such a high extent that I have described it to others as a feeling completely separate and independent from earthly substance. I have never experienced this completely satisfying feeling in any other experience in my life, not sex, dining, athletic accomplishments, receipt of monetary value or any other. This feeling is more closely related to love or constructive religious thoughts, but to me, personally, it has been even higher because the feeling has been so completely pure — there are no doubts that cross the mind, there is only the feeling of completeness, an absolute unawareness of earthly substance.

6B. From 469 - 399 B.C., there was a truth-seeking individual named Socrates. On the day he was to be put to death for his beliefs, he carried on a discussion with some of his followers as to whether the body had a Soul. This discussion was based on logic deduced from limited scientific information and observations of that time.

6C. The paragraph that follows is a statement of Truth made by Socrates on that day which has inspired me greatly, as the statement is still Absolute Truth to this day:

“And thought is best when the mind is gathered into herself and none of these things trouble her — neither sounds nor sights nor pain nor any pleasure — when she takes leave of the body, and has as little as possible to do with it, when she has no bodily sense or desire, but is aspiring after true being.”

6D. Prior to reading this statement, I had stated to others I doubted that I had a Soul, because I was not mentally aware of my Soul, nor could I scientifically point out its separation from the material body, which included the mind. Immediately upon reading Socrates’ statement, I related to my own personal experiences and statements concerning deep creative thought. I then quickly questioned, does this then mean that I have been aware of my “Soul Entity” without realizing it?

6E. In 1968, at a time when I felt that I did not have a Soul, I wrote this statement that I derived from deep creative thought as to all matter and the Human Mind: “It does not seem improbable to me that the Human Mind is capable of feats that have not been imagined.” Coupling this statement with my present statements, I now realize that I had concluded the possibility that the Human Mind may create its “Soul.”

6F. This raises the question, When does the Soul enter the mind of a human? Religion teaches the “Soul” is made Good or Bad by what you think. Therefore, if this is a true statement — the scientific conclusion is that the mind surely develops the “Soul,” probably not unlike the process that the physical body develops, but taking much longer for real development as to being a Good or Evil “Soul” — and being in a state of limbo until such thinking processes are established.

6G. Therefore, the scientific conclusion I draw from these thoughts is that if the “Soul” is developed by the mind at a time later and independent of the material body, then it would possibly continue to live for a period of time after the death of the physical body.

7. As a Scientist who searches for Absolute Truth in All Things, it pleases me to state that the True Scientific Facts of life relative to the Human Existence indicate that there is a development in the human mind — when pointed in the right direction — which causes the human mind to strive to obtain a mental state of existence separate and independent of the material functions and needs of the Human Body, which is not unlike the Entity named the “Soul” of religion.

Joseph Westley Newman

May 16, 1978

EDITOR'S NOTE: There will undoubtedly be those in the present scientific community who do not understand Mr. Newman's rationale for including in this published work a "discussion on God." However, it should be historically noted that even the great physicist Isaac Newton chose to include a discussion concerning "the nature of God" in BOOK III of his scientific masterpiece PRINCIPIA MATHEMATICA.

Mr. Newman considers his "discussion on God" to be inseparable from the presentation of his other scientific theories and technical processes. Moreover, as a result of the societal crisis presently confronting our species, it is important to Mr. Newman that these concepts be published in their entirety at this time.

Approximately one or two years prior to writing "The Scientific Evidence of the 'Soul,'" I began to state this single prayer: "God, if you exist, make me know it relative to the mind you have provided me." I asked nothing else, and I made the statement silently and periodically over a year's passage. I felt it would not demonstrate sincerity on my part to state it only once or twice.

In order to appreciate what I am preparing to share with you, I must assure you that I am a totally factual and non-superstitious individual.

During 1978, the mathematical number "14" became repeatedly and compellingly fixed in my mind. In response to this mental input, I asked Ellen, my devoted wife, to record the number "14" in a written log and to remember it.

Remarkably, important business transactions and other significant events began to arrive consistently at a satisfactory conclusion on the 14th day of varying months and years. This process has continued through April of 1985.

For the first time in 1984, I disclosed this fact to other business associates and they marveled when they independently witnessed several significant events consummate for me on the 14th day of the month. [I must stress that I did not influence or plan these events in any way. Such events were planned by others at their own instigation.]

The mathematical probability odds of these events consistently occurring on the 14th day of the month over a seven-year period on a coincidental basis are staggering. There exists a complete and recorded log of all such occurrences.

I must also stress to you that I sincerely doubt *any* human being would have convinced me that God exists. However, because of these and many other related actually-recorded events, I must follow the dictum of Shakespeare when he said:

"To thine own self be true;

And it must follow as the night the day,

Thou can'st not then be false to any man."

Because of this attitude I now know there is a God and that God has been kind to me in my stubbornness to seek

"Absolute Truth." God answered my request in a factual manner exactly in accordance with the scientific manner in which my mind and my life function.

As a truthful scientist, my mind responds to factual circumstances that consistently repeat themselves. Like a magnet, such signs and signals attract my scientific mind and direct my deep attention to the pertinent subject matter.*

I always keep my word to any human being. I most certainly keep it with my Supreme Being!

I now pray the following: "God, give me the knowledge and wisdom to draw all peoples of this Earth to you and not the first one, no, not the first one, away from you."

In the beginning, God did not "reveal everything to humans," but did bestow upon us "Free Will" and the mental ability/desire to question and seek to totally understand the nature of the Universe. Use the divine abilities to the maximum and you will benefit both yourself and others.

Concerning my earlier question with respect to the misery of innocent individuals throughout our history on this planet: Such misery is created by humans and the actions (or lack of actions) by humans. All problems on this Earth can be solved if we first question and then work to seek a solution to the problems.

"Pure" love and "pure" actions are not "pure" if they are forced — they must be offered and performed via the exercise of one's Free Will. I can understand God not desiring anything that is not reflective of Truth. Personally, I feel exactly the same way. If I cannot depend upon someone, then I strongly prefer to stand alone since I realize that I can depend upon myself. Moreover, I want no part of something or someone's actions which are not true. I can only ask, "Why should anyone want someone who is false?"

We are false if we do not truly care about our fellow human beings. We can solve any problem that we "set our mind to." If misery exists upon this planet, then we have only ourselves to blame, not God.

The greatest gift God has given us is our "Mind" — for even the mind is the essence of the "Soul." Whether the "Soul" is good or bad depends solely upon the "Mind."

If God gave us such a powerful tool as a "Mind," then it should be obvious that God expects us to use the "Mind" for *good*, not evil, and that one's "Mind" should not be complacent, unthinking, or unquestioning. With such a powerful God-given gift as the "Mind," we must place the blame for the misery throughout the world upon ourselves, not God.

It is evident to me that we must have Free Will. How else could we demonstrate pure and voluntary love to

*I have an extensive log book containing all recorded events relating to the number "14." I am not including these events [which number over fifty] in this Book, since I believe most people would only view such events as extraordinary coincidences. The significance of the number "14" has much importance to me, but such significance is not proposed as a "proof" for God's existence. The specific recommended "proof" will follow later in this Chapter.

God? If we were fashioned by God as “robots” which were fully programmed to do good and eliminate misery from the Earth, then not only would our actions be meaningless but our very existence would be equally meaningless.

I ask you: “Would you wish to replace your loved ones with robots?” Of course not. The difference in the mental significance between “loved ones” and “robots” is phenomenal. The “pure love” within our “loved ones” touches our inner being; the intelligence of a robot is only a result of given materials which may be easily replaced. A robot may even be programmed to “love” and “care” for you. However, you would know that such robotic actions are false and do not represent “pure love.” Your inner being would not be content with a “loving” robot since the essence of such an arrangement would be *false*.

If one seeks Absolute Truth via a questioning attitude, then one should clearly understand and be sensitive to why God provided us with a “Free Will.” In striving for Absolute Truth, one should possess the intellectual honesty to recognize that the responsibility for the human misery upon this Earth lies with us — not God.

I am totally certain that if we apply our minds to understanding nature, we can solve any problem upon this Earth. Do not belittle yourself and blindly say, “No, such cannot be accomplished.” Such an attitude is but an unknowing rejection of the unjust teaching system in-

Think for a moment and question your own mind concerning the *Truth* of what I have just written. Consider also the fact that insurance statistics prove most accidents are preventable and represent the results of an unthinking, unquestioning, and complacent attitude of “Free Will.”

Carefully question and consider the above statements: let’s proceed to seek *Absolute Truth*.

God has provided us with “Free Will” as well as a powerful MIND, and God expects us to utilize our MIND without complacency or evasion of responsibility for accidental deaths as a result of fire, collisions, storms, earthquakes, guns, floods, disease, etc. Such is true because we are responsible for understanding and formulating the Laws of Nature. Moreover, the history of science demonstrates that we can solve any problem to which we address our minds.

QUESTION: If we care so little about ourselves — which demonstrates a lack of self-respect, a lack of the responsible application of “Free Will,” and an insensitivity to the precious gift of a powerful mind — then by what logic can we expect God to be responsible for our own incompetence?

If we seek Absolute Truth, then we must place the blame solely where it belongs: upon ourselves.

If one wishes to solve a problem, then one must first admit that there is a problem. One must then pinpoint the problem and solve it by asking, “How, What and

“I am totally certain that if we apply our minds to understanding nature, we can solve any problem upon this Earth.”

herited from the past.

I urge you to have the intellectual honesty to admit to yourself that God has provided you with a powerful and leveraged entity: the MIND. God expects you to utilize such a MIND for beneficial purposes and to demonstrate *pure love* on the basis of your “Free Will.” Such “Free Will” represents *Absolute Truth*. When such occurs, we will have shown that we are able to be with God. Anything less than such demonstrable actions is *false* and constitutes a *lie*.

QUESTION: Why does a loved one, who may be a good and decent individual, suddenly and unexpectedly die?

While I do not know the answer to this question for certain, I do sense that “Free Will” is the major factor in such an occurrence.

EXAMPLE: What would happen if you jumped without a parachute from an airplane flying at 20,000 feet and you landed on concrete? There should be no doubt in your mind what would occur. At the very least, serious and possibly permanent injury would occur. Far more likely — you would be killed.

Certainly we would not use our “Free Will” to perform such an obviously foolish action unless suicide is our intent. However, if we were to do so, we would not expect God to stop us.

Why,” via God’s precious gift to us: our Mind.

With regard to the implications of self-responsibility for the use of our Mind, let’s discuss different religions.

EXAMPLE: In previous years, many religious doctrines taught that the Earth was flat, that the Earth was the center of the Universe, was orbited by the Sun, planets, etc., and that all celestial objects were “perfect spheres.” Religious doctrine also taught that plagues, storms, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, etc. were acts of God, representing retribution for our sins. We were also told that “if God wanted man to fly, God would have given him wings like the birds.” We were instructed not to question anything taught by the various Churches.

It is true that the above teachings are and were *totally false*. The facts demonstrate that God did not say these teachings. The question is then raised, “Who did say these statements?” The truthful answer: “Man!”

There are many different religions with separate teachings throughout the world and dozens of orders, congregations, and sects even within a single denomination.

FACT: God’s word is *pure* and represents *Truth*.

QUESTION: In an effort to justify the confusing result of so many religious teachings, who has said that God has stated so many varying pronouncements?

ANSWER: "Man!"

QUESTION: Who has written the scriptures of the world's religions?

ANSWER: "Man!"

QUESTION: Does God teach us to hate and kill?

ANSWER: No! God teaches love, caring, and forgiveness.

QUESTION: Who has taught (or teaches) the justification for religious wars which serve to generate hate, death, and revenge?

ANSWER: "Man!"

To those who may feel uncertain or uncomfortable with what I write, I warmly ask that you truthfully question my statements since I am only a mere man. However, if you do this (as you should), then you should also truthfully question what you have been personally taught by any man or woman.

I write to you only of my love for *Absolute Truth*. The very essence of my being has always, yes, always, cried out: *Seek the "Absolute Truth" in all things and the Truth will set you free!*

As Thomas Paine so elegantly wrote in his *Age of Reason*:

*"THE WORD OF GOD IS THE CREATION WE BEHOLD and it is **this word**, which no human invention can counterfeit or alter, that God speaketh universally to Man."*

I believe in God not because of the word of any man or woman, but because I sought *Absolute Truth* and I was committed to follow the trail of such *Absolute Truth* to its end, regardless of whether such a trail proved or disproved the existence of God.

My very essence said to me that if God does exist, then God is Truth and such a God could endure subjection to any honest question I ask in obtaining *Absolute Truth*.

It warms my being to be able to inform you that God is Truth! Moreover, such a God can withstand any honest question.

Only a mere man or woman is capable of hiding in the cloak of darkness and despises serious questioning of the biased and prejudiced untrue rhetoric which flows from her or his mouth.

God exemplifies confidence and *Absolute Truth* via the very essence of my own being. I realize that God has bestowed upon me a questioning mind and a bulldog determination to pursue and find the Truth. To those who believe in God, it should be obvious that I have retained this precious God-given gift of a questioning mind and that God gave it to me because God expects me to use it.

God exemplifies his confidence and *Absolute Truth* to you since all healthy young children have the precious

God-given gift of a questioning mind. The facts I have presented in Chapter 21 demonstrate that children are unjustly taught by school systems and religious denominations to forsake their God-given gift of a questioning mind. The facts also demonstrate that the "fear of questioning" is a result of the influence of mere men or women.

God is Truth and God has no fear of Truth. *Absolute Truth* can **only** be achieved by sincere questioning! The blind, non-intellectual, unquestioning mental acceptance of teaching or dogma from whatever source, will only result in the acceptance of falsehood born of the biased, prejudiced attitudes of mere men and women.

I write and speak this *Truth* to all men and women of the world. It is my sincere purpose to teach one to *think*; one can correctly *think* by honest questioning.

"The blind, non-intellectual, unquestioning mental acceptance of teaching or dogma from whatever source, will only result in the acceptance of falsehood born of the biased, prejudiced attitudes of mere men and women."

At this point, I wish to share with the reader a proof of God's existence via my simple prayer: "God, if You exist, enable me to know it relative to the mind You have given me."

Several years ago, a sincere, God-respecting business associate advised me to purchase a Bible and read it. He claimed that by so doing, I would have no doubt of God's existence. I did as he suggested, and as I read the Bible, I discovered many conflicting statements. (I will not discuss these statements, since it serves no constructive purpose.)

As I read the Bible, I felt deep dismay because I wanted to believe in God's existence. However, in my endless desire for *Absolute Truth*, I could not complacently and blindly accept what I read. One thought rushed through my mind: the Bible was the one place where I would not expect to find error and conflicting statements if it truly represented the Word of God.

Suddenly, my mind "received" a powerful, scolding message: "Get up and do what you do best!" Instantly, I knew what to do. I went to my library which contains numerous books describing countries throughout the world. I rigorously researched the *essence* of religious doctrines throughout the world.

In studying such doctrines, I discovered a dominating, clear, and unquestioning *Truth* which made itself apparent to the purity of my rigorous questioning mind — a mind always searching for *Absolute Truth*. The Truth I discovered is the following:

Any conflicting statement or falsehood within the Bible, teachings, or doctrine of any religious sect, represents the mistake of MAN, not GOD.

History demonstrates that anything "touched" by mere man or woman is contaminated by their own

biases and prejudices. Bibles are no exception to this rule. Like textbooks which contain incorrect statements, I do not recommend that one dismiss the *entire* Book. There are valuable Truths in the Bible! The same is true for the various bibles of religions throughout the world. You should only dismiss what is *False* and retain what is *True*. Teach such Truth to your children.

The following is the true essence of all religions in the world:

“Do good, think good thoughts, care for others, and do not steal, kill, etc.”

This basic common denominator of the “teaching of Goodness” which I found evident in all religions, represented a tell-tale sign to my questioning mind. Such a common denominator is unlikely to be accidental. To my questioning mind, this “teaching of Goodness” had a purity that was majestic and distinct from the biases and prejudices of mere man or woman. Such a consistency of “Goodness” is what I would expect from God, who I know is “merciful.”

I thus perceived a logical reason for the existence of different religions throughout the world. At different times, God had instructed special individuals to teach the essence of God’s love, as well as to live and maintain such love on a consistent basis.

History had demonstrated that God’s Word was not quickly taught throughout the world. Consequently, God commissioned individuals familiar with their respective customs in different parts of the world to teach the essence of God’s love to people with varying ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

QUESTION: What would you do if you hired someone to perform a particular task and you found they were unable to maintain or complete the total task as required?

ANSWER: If you believed that the individual was providing her/his best effort, you would very likely secure additional assistance to complete the job. In effect, one would have separate contracts with various individuals to effect the same task. One would expect that each individual would honor the terms of their respective contract.

QUESTION: Does it not seem reasonable that God would act in some fashion if a task God sought to achieve was not being accomplished?

EXAMINE THESE FACTS:

- (1) **BUDDHISM** — a doctrine whose message is *Goodness*, with the following intended result:
“The reality beyond all change and suffering, it is peace, security, supreme joy, unspeakable bliss.”
- (2) **HINDUISM** — a doctrine whose message is also *Goodness* and the words of the incarnate god Krishna, who says:
“Whatever god a man worships, it is I who answers the prayer.”

(3) **ISLAM** — a doctrine whose message is also *Goodness* and a belief in one God. The name “ALLAH” is used by Muslims and Christians.

(4) **JUDAISM** — a doctrine whose message is also *Goodness* and a belief in one God.

(5) **CHRISTIANITY** — a doctrine whose message is also *Goodness* and a belief in one God.

I will take the liberty of quoting the Biblical Peter, chief of the twelve apostles, and Jesus, who understood the true message of God:

“Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, ‘Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.’”
 [ACTS 10:34,35]

And Jesus himself said:

“Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.”
 [MATTHEW 5:8]

Once again I repeat my constant prayer:

“God, give me the knowledge and wisdom to unite all people of this Earth to you and not the first one, no not the first one, from you.”

The evidence has proven to me that at various times and places God has ordained and chosen Special Good Individuals by endowing them with the Spirit of God for the purpose of teaching “God’s Goodness” to all God’s people on this Earth. However, none of these chosen individuals were or are superior or equal to God. God is Goodness, Supreme, and represents the purity of *Absolute Truth*.

Those who have been chosen by God to teach God’s word have admitted that they are neither equal nor superior to God. As an example of this fact, I quote Jesus:

“Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.” (Emphasis added.) [Quotation from ST. JOHN, Chapter 14, verse 10. The number “14” as I have discussed is very significant to me but not necessarily to anyone else. This quote was brought to my attention after I noted the significance of the number “14.”]

The following quotation is from ST. MATTHEW, Chapter 27, verse 46 (similar to a quote from ST. MARK, Chapter 15, verse 34):

“And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, ‘Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?’ that is to say, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Emphasis added.)

Such a quotation demonstrates that Jesus was certain that God's Spirit dwelt within him and therefore he called upon God.

Although the Special Individuals chosen by God were not actually God, this fact does not distract from the *Absolute Truth's* essence of God, "Spirit," and the essence of God's Goodness mirrored from such individuals. The facts of history demonstrate that if God exists then these Special Individuals must now exist with God. To believe in such Individuals and the essence of what they teach (whichever religious doctrine) is to believe in God.

Such Special Individuals were chosen by God for the exact purpose of providing a means for other individuals to make a covenant with God! Moreover, God expects one to honor such a covenant.

Quoting again from Jesus and the apostle Peter, who understood God's true message, Jesus said:

Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."

[MATTHEW 5:8]

"Then Peter opened his mouth, and said: 'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.'"

[ACTS 10:35]

I perceive that God wishes all people upon this Earth to live together in peace and harmony. I also perceive that all religions which recognize God's existence have been instructed by God to teach "Goodness." Since the killing of one another is not sanctioned by God, who teaches and/or sanctions such action? ANSWER: "Man!"

In accordance with God's teachings, all war should permanently cease. Moreover, all religious individuals should love one another and share their love with non-believers.

Not because of man do I believe in God, but rather because God was kind to me during my determined efforts to seek *Absolute Truth* by providing me with overwhelming "proof of God's existence relative to the mind God has given me." I will endeavor to demonstrate equal proof to other "non-believers," as well as to those religious individuals who have ever experienced "doubt" concerning God's existence. Such attitudes are the result of worldly experiences.

After years of study, thought, and questions during my relentless search for *Absolute Truth*, I asked myself a question:

"Surely God realizes the imperfections of mere man or woman and surely God has developed a *pure* and *factual proof* of God's existence totally independent from the contaminating influence of mere man or woman?"

I was convinced that such a factual proof must exist. But where would I find such a "pure proof?" At that

moment in my life a "comfortable and knowing" thought entered my mind:

"Examine the 'Speaking in Unknown Tongues.'"

Although I was raised a Baptist, I immediately felt confident concerning the Truth of this thought. The "Speaking in Unknown Tongues (Languages)" was not taught or practiced in the Baptist Church. Moreover, such action would not have been countenanced in the Baptist Church. I have never spoken in "Unknown Tongues (Languages)," nor have I ever had the desire (prior to this time) to speak in "Unknown Tongues (Languages)." However, without such an experience I nevertheless sensed within myself a thought that the "pure proof" of God's existence would be found via the "Speaking in Unknown Tongues."

I disclosed this thought to a California business associate who responded by sending me a book entitled, *They Speak With Other Tongues*, by John L. Sherrill. I proceeded to read the book in an effort to discover scientific facts.

On page 25 of the book, John Sherrill asked the preacher of a small church whose members practiced "Speaking in Unknown Tongues" to indicate the source of such worship. "Why, from the Bible," he said. "The last part of FIRST CORINTHIANS, Chapter 14." (Emphasis added.)

In this instance, the mention of the number "14" had *double* significance for me (although not necessarily to anyone else): (1) the earlier references to factual experiences which had consummated for me on the "14th" day of various months and (2) my search for a "pure proof" of God's existence had led me to Chapter "14" of FIRST CORINTHIANS.

There are 16 Chapters in FIRST CORINTHIANS. The odds are 16 to 1 against "14" being the Chapter which would be of unusual significance to me. However, when such odds are multiplied by the many additional events in my life relating to the number "14," I know that my becoming aware of "The Speaking in Unknown Tongues" is neither accidental nor coincidental.

Although I'll never humble my "Will" to any man or woman upon this Earth, I'll gladly humble my "Will" to the "Purity of God" and the "Goodness" that God represents.

FIRST CORINTHIANS, Chapter 14, verse 22, states:

"Wherefore tongues are for a Sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe." (Emphasis added.)

As I searched for "Facts" within *They Speak With Other Tongues*, by John L. Sherrill, the more knowingly I perceived the Truth of the "pure proof" for God's existence via "Unknown Tongues." Such an activity as "Speaking in Unknown Tongues" is totally independent of contamination by mere man or woman. Examine the following facts to understand why this is true:

- (1) Between 1926 and 1936, a significant impact of the spiritual power involved with "Unknown Tongues" was demonstrated: the traditional churches lost

two million members — 8% of their total membership. During the same period, Pentecostal membership increased:

PENTECOSTAL ASSEMBLIES — up 264.7%

ASSEMBLIES OF GOD — up 208.7%

CHURCH OF GOD — up 92.8%

[Statistics from page 50 of *They Speak With Other Tongues.*]

- (2) In the past, traditional Churches have coolly received the Pentecostals due to the latter's doctrine of "Speaking in Unknown Tongues." However, as a result of the phenomenal results obtained by the Pentecostals, many important traditional Church leaders such as Billy Graham have been quoted as recognizing God's influence via the Holy Spirit (Speaking in Unknown Tongues). [See pages 64-67 of *They Speak With Other Tongues.*]

Some Traditional Churches would still be uncomfortable with the demonstration or thought of demonstration of "Speaking in Unknown Tongues" within their own congregation. This is because the actions of the individual who "speaks in unknown tongues (languages)" cause him to appear foolish and totally degraded.

As an eight-year-old, I can recall when I once visited a Pentecostal Church with a friend. I had never heard of "speaking in unknown tongues" and I remember how shocked and stunned I became when I watched a twelve-year-old girl suddenly stand and begin to jump about while loudly blabbering in a totally unintelligible fashion. As a young boy, my immediate reaction was to laugh — so much so that my young friend also began to laugh, even though it occurred in his own church. The adults sitting in our vicinity began to sternly hush us.

I never returned to that Pentecostal church. Such strange behavior was totally foreign to the strict and rigid Baptist posture where one's parents would admonish one to "be still" if one twisted or squirmed in the pew; one was also forbidden to speak during the Church Services.

However, I can now comprehend internally what that boy of eight only visualized externally. Such is the case because I now have "Free Will." I recognize the God-given power of the mind, and I seek *Absolute Truth*.

It is true that members of traditional Churches have coolly received reports of those individuals who "speak in unknown tongues (languages)" and physically act foolishly and degradingly by jumping, shouting, rolling on the floor, etc. However, in one sense, such "degrading" actions are "beautiful" because they establish a *purity* not likely to have been contrived by the contamination of man. Conversely, such *purity* does indeed demonstrate God's spirit.

I am fully aware that the reader will be tempted to totally dismiss what I now write as foolish, ridiculous, and irrational. However, I implore you to utilize your questioning mind and recognize the *Truth* of what God demonstrates by such belittling and seeming degradation of the mere physical body. Such a body is only the *glitter* and not the *substance* of the "Soul." That such is the

case is obvious to me since I described earlier the same effect from a totally different approach. Refer to my article entitled "The Scientific Evidence of the Soul," in which I state:

"As a scientist who searches for *Absolute Truth* in all things — it pleases me to state that the true scientific facts of life relative to the human existence indicates that there is a development in the human mind — when pointed in the right direction — which causes the human mind to strive to obtain a mental state of existence separate and independent from the material functions and needs of the human body, which is not unlike the entity named the 'Soul' of religion." (Emphasis added.)

One should recognize the fact that the Mind (Soul) demonstrates an existence separate and independent from the human body via the unorthodox actions of individuals who "speak in unknown tongues (languages)."

Examine the scientific significance of this recommended proof of God's existence. Begin with an individual who is taught to have self-respect, proceeds to "speak in unknown tongues" and, as a result, totally belittles and degrades the importance of one's physical body by one's unintelligible actions. After exhibiting such behavior, one would expect that the individual would be ashamed, embarrassed, and sad for behaving so before others.

However, the facts consistently demonstrate that those individuals who truthfully "speak in unknown tongues" feel blessed, close to God and are grateful for the experience. Many such individuals have reported feeling within themselves a new source of energy which lasts for months.

Such psychological results are *totally* opposite to what one would expect.

If one could "bottle" the end result of BLISS and market it, there would be a stampede to purchase such an elixir. Dope and alcohol would instantly be forgotten!

It is my intent to use my God-given gift and prove God's existence by tape recording those who "speak in unknown tongues (languages)" and convert such sounds into electromagnetic impulses which can be observed on an oscilloscope. With the assistance of linguistic experts, I would endeavor to identify the audio and conceptual order of the sounds produced by those who "speak in unknown tongues (languages)." I believe instinctively that God has provided such an order capable of being detected by the Truthful, questioning mind for purposes of providing an Absolute Proof to those who disbelieve the existence of God's presence within our lives.

In pursuit of scientific Truth, author John Sherrill arranged a meeting at the Columbia University Faculty Club, and had six linguists listen to an approximately one-hour tape recording which featured individuals who were "speaking in unknown tongues (languages)." [Refer to pages 100-103 of *They Speak With Other Tongues.*]

Although the linguists were unable to identify any

specific languages on the recordings, Sherrill writes that “they had frequently identified *language patterns* on the tape.” In an attempt to fool the linguists, John Sherrill had intentionally recorded two deceptive sound sequences under normal circumstances. These sequences were intended to resemble the voice quality of an individual who was “speaking in unknown tongues.”

At the Columbia University meeting, the six linguists quickly detected the two fake sound sequences. According to John Sherrill:

“The ‘shape’ of real language, the variety of sound combinations, the infrequency of repetition, and so forth, is virtually impossible, so they (the linguists) said, to reproduce by deliberate effort.”

The linguists added that there were over 2,800 known languages and dialects spoken throughout the world today, and the odds against the recognition of a particular language were enormous.

I feel certain that this recommended proof of God’s existence can be accomplished and electromagnetically documented.

I warmly recommend that all churches and religions throughout the world encourage the “speaking in unknown tongues (languages)” in a purposeful manner which complements the power of our God-given mind. If one were to introduce scientific technology into this process, then one could simply construct “seat-belted chairs” which would automatically restrain an individual filled with the Spirit of God. Such a mechanism would improve personal safety, improve posture, and would restrain those physical movements which distract from the phenomenal experience.

With such physical restraint, those who are not “filled” with the Holy Spirit may then observe the physical manifestations reflecting the inner being (Soul) of the individual who “speaks in unknown tongues” (languages) without distraction from physical body superficialities. Such superficialities do not reflect the substance of the “Soul.”

I am confident that good design engineers could construct a proper restraining seat; moreover, with the introduction of visual dramatics to enhance the effects of the experience, such engineers could utilize a discrete electrical and/or hydraulic system to enable the restraining seat to physically rise several feet above the floor. By surrounding this seat with “white veils, etc.” one could metaphorically represent the “Purity” of God’s Spirit which resides within us all. Such an arrangement would permit all observers — as well as the person “speaking in unknown tongues (languages)” — to participate in the splendor of the moment.

To avoid deception by mere man or woman, NASA-developed, heat-sensing and pulse/blood pressure monitoring devices could be installed within the special seats. The seat would not mechanically rise unless all pre-programmed instruments psychologically indicated that the experience was genuine (from God) and not induced by mere man or woman. A pre-programmed computer integrated with an oscilloscope and EEG machine

could monitor both linguistic output and brainwave pattern to reduce or eliminate the possibility of deception.

Recently I spoke with a woman who is the mother of several grown children and was formerly a strict Baptist. Approximately five years ago, she began attending a Pentecostal Church as a result of her teenage daughter’s experiences at the same Church.

The good woman informed me that she had prayed in the following manner to God: “While I do not understand the nature of one who ‘speaks in unknown tongues,’ if it *is* real then I wish to share the experience.” Within a short time, according to the good woman, she experienced the “speaking in unknown tongues (languages)” on a number of occasions.

I asked her the following question: “After such an experience, what was the intensity of your ‘closeness to God’? Was the intensity the same, slightly greater, significantly greater, or tremendously greater?” Without any hesitation, she vigorously stated that she had felt “tremendously closer to God!”

She added that her son — a man in his early twenties — had recently told her that “he could never return to the Baptist Church because it simply did not provide him with what he needed.” I am convinced that their respective responses would have been identical had they originally belonged to any other traditional Church. [I do not write this to derogate other traditional Churches, but rather to encourage them to honestly and sincerely examine the phenomena of those who “speak in unknown tongues (languages).”]

I am convinced that it is necessary to scientifically corroborate the unique nature of those who “speak in unknown tongues (languages).” In the above discussion, I have offered a technique to accomplish such corroboration. While personal opinion and experience is valuable, it is still necessary to subject the “speaking in unknown tongues (languages)” phenomena to the rigors of the scientific method. It is my hope that the discussion on this subject within the context of this Book will encourage honest, scientific investigation of this phenomena.

It is true that I have never spoken in unknown tongues (languages). Although I sincerely advise others to attend the religious institutions of their choice, I should state that I do not physically attend any particular church. In this sense, my personal approach is perhaps similar to that of Thomas Paine who once wrote: “My own mind is my own church.”

However, I am certain that God has provided me with the gift of a questioning mind. The facts that I have discovered and my awareness of God’s existence convince me that the good woman speaks the *Truth*.

To quote once again from *They Speak With Other Tongues*, pages 65 and 66:

“Father Daniel J. O’Hanlon, Professor of Theology at Alma College, Los Gatos, California, wrote an article for *America*, the national Catholic weekly, in which he said:

'Few Catholics regard Pentecostals with little more than amusement, if they take notice of their existence at all. Even most Protestants keep their distance from these unconventional Christians and find it difficult to say anything good about them. Nevertheless, the rapid growth of the Pentecostal movement all over the world and the extraordinary appeal it has for the kind of people to whom our Lord especially addressed Himself, the poor and dispossessed, should warn us to put aside our squeamish bourgeois prejudices and take a long, hard look at it.'

The evidence before me indicates that not only is the unbeliever converted into a belief in God after the "speaking in tongues" experience, but even conventional believers in God greatly benefit by such an experience. Such conventional believers are drawn closer to God and experience an intimate feeling concerning God's reality.

Quoting from page 140 of *They Speak With Other Tongues*:

"Not long ago, I talked with Dr. John Alexander MacKay, President-Emeritus of Princeton Seminary and one of the country's leading theologians.

'If it is a choice,' he told me, 'between the uncouth life of the Pentecostals and the aesthetic death of the older Churches, I for one choose uncouth life.'

'But what if there need not be this choice? What if there can be a synthesis on a higher plane than either, so that in our Churches we have form and life growing Godward together? What if Pentecost comes to the Church today?'

If you are utilizing the precious, God-given gift of the powerful questioning Mind to seek *Absolute Truth*, then I need say no more. However, if you are not and will not pursue such *Truth* with your Mind, then it would be a mutual waste of time for me to say more to you on this subject.

I do, however, perceive the following Truth from God: People of every religious denomination/persuasion throughout the world who worship/pray to God or to God's Essence should respect one another, love one another, care for one another, and, as a Unity of One, pray to God for one another.

Throughout the world, God-loving individuals who fight amongst themselves only serve to provide evidence to non-believers that God does not exist. Peace between such individuals should provide evidence to the non-believers that God is real.

Many non-believers ask by what means does God simultaneously talk with or influence millions of people throughout the world? Scientifically speaking, I can visualize that such is accomplished in a manner similar to a powerful radio or TV transmitter. Only if one is attuned to "God's Channel" will one receive God's message.

Even with a normal TV or radio one can only receive

a broadcast if one is properly tuned to that frequency. Of course, it is technologically possible for millions of individuals to do so simultaneously.

When one prays and is tuned into "God's Channel," then one is transmitting a message. However, one only reaches "God's Channel" by being sincere. One could consider "God's Channel" to be a "pay-TV Channel" in the sense that the "payment" God expects is the sincere and consistent utilization of your honest and questioning Mind.

It is a recognized fact that one's brain operates as both a transmitter and a receiver of electromagnetic waves. It is also known that the electromagnetic wave pattern will vary according to one's thoughts. When an assembly of individuals (as in a Church) began in unison to pray and "transmit" on the same "channel," such activity acts as a powerful transmitter to and receiver from God.

I have no doubt that our scientific capability appears less than barbaric by comparison to God's scientific capability!

We are all composed of the same type of gyroscopic particles that exist throughout the Universe. Such particles can certainly be mechanically foreseen and understood by God.

Based on the concepts I have expressed in this Book, the time is long overdue for wise men and women and heads of religions and nations to join together to produce a Doctrine capable of providing the people of the world with enduring Peace, Love, and Happiness.

By the grace of God, I have developed an innovation capable of uniting the world mechanically and technologically. But without the proper conceptual teachings, such an innovation means nothing. God has provided us with "Free Will" and a powerful questioning brain. If we utilize such a brain properly, we can achieve the goal of pleasing God and ourselves.

There are those who will read what I have written on the "subject of God" and be convinced of its Truth. I fully realize that there will be those who will be skeptical, unconvinced, or only convinced that I am a "religious nut." Some will perhaps be of the "charitable" opinion that I am a *sincere* "religious nut." I am well aware of the possibility of such reactions.

I stress to the reader, however, that I am not writing this Book *only* for present audiences, but rather for those who will be our distant descendants. Consider the many occasions in history when someone was branded a "nut" by his contemporaries, only to be proven correct and insightful in later times.

My purpose in presenting the "speaking in unknown tongues (languages)" subject within the context of a scientific treatise is to encourage the sincere and scientific investigation of this phenomena. Only by the honest inquiry of our minds will we ever be capable of unlocking the seeming secrets of the Universe.

With such an open, questioning, and truthful mind, I wish to discuss another subject of vital importance to this worthy goal: ECONOMICS.

Chapter 23

THE MERGER BETWEEN MECHANIZATION AND ECONOMICS

"It is one of the most beautiful compensations of this life, that no man can sincerely try to help another without helping himself."

— Shakespeare

Economics is a subject that strongly demonstrates the "unjust" and "detrimental" results of the *brainsoiling** effect generated by our present primitive teaching system.

I majored in Accounting and Economics in the traditional college and quit college during my Junior year.

As an adult, Economics is one of the first subjects whose validity I strongly challenged. Even as a young man, an honest and caring concern for humanity ran deep within my being. I was deeply touched by the subject of Economics because I knew that it affected the physical well-being of the total population upon this planet.

Originally, it required considerable thought to properly analyze the incorrect scientific thinking which I have discussed in this Book. However, when I proceeded to study Economics, I was *shocked* by "accepted teachings" which my thinking, caring, and questioning mind recognized as being obviously **wrong**.

After studying in traditional economics, I found that my questioning mind — which has always pursued *Absolute Truth* — would not be stilled. I loudly spoke up in my Economics class and said: "What is being taught is wrong!" At first my teacher thought that I was a smart aleck and told me that if I was so smart I should "get up and teach the class." I responded by proceeding to do just that.

As a result of my delivery to that Economics class, I successfully stimulated the thinking processes of every young man and woman in the room. My delivery prompted my fellow students to eagerly begin to think and question.

At this point, I wish to pay tribute to my exceptional Economics teacher — Mr. Paul R. Cooper — who was not offended by my response to his challenge of me and from that point continued to encourage my questions. I immediately sensed that Mr. Cooper was an exceptional teacher. Prior to that time, I would ask questions and would always be told by my teachers: "Joe, you are holding up the class." I do not even recall the names of such teachers.

In 1961, I wrote to President John Kennedy because I

was very concerned about Economic teachings which failed to offer a sound solution to the obviously severe problems repeatedly observed in Economics. One of President Kennedy's special assistants (whose name I have unfortunately forgotten) responded by mail by sending me a copy of President Kennedy's Congressional recommendation entitled: *How to Add Momentum Back to the American Economy*.

I handed the copy of these recommendations to Mr. Cooper, whom I respect as a teacher and human being. Mr. Cooper was very pleased, made copies of the recommendation, and distributed them to the students in all of his classes.

At the end of the semester, Mr. Cooper took me aside and said: "Joe, I wish to thank you."

"What for, Mr. Cooper?" I replied.





Mr. Cooper responded, "Joe, I am an old man, and Economics is one of the most important courses a student can take since it affects one's whole life. Over the years, however, students attend my classes and behave dryly and unresponsively. You have generated more enthusiasm and participation from this year's class of students than all of my prior years of teaching achieved. I simply wanted to thank you, Joe."

I warmly replied, "Mr. Cooper, it was my pleasure to be your student and attend your class." I often think of Mr. Cooper with great warmth even though I have not seen him since I left college as a young man. *Mr. Cooper was truly a teacher!* I sincerely recommend that any teacher who wishes to be warmly remembered by her/his students should so conduct herself/himself. By such actions, the teacher will do her/his students and herself/himself honor, justice, and stimulate progress.

I humbly pray that I can use my talents to stimulate you and the world to *question, think, and become excited* about Economics and the future of our world. Read again in Chapter 20 my 1967 letter to President Johnson in which I predicted "An Energy Innovation and a Merger between Mechanization and Economics."

Just as I was "shocked" as a young man, I will now attempt to "shock" you. There is an old saying — "A picture is worth a thousand words." The following graph is far more valuable than a *million* words:

*It is more semantically precise and descriptive to use the term *brainsoiling* rather than *brainwashing*, since "washing" implies a purification process; "soiling" implies just the opposite. This semantic distinction was first developed and employed for such usage by Evan R. Soule, Jr. in 1981.



American business activity, shown in solid black and indicated by the scale at the left, has been subject to wide fluctuations from the long-term trend. Changes in wholesale commodity prices are suggested by the dashed line.

Reprinted from "An Economic History of the United States" by Gilbert C. Fite and Jim E. Reese, Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959.

This graph is from my basic economics text entitled "An Economic History of the United States."

Imagine taking such a graph to a given company's competent production engineer anywhere in the world and informing that individual that: "I have a new production machine for your assembly line. This graph I'm showing you demonstrates my new production machine's operability and dependability — it works for a week, breaks down, works for a week, breaks down, etc." It should be obvious that the company's production engineer would tell such a person to "get lost."

But how ironic it is that the same graph which depicts *societal* inefficiency does affect and control the entire above-discussed company as well as its assembly lines. This fact was clearly demonstrated in the early 1980 "Depression" which was euphemistically called a "Recession." There were many long-time, established companies which permanently closed their doors during this recent Depression. It was a heartbreaking experience to watch the dependable employees of such companies lose their jobs and the sincere managements be helpless to prevent such loss and closure. Company management believed they neither created nor knew how to fight the "unseen enemy" of an economic Depression.

Are you "shocked" by these economic events? I was and I remain shocked to this day! I simply could not believe that I lived in a world that would blindly repeat the same mistakes — so costly and damaging to human life and happiness — over and over again. What I have witnessed is an extremely inefficient economic mechanism that first "soothes," then "worries," and then "slaps down" human beings. The trickery and deception which creates such human misery apparently goes unnoticed by others.

Since the late 18th century, periods of prosperity and depression have succeeded one another at irregular intervals in the United States, Great Britain, and other industrial nations throughout the world.

It is currently taught that the essence of economics is "supply and demand." This teaching is *totally false*. As it now exists and has existed in the past, the essence of economics is "Fear" and "Greed."

I urge the reader not to blindly accept what I teach. On the contrary, you should *honestly question* both what I teach and what you have learned from the past.

Simply examine the graph depicted above and prove to yourself that "Fear" and "Greed" are the true economic culprits of our present civilization. On the graph, all nodes located above the zero line represent inflationary action. Inflation occurs because of "Greed." This problem will only be solved if *Absolute Truth* is consistently taught to the entire world.

At the height of an inflationary cycle (the highest point on the nodes above the zero line), the "Greed" Factor becomes so outrageous that consumers begin to refuse to purchase commodities or services. Even though the consumer still desires goods/services, the consumer refuses to purchase and endeavors to wait for "fair" and

"reasonable" prices. At this point in time, manufacturers have extensive inventories as a result of having recently increased their production capacity.

Such facts clearly prove that the essence of economics is not "supply and demand." Actually, at the point of maximum inflation, there is an abundant "*supply*" of inventory *and* a strong consumer "*demand*" for such goods/services. The problem is that the consumer simply refuses to purchase the goods/services at prices which are "*unreasonable*" and which represent "Greed."

Such "Greed" results in unemployment at the companies who supply raw materials and the factories who manufacture the products. At this stage, the psychological factor of "Fear" becomes manifest. Such "Fear" precipitates a sharp decline towards a "Depression." On the graph above, such Depressions repeatedly follow the inflationary cycles. [They begin at the point immediately following the height of the inflationary cycle and fall to the lowest point on the node below the zero line.]

It is ironic that the initial extensive unemployment occurring at the height of the Inflation ("Greed"), initiates a negative chain reaction by instilling a "Fear" factor which results in a Depression.

Such "Fear" causes consumers not to purchase goods/services even when prices are lowered during a depressionary cycle. When goods and services go unsold, unemployment increases. Everyone is well acquainted with the extensive human misery that occurs during a Depression ("Fear").

I repeat that the essence of "present" Economics is *not* "Supply and Demand." *The essence of "present" Economics is "Fear" and "Greed."* I am certain that the reader recognizes that "Fear" and "Greed" do not represent the essence of Science or of a "thinking, questioning, and truth-seeking mind." "Fear" and "Greed" are totally inappropriate as the controlling factors for the essence of the "economic well-being" of human beings.

"Present" economics is indeed "a subject that strongly demonstrates the 'unjust' and 'detrimental' results of the brainsoiling effect generated by our present primitive teaching system.

I implore you not to close your mind. To do this would only endorse a continuation of human misery.

The facts demonstrated by the above Graph prove that I speak the Truth. Such facts clearly prove that "present" economic dislocations result from the repetitive cycles of hope (Greed) and misery (Fear). This economic system is highly inefficient and demonstrates an unwillingness to sincerely *question* the observed problems and seek *Absolute Truth* with respect to a realistic solution.

I now wish to focus on the presentation of a "Positive" solution rather than discuss the "Negative" nature of the problem. I seek to inspire and excite you as to the solution for our economic problems. Such a solution will replace the "Old" with the "New" and will be extremely efficient. This solution will offer the human population of our planet a continuous enjoyment of *physical well-being* rather than intersperse such enjoyment with

“Greed,” “Fear,” and “Misery.”

Let me share with you how I perceive the *Absolute Truth* for the essence of Economics:

“Economics is simply a ‘thought tool’ with respect to the efficient utilization of human power via mechanical devices!”

We cannot and should not lose sight of this Fact! To do so only “mocks” the very essence of the deep motivating force within the truly creative individual.

“Economics is simply a ‘thought tool’ with respect to the efficient utilization of human power via mechanical devices!”

While he was President of the National Academy of Science, Frederick Seitz eloquently stated it this way:

“Regardless of the diversity of nationalities, personalities, and specialties, scientists everywhere — intentionally or not — are bound together by a common purpose: the advancement of human capabilities.”

I might add that this fact is true for any *creative* individual. I have classified a *Scientist* as anyone who honestly questions what they are taught and then sincerely and diligently seeks a correct answer to their original question(s). Furthermore, they then seek to improve upon what they have been taught.

Such an attitude is exemplified by the Pioneering Electromagnetic Energy Invention which I have innovated during twenty years of dedicated effort.

EXAMPLE: Several years from now, imagine that my innovation is in full production for any type of device necessary to perform a given task.

At this point — according to the old (and incorrect) economic teachings — the management of all manufacturing/production companies will decide to mechanize and replace *all* human operations with robotics. The management will conclude that by firing most of their employees they can increase profits for their company. Such “Greed” — or lack of concern for human welfare — will engulf companies throughout the world as they endorse the same selfish idea.

I agree that any routine task performed by a human being can be more efficiently accomplished by a mechanized device. *However, the results obtained via “Greed” or such a selfish and “unthinking” response on the part of a company will be opposite to management’s expectations!* If all companies fire most of their workers, this would not only drastically reduce the work force but would also drastically reduce the purchasing power of the consumer — a consumer readily *desired and needed* by all companies to provide an outlet for manufactured products. The economic result of such diminished purchasing power is a “Depression!” Products and services would simply go unsold because

the “unemployed” consumer would lack the available financial resources.

It should be obvious that *both* the potential consumers (who are generally employees) and company management do not desire the negative results of a “Depression.”

I sincerely urge both “Labor” and “Management” to question, think and seek *Absolute Truth* — only then will both sides recognize that the facts of economics with respect to an Efficient Economic Program prove that “Labor” and “Management” are *not* enemies. On the contrary: *Neither can exist without the other! For one side to truly function efficiently, so must the other.*

It is therefore only pure economic sense for each side to be concerned about the prosperity of the other side. The facts clearly demonstrate that as one side efficiently functions, so does the other.

As a scientist who always searches for *Absolute Truth*, I find this “Fact” of efficient economics very pleasing. *This fact proves that in order to achieve an Efficient Economic Program, we must care for one another’s economic well-being.* Such a true concern for one another contributes toward national and “world peace.” Once again, I recognize the same common denominator I had discussed in my earlier chapter on God: *Goodness!*

I now wish to specifically present the *positive* perspective: permit me to excite, stimulate, and “open your mind” to the magnificence of the future which can begin with *positive, thinking action.*

I ask that company management/owners consider the following *positive* economic results of my invention rather than the above-described *negative* economic results:

Consider what would occur if all companies, instead of firing workers as mechanization proceeds, simply have such employees *work less hours* for the *same* salary.

Your first unthinking reaction to such a proposal would be to say “Such a proposal is ridiculous!” My response: NOT SO! Examine the *whole* picture and not simply a *microscopic portion* of the whole picture.

If the workers utilize the benefits of Mechanized Pro-

“Examine the whole picture and not simply a microscopic portion of the whole picture.”

duction, then such workers can produce more products in less time and at less cost.

Now you, the “worker/employee”, must also *think.* You must not continually strive to raise your salary. Your first unthinking reaction to such a proposal would be to say, “Such a proposal is ridiculous!” My response: NOT SO! Examine the *whole* picture and not simply a *microscopic portion* of the whole picture.

If all workers produce more products at reduced costs, then the consumer — you — will have more products available at reduced cost. In effect, this decreased product cost to the consumer represents a *continuous salary increase* without the “negative” results affecting

the *whole* picture. The positive actions I propose will naturally decrease costs and dramatically increase the well-being of all people.

And from the management/employer perspective: If worker employment is high, then there is an extremely large consumer population willing and desirous of purchasing your products.

Moreover, as the working hours of the "employee/ workers" decrease, then these employee/workers have more leisure time available. Such leisure time generates additional demand for more products, services, new companies, and greater employment.

Sound and "thinking" Economics requires that realistic safeguards proposed by the general public, company managers, and employees be established. If properly prevented, "Greed" and "Fear" will not occur. *At the same time, however, incentive must not only be maintained but stimulated!* It is an observational fact that animals perform far more efficiently when an incentive reward is provided for their efforts. For human beings, this is even more true.


Companies must strive to increase financial profit via increased production and sales, *not* by price increases.

Similarly, workers must strive to obtain more products and services *not* by salary increases but via increased production which *lowers* the cost of such products and services.

If a company enjoys an increased demand for its products or services, that company must *not* proceed to irresponsibly raise its prices, if at all.

In essence, top-level company management, top-level employee personnel, politicians, other responsible individuals and especially *you* — the "voters" — must unite to think, question, and solve problems *together*. If such is done, then the Positive and Efficient Economic program I have described *will occur*.

The following statement is a *Fact*: If "Fear" and "Greed" are replaced with "Truthful Thinking," Questioning, and Action, then the realistic results of the Economics which I teach will produce the following graph:



What I have been discussing is Positive Economic Action that is compatible with the Revolutionary Energy Invention to which I have devoted many years of my life. Such Positive Economic Action will enable Space Travel to become an efficient and exciting reality. I am also speaking of the beginning of positive hopes and dreams for our young children and those future generations who look to us for a "smoother road through life!" The historical facts prove that in Economics we most definitely "reap what we sow."

That which is required is actually quite simple. What is required is that we *truthfully* "Question, Think and Act." The achievement of what I have described also requires *that we care for one another* which is the functional essence of *Goodness*. Moreover, the simplicity of what is required is mirrored in the "twinkling eyes" of our ever-questioning children. Such simplicity only demands that we creatively utilize the "Birthright" of our own "Questioning Mind," which has previously remained as a *Sleeping, Majestic Lion*.

I urge this "Majestic Lion" to *awaken!* *And the world will be changed most beneficially.*

The following Chapter will discuss an area requiring urgent attention and constructive change for the benefit of you, the "People."

Chapter 24

THE PATENT SYSTEM

“Justice delayed, is justice denied.”

— William E. Gladstone

The sole purpose of *any* Patent Office throughout the world is to stimulate the creativity of the people in all countries. Such action generates benefits for all inhabitants of the planet.

This discussion of the patent system will begin with a quote from an article in *U.S. News and World Report*, 1981, February 2, pages 45 and 461, entitled “Patent System ... A Drag on Innovation.” The article quotes Donald W. Banner, former Commissioner of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, who says:

“A U.S. Patent has become a cruel hoax, providing neither protection nor incentive for development of inventions.”

When inventors and their inventions suffer at the hands of Patent Office Officials, then the people of all nations suffer. This is so because such inventions which could bring to all people prosperity and happiness are stifled, restricted, suppressed, and/or interminably delayed to the point of extinguishing creativity and hope.

The *total injustice* which I have been forced to endure for years from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office with respect to my Pioneering Energy Invention clearly illustrates and confirms the truth of the above quotation by Donald W. Banner. Due to lack of space, I will not present all the shocking details of the very extensive file (over 1500 pages) concerning the *injustice* inflicted upon me by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. I will, however, quote several sections from the public records of the Washington, D.C. Federal District Court Case No. 83-0001 concerning my lawsuit against the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

For years, I have carefully and *factually* documented my file with respect to both the actions of the U.S. Patent Office and the Federal District Court. Such extensive documentation is being accumulated because I do not want other creative and talented individuals to be exposed to *Injustice* from employees of the U.S. Patent Office.

As of the time of this writing, the following is a *brief* outline of what has occurred:

1. My Constitutional Rights were and are being deliberately violated.

A. I was originally told in January 1982 by Patent Examiner *Donovan F. Duggan* that he didn't think he would ever be able to give me a Patent “no matter what evidence I presented to him.”

[On September 12, 1983, a Federal District Court in Texas found that Donovan F. Duggan's “Knowledge of electrical theory may have been inadequate for his responsibilities.” (See *Lindsey v. United States*, Civ. Action Nos. TX-79-60-CA, TX-81-39-CA.) This Texas case involved the same Examiner Duggan and another inventor, Ralph Lindsey. The Federal District Court in Texas also found that Examiner Duggan rejected the patent application of Ralph Lindsey because he (Duggan) “misunderstood” the nature of the device and therefore “carelessly and incorrectly perceived” it to be a “perpetual motion machine.” The Court found that Duggan summarily rejected the Lindsey application with a “cryptic comment” failing to provide “such clear and full disclosure of reasons for rejection as required by the regulations.” The Court found that once Duggan was “convinced” it was “a perpetual motion machine,” he “seemed unable to consider the design on its own merits.” The Texas Court concluded that, as a result of Duggan's negligence, Lindsey failed to receive a patent that was later issued instead to a Mr. Davis for a similar device.]

B. My legal rights to a Pioneering Patent have been unscrupulously delayed for over five years.

2. There has been and still is a deliberate violation of U.S. Patent Law.

A. I was informed by a U.S. Patent Office Examiner that he had not read my extensive, 133-page Disclosure Document.

B. The Patent Examiner refused to clearly define his objection to my Disclosure Document.

C. The Patent Examiner refuses to accept the Affidavits attesting to my energy machine's operability. These Affidavits have been provided by more than thirty independent, competent, scientifically-educated individuals who include nuclear physicists, electrical engineers, electrical technicians, etc.

3. The U.S. Patent Office has consistently, deliberately, and with premeditation misrepresented and distorted the *Facts*.

A. Patent Office employees have falsely stated that I claim my energy machine is a “perpetual motion device.”

B. The Patent Office employees have implied that I had a “hidden energy source.” (Several other Patent Office employees later agreed that this was not the case.)

C. The Patent Office employees doubted that my 5,000-lb. operational prototype even existed.

D. The legal counsel for the Patent Office had a “witness” (who had never actually tested my energy machine) sign an Affidavit questioning the operability of my energy machine *despite the fact that at the time* the “witness” truly believed the possibility that the

“The U.S. Patent Office has consistently, deliberately, and with premeditation misrepresented and distorted the Facts.”

energy machine worked. Later, this same “witness” *reversed himself* and submitted a second Affidavit which attested to the operability of my energy machine.

E. The Patent Office made false statements to the effect that all of the independent scientists who had endorsed the operability of my invention had an interest in my invention.

F. There are many other distortions too numerous to list in this Book. Such distortions are contained in the entire Court records and available documentation.

4. The U.S. Patent Office has consistently acted as a “hostile adversary” towards the development of my Pioneering Energy Invention.

A. A representative of the Patent Office who acted solely as an adversary came to my house to question testimony submitted by two competent scientists — testimony which was provided in Depositions verifying the operability of my Pioneering Invention. At the same

“The U.S. Patent Office has consistently acted as a ‘hostile adversary’ towards the development of my Pioneering Energy Invention.”

visit, however, the Patent Office *refused* to furnish anyone to physically test my energy machine despite the fact that my attorney had repeatedly asked that such testing be arranged before the Patent Office representative traveled by plane from Washington, D.C., flew to New Orleans, and rented an automobile for an approximately 130-mile drive to my home in Lucedale, Mississippi. *After* the patent office representative arrived at my home, he informed me that he was unable to conduct testing on my energy machine since

he was not technically qualified. MY QUESTION: If such an individual admitted that he was technically unqualified, then how could he be qualified to judge the capability of the technically qualified individuals who *had* tested the energy machine?

B. The Patent Office falsely implied that I and the more than thirty scientifically-educated individuals who had attested in Affidavits to the validity of my Pioneering Invention were all incompetent.

C. Major William Schuyler, Jr., a former Commissioner of the U.S. Patent Office, was *nominated by the Patent Office* and appointed by the Federal District Court to evaluate the validity of my energy machine. Both the Patent Office and the Federal Judge expressed the fact that they were very impressed with Mr. Schuyler’s superb technical qualifications. (See a further discussion of this subject in the following Chapter.)

After evaluating my energy machine, Mr. Schuyler wrote in his *Report of the Special Master*, dated September 28, 1984:

- (1) “EVIDENCE BEFORE THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE AND THIS COURT **IS OVERWHELMING** THAT NEWMAN HAS BUILT AND TESTED A PROTOTYPE OF HIS INVENTION IN WHICH THE OUTPUT ENERGY EXCEEDS THE EXTERNAL INPUT ENERGY: THERE IS **NO** CONTRADICTORY FACTUAL EVIDENCE.” (Emphasis added.)
- (2) The Patent Office has presented “no contradictory factual evidence.”
- (3) There was ample evidence that one skilled in the art could construct or utilize the energy machine.
- (4) The Patent Office did not examine the petitioner’s (Mr. Newman’s) application “on its merits in accordance with usual practices.”
- (5) The Patent Office Board of Appeals’ finding rejecting such a machine as “impossible” was “clearly erroneous.”
- (6) Petitioner Newman “is entitled to a patent.”

The legal counsel for the Patent Office had originally vouched for the superb credentials of former Commissioner Schuyler at the time Mr. Schuyler was nominated for Special Master to the Federal Court. After the *Report of the Special Master* was issued, the same legal counsel vilified former Commissioner Schuyler and advised the Court to “exercise some common sense and refrain from joining those who apparently still believe in the tooth fairy.” The legal counsel was, however, incapable of specifically advising the Court as to why the findings of the former Patent Office Commissioner were incorrect.

D. All of the above, 1 through 3F.

5. As a result of the *Injustices* described above (and *many* others not included in this brief synopsis), I have been forced to write this Book and fully disclose the nature of my Pioneering Invention without the full benefit of Pioneering Patent protection to which I am entitled by law.

6. The Injustices inflicted upon me by the U.S. Patent Office have cost me (as of this date) over \$200,000.00 in legal expenses and, more importantly, have cost the American people and the World the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a revolutionary energy invention.

I must stress to the reader that such Injustices go far beyond myself. If these Injustices are permitted to continue without reprisal, then you may be assured that *other* creative individuals *will continue* to suffer such injustices — injustices which will *only increase* with time.

I do not so vigorously fight this battle with the Patent Office solely for my own benefit. *I especially fight for those creative individuals whose sensitive dispositions can be shattered by such injustice!*

I ask the reader to use your “Questioning Mind” and examine the many existing innovations which eliminate

“I especially fight for those creative individuals whose sensitive dispositions can be shattered by such injustice!”

the drudgery from your life. What is the *source* of all these beneficial inventions?

ANSWER: Such beneficial inventions were innovated by *creative individuals* at a moment in time when such individuals envisioned something “new” that had not been previously understood. These beneficial inventions were *not* created by Kings, Queens, Presidents, politicians, etc., but were developed by *creative individuals*.

Simply examine the previous several thousand years of human history and ask, “Why have there been so many significant material improvements?” The facts prove that: **the Jewels of our civilization are our Creative Individuals!**

Is it not logical that we should at least protect, nurture, and inspire our Creative Individuals with the same diligence and protection provided in Nature by a productive “worker bee” to a “Queen bee” within the hive?

The Constitution of the United States directs that we behave in such a fashion. Moreover, the sole purpose of the U.S. Patent Office is to afford such protection.

The facts prove, however, that the Patent Office is failing to do its job. It is obvious that proper legal actions must be initiated to guarantee that the Patent Office properly performs its very important function.

I urge the reader to contact your elected officials and demand that your “Queen bee” — the Creative Individual (by which you and your future descendants will continuously benefit) — be *protected* such that *creativity* is *stimulated* and not stifled.

At this point, I wish to pay tribute to the News Media. *In many instances, the News Media are the “lubricant” which “unclogs” the wheels of our Democracy!*

I urge the News Media to vigorously investigate the Facts concerning the behavior of the U.S. Patent Office and to maintain such an investigation until the U.S.

Patent Office is operating efficiently and legally. From this point forward, the People and the News Media should closely and continually monitor the performance of the U.S. Patent Office. If warranted, the public should be advised by the News Media when action is necessary. Such action should then be taken immediately to prevent further stifling by the Patent Office of individual initiative and creativity.

While most members of the News Media have fairly and accurately reported my case to the public, there have been several news stories that did a disservice to the news reporting profession. In each case, these factually inaccurate news stories were written anonymously. It requires no personal courage to attack the potential rightness of an individual from a protective cloak of anonymity. Being unwilling to assume explicit credit and reputational risk for what was written is a form of cowardice.

One of these inaccurate, misleading, and anonymous articles appeared in DISCOVER magazine. This reputed scientific magazine hired the services of a magician in an attempt to discredit what I have accomplished. If a hoax was really feared, then a more scientific approach would have been to send someone having technical and scientific credentials to accompany the magician in the event my work appeared to indeed be genuine. This was not to be, however. By indicating that he was an “investigative consultant,” the magician did not truthfully represent himself to me on the telephone, and implied that he possessed the requisite scientific credentials. Also, the “investigative consultant” promised to confer with me following his investigations and before he submitted his findings to the magazine. This he failed to do.

The article that finally appeared in DISCOVER magazine was replete with factual inaccuracies. However, since the “investigative consultant” is a professional magician, I would say that he is eminently qualified to investigate the illusions which appear to exist within the mind of the individual who fabricated the article in DISCOVER magazine.

A second inaccurate, misleading, and anonymous article appeared in the *New York Times* entitled “Perpetual Invention.” In this article, the writer describes my energy machine as a “perpetual motion machine.” I have repeatedly stated that my machine is *not* a “perpetual motion machine.” Such an unscientific attitude on the part of the writer indicates an unwillingness to examine an innovation which requires new thought processes. Labeling an invention a “perpetual motion machine” relieves the writer of the responsibility of seriously and scientifically considering my theories and innovations.

The *New York Times* anonymous writer specifically wrote: “Mr. Newman calls his device an ‘energy generation system having higher energy output than input — an electric motor that gets something for nothing.” This statement is **totally false!**

I have very specifically described my energy machine as a device generating “greater *external* energy output than *external* energy input.” This statement is totally

different from an electric motor that "gets something for nothing." The depth and validity of my work has already been sincerely presented to you, the reader. The irresponsible action of those individuals who make such unthinking statements is exposed for what it is.

In general, however, the News Media has acted responsibly, accurately and fairly. Their actions can continue to serve the public in a beneficial manner by alerting them to the unjust actions of the U.S. Patent Office.

I have included a copy of an Affidavit concerning the U.S. Patent Office which I presented to the Federal District Court in Washington, D.C. This Affidavit recommends specific changes in the patent system which I had originally suggested to Mr. Paul Gomory, expert advisor to the Senate Judiciary Committee on Patent Office Affairs.

AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH WESTLEY NEWMAN

For the benefit of the Honorable Court, I submit the following Exhibits A, B, and C and related following comments.

In July, 1982, as a result of my grievances given to Senator Stennis' Office concerning this patent application and its resulting treatment by the U.S. Patent Office, I was given a meeting with Mr. Ralph Oman at his office. Mr. Oman is Staff Director of Criminal Law Subcommittee, Committee On The Judiciary, United States Senate.

After discussing my concern with Mr. Oman for a short period of time, Mr. Oman stated he wished me to talk with and expalin myself to Mr. Paul L. Gomory, whom he advised me was an Expert Advisor to the Judiciary Committee on Patent Matters. Thereupon, Mr. Oman called Mr. Gomory by phone and I talked with Mr. Gomory for a while and then met with him personally the next morning for about one hour.

I returned home that day and within the week wrote Mr. Gomory a five page letter explaining my concerns, which is attached as Exhibit C, and also forwarded a copy to Mr. Oman, which is attached as Exhibit B.

Said five page letter prompted Mr. Gomory in writing a **most** positive letter in my behalf to Mr. Oman and is attached **as** Exhibit A. (Information concerning Mr. Gomory is attached **as** Exhibit Al.) Especially see the first one and one-half sentences of paragraph 4 of first page. Quote: "I feel strongly, very strongly, the situation that Joe is experiencing.

Manifestly, this is not the way to treat our inventors, much less their inventions....." Unquote: (Emphasis Added)

Also see last paragraph of page one. Quote:

"I subscribe to Joe's letter in general. I have experienced his experiences, especially as related in each of the paragraphs, especially beginning with paragraph 4 and 5 on page 2 to the end of his letter including his excellent suggestions which take into consideration the nature of the human being." Unquote.

I have not received or been told any information by these individuals which have stated or implied contradiction to the above facts.

Leaving one to conclude others of prominate, pertinent position feel my complaints are justified.

The undersigned declares further that all statements made herein of the undersigned's own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and, further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or document or any registration issued thereon.

DATE:

16 Aug. 1984

Joseph Westley Newman
JOSEPH WESTLEY NEWMAN
STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

County of George

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the

16th day of Aug., 1984

Gary Ray Harvey, Chancery Clerk
By Conna Lee Holland, D.C.

My Commission Expires 1st Monday in 1988

copy

August 2, 1982




EXHIBIT A

Ralph Oman,
Chief Legislative Assistant
Senator Mac Keithan

Dear Ralph:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter mailed to Laurence Pretty, Chairman, ABA, PTC Section, Committee on Patent Law Revision. Copies were made on Saturday and mailed on Sunday. This is the first opportunity I have to write to you concerning our discussion on what should be done, as discussed with you on the phone when, responsive to your request that I do so, I outlined to you briefly my then thoughts on how to break the many impasses which I have encountered in my practice and which, unfortunately, Joe Newman has encountered. My letter to Larry Pretty amplifies somewhat my thoughts in the matter. When I have heard from the Committee and others to whom I have sent copies of the letter now enclosed, I shall again be in touch with you, ready to draft a proposed bill if this seems indicated at the time.

The persons receiving copies of the enclosed letter are all of them well-respected leaders and/or officers in the associations to which I belong.

Just this morning I have Joe's letter of July 30. He indicates thereon that you have received a copy. My comments on Joe's letter can be brief because you should already have it.

I feel strongly, very strongly, the situation that Joe is experiencing. Manifestly, this is not the way to treat our inventors, much less their inventions which they should be encouraged to disclose responsive to the incentive of the system which you know I have frequently referred to as being our VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE, PATENT INCENTIVE, INVENTION AND INNOVATION SYSTEM. This name for our system, which I have used in testifying before the several houses of Congress, explains or describes that there shall be incentive sufficient to cause "voluntary" disclosure of inventions. Such disclosure immediately permits, when the patent has issued, or earlier when the applicant for patent sees that he has adequate protection in a patent to be issued, that others in the field may begin to build on or attempt to design around the invention, the disclosure having been made responsive to the Constitutional provision of Article I, Section 8, Clause 8. This is indeed "... to promote ... the useful arts ..."


I subscribe to Joe's letter in general. I have experienced his experiences, especially as related in each of the paragraphs, especially beginning with paragraphs 4 and 5 on page 2 to the end of his letter including his excellent suggestions which take into consideration the nature of the human being.

Ralph Omen

August 2, 1982

I now look forward to the meeting which you have said you would like to have with me and will wait for you to set the date as you have advised me.

Kindest regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Saul".

320-4327

cc Joe Newman

Abbreviated Biographical Sketch

PAUL LOUIS GOMORY, born Newark, New Jersey. Lived in several states and traveled in others. Lived ten years abroad during his formative period, attending schools in Hungary, Austria, France and England. Studied chemistry and engineering at the University of London, England and at Polytechnic Institute in New York City. He holds a law degree from Temple University School of Law and is a member of the Bar of the United States Supreme Court, Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and a number of lower state courts and federal courts.

Paul was an active Washington Athletic Club member for about 23 years. He now works out at The Army & Navy Club, making it to the club regularly. He runs before breakfast. He and Peg are avid bikers. They can be seen on the C & O Canal towpath on Saturdays, Sundays and some holidays.


Paul is Director, Washington Office Phillips Petroleum Company Patent Division. He has served Phillips for over 32 years. Active in politics he is engaged in several endeavors related to the abatement of crime and recidivism. He is personally deeply concerned about federal legislation concerning business, which is America's business.

Bills with which he has been personally concerned are divestiture of organizations in the chemical, the oil, the ferrous, the non-ferrous and other industries. An important item he personally has put in his time on is deregulation, especially of the oil and gas industry which he says ". . . is at the backbone of our great Country's military and economic posture." His concern with patent legislation has been a part of an overall concern for the welfare of our Country.

The recently enacted patent law revision bill is one of several on which he has worked assiduously having testified on it and others on behalf of the Association for the Advancement of Invention and Innovation (A²I²) and on his own behalf. Paul drafted a number of bills which have been introduced in the U.S. Senate as well as in the House of Representatives, and has secured the introduction of the American Patent Law Association bill presented to the 94th Congress. He is an ex-officio member of the National Council of Patent Law Associations.

Paul has chaired a number of committees in the American Bar Association, the District of Columbia Bar Association, and in the American Patent Law Association. These committees have been related to various legislation activities including public relations and public information. He has acted as liaison between the D.C. Bar Association, Patent, Trademark and Copyright Section of the District of Columbia Bar Association and was for many years a member of the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and its Subcommittee on Divestiture which he conceived and formation of which he instigated. He has worked with a large number of other associations including NAM, CMA, PMA, MAPI, ATA, etc.

*Retired and
of the Patent - 1930
- 1961, 81*



A Director and Advisor of A²I², he has represented the association in legislative matters on the Hill and elsewhere in the private sector and in government. He has prepared and presented testimonies on the Hill where he is well received as shown by the printed records.

Paul has worked with a large number of persons and organizations, personally and informally, on subjects of interest to him. He works in close touch as advisor to Intellectual Property Owners. He worked with the Business Round Table for several years.

Paul has spoken and continues to speak on various subjects including political, legal and technical subjects. He has addressed the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, Sertoma, Lions, Oldest Inhabitants of Washington, D.C. Society and other groups including political and civic action organizations. He has been invited speaker to the Practicing Law Institute in New York City and has spoken at a number of technical and legal conferences and conventions.

Paul has authored a number of legal briefs for the United States Supreme Court, as well as articles on political and legal subjects, including Trade Secret Law, Freedom of Information Act, Intellectual Property Law and Government Patent Policy.

Paul is married to Margaret Burke and says that much of what he is and may have accomplished he owes to her aid and encouragement.

The Gomorys' daughter is now Mrs. Nanette Lunde. She and her husband Ivar, who is from Oslo, Norway, teach at the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire (Fine Arts Center). Paul, Jr. was for several years a Staff Assistant to the President in the White House. During part of this time he was Executive Assistant to Mr. Peter Peterson, later Secretary of Commerce. He is now with Korn-Ferry International, executive management specialists. (Formerly Chairman of the Board of Bell and Howell.)

In his talks to various groups, Paul has sought to impart information leading to a more effective citizenship for those of us who want to do more than simply vote and pay our taxes.

Paul has asked me to state that he appreciates particularly the opportunity which has been afforded to him to appear here today.



RALPH OMAN
STAFF DIRECTOR

CRIMINAL LAW SUBCOMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20510

(202) 224-9491

July 30, 1982

Route 1, Box 52
Lucedale, Mississippi 39452
Phone: (601) 947-7147

202-224-9491

Mr. Ralph Oman
Staff Director
Criminal Law Subcommittee
Committee on The Judiciary
UNITED STATES SENATE
Washington, D. C. 20510

copy



Dear Ralph:

I appreciate you meeting with me this week and introducing me to Paul. Please find enclosed a copy of a letter I sent to him today.

It would seem imperative to me that the Committee regarding improved patent procedures have earnest and dedicated input from "Inventors" (the creators), the individuals whom the sole purpose of patent procedures are and were intended to stimulate and to protect. Their feelings and needs can not be appreciated or truly anticipated by the "Non-Inventor" Individual who has not experienced their burning desire of the mind to be creative, which is most always discouraged and dampened by the trials and tribulations that most independent inventors usually experience. The one place that these unusual individuals should feel that they will find refuge, should be the Patent Office!

I would gladly participate and charge absolutely No Fee for this most worthy cause. I am sure there are others such as myself who would also participate in the same way.

It should be understood I am extremely honest, and will always state what I believe to be the absolute and fair solution to any problem. I despise rhetoric and always go right to the heart of any problem.

Sincere thanks and regards,

Joseph Westley Newman
Joseph Westley Newman

JWN/en
Enclosure

Copy

July 30, 1982

Route 1, Box 52
Lucedale, Mississippi 39452
Phone: (601) 947-747

301-320-4327

Mr. Paul L. Gowory
5609 Ogden Road
Washington, D. C. 20816

Dear Paul:

It was enjoyable meeting and talking with you this week in Washington, D. C.

Please find enclosed the materials you lent me to make copies thereof.

I have carefully considered the words of our conversation.

I am sure you are correct, that I am my own worst enemy, when making points to individuals who are effected or reflected on by the points which I make in accordance with my own rigid and high standards of honesty and direct statements, which I expect to mean exactly what is stated or implied. (Part of this is probably my scientific training and discipline, that all statements should mean exactly what they imply regarding the subject matter under consideration.)

Anyway, I still feel with all my being that the problems I have encountered from the U.S. Patent Office on this particular invention are most definitely wrong and unjust. For such procedures to continue or expand will most definitely be to the detriment of creativity of the individual.

The Patent Office is an Institution of Science In Continuing Physical Expansion! In many instances the Physical Realization of a Property of Science, will precede the Scientific Explanation or Expectation of the Fact; by the Scientific Community.

The Examiners and Officials of the U.S. Patent Office have a sensitive and moral obligation to the encouragement of creativity of the Individual, which is the essence of the betterment of the Human Race. All the great advances in the betterment of the Human Race are not and were not made directly by kings, queens, politicians and etc., but were made directly by the Creative Processes of the Individual. The greatest and most lasting contribution to the




EXHIBIT C

Mr. Paul L. Gomory
Page two
July 30, 1982

human race that a politician or President can make is to initiate and set up procedures to encourage and protect creativity of the individual, in addition to the normal and decent rights of the individual.

As I have already stated, the Patent Office is indeed an "Institution Of Science In Continuing Physical Expansion". Therefore, Examiners and Officials of the U.S. Patent Office should most certainly wish to conduct themselves in a Scientific Manner.

Their statements should be interpreted to read exactly as the wording implies.

Their statements should require facts of Proof, exactly as is presently required of the applicant (the individual who is the creator and takes the drudgery out of life). Is the applicant not entitled to at least the same consideration as the Examiner ask of the individual who has made the contribution?

On Pioneering Inventions, the Examiner is at an extreme disadvantage. All of a sudden he has thrown upon him completely New Teachings which, in many instances, will go against what he was personally taught in his schooling. In such Pioneering Cases the Examiner should call in the applicant (the extreme creator) prior to making or taking action on the pioneering application for the purpose of being diligently instructed and taught the knowledge of these New Teachings. The law already requires that the Examiner make a thorough study thereof of the application. This does not mean that the Examiner simply read the New Teachings, but means he must master it!

It is very important for the Examiner's sake that he be taught and master these New Teachings of a Pioneering Invention. The reason being, many other inventions will follow pioneering inventions. They will be mere improved inventions, and not pioneering inventions. The Supreme Court has already ruled Liberality should apply to Pioneering Inventions. If the Examiner does not master the Teachings of a Pioneering Invention before all the improved inventions start pouring into the Patent Office, he will become even more frustrated because it will be difficult for him to quickly and exactly point out what is or is not patentable of the improved inventions in light of the existing Pioneering Invention.

Mr. Paul L. Gomory

Page three

July 30, 1982

In contrast to this procedure, after the Fact of the Final Rejection, I was personally advised by the Examiner and his Supervisor that neither one of them had even read the 130 page Document, that took me 15 years to complete and was legally made a part of the patent application. And is extremely important in understanding the "How" and "Why" and "Breadth" of this Extremely Pioneering Invention! Every page of that Document was literally an inventive process on my part, all consummating in a working prototype and the Technical Process of Releasing a New Source of Energy. At the time of the Final Rejection the Examiner had not even read said document, much less mastered it, nor had the Examiner even mastered the teachings of the Specification itself. I know because I talked with him shortly after the Final Rejection!

For the Supervisors of the Examiner (who are in essence judges of the Examiner's and the applicant's disagreements) to be allowed to fraternize with the Examiner, is totally unjust toward the applicant (who is the creator or contributor to the betterment of the human race). For this to be allowed is to ignore the facts of human nature! The law in the courts regarding Judges is quite explicit in this fact. If a Judge can even be considered biased or prejudiced (he does not have to be proven biased or prejudiced), he should excuse himself. Considering the extreme importance in setting up a procedure that encourages creativity of the individual and as a result thereof improves the well being of all, can we do any less than what is standard procedure in a normal court of law?

There appears to be a problem because of the closeness of the Examiners and their Supervisors all being on the same floor in the same Art Unit. Of one thing I am sure, no matter what the problem there is a solution. First, we must recognize there is a problem and, second, we must want to correct the problem and then search for the solution in a truthful manner and the solution will most certainly come.

It would seem to me an easy and improved procedure could easily be set up along the following lines:

* A. The Director of each Art Unit must not have his office in the particular Art Unit. All of the Directors of All the Art Units be put on a floor with all of their offices together. They would then have camaraderie and could fraternize with each other without Jeopardizing the fairness toward an examiner or applicant. The

Mr. Paul L. Gomory
Page four
July 30, 1982

Directors do not perform normal Examiner procedures, therefore, they do not have to be in that Art Unit continuously to do their job efficiently. Also the Directors will all experience one or more problems that will be common to all Directors. They could easily meet every month or so and discuss solutions. The Directors of an Art Unit must have and maintain an air of respect and separability from the Examiner or the Applicant that is conducive with the power and the importance of the position given him. The fact that the Examiner has to go outside of his normal environment to address the Director in his office will have a most positive effect of getting responsible action from an Examiner relative to an applicant. Also the fact that the Director may make an inspection of his Art Unit at any time will also have a most positive effect on the Examiners and their immediate Supervisors.

The immediate Supervisors to the Examiners must also maintain separability. The Supervisors can have their office in the same Art Unit area of the Examiners, but he must not be allowed to fraternize with the Examiners. If he is honest in wanting to be completely fair and unbiased, he should have no desire to fraternize with the Examiner, but to the contrary, should have a sincere desire to cut any ties he may have had with the Examiners back when he himself was an Examiner. They can not eat together, they can not fraternize after work. The Examiner's immediate Supervisor must sign pledges that they will not or do not fraternize with the Examiners.

The Examiners, the Examiners' immediate Supervisors and the Directors and all other Patent Officials should recognize and hold in Reverence the Moral Obligation to act in a manner that will be conducive to creativity of the individual, and as a result thereof, to the betterment of the human race. They must protect the patents of the individuals which they grant, but at the same time they must be sure they give patents when deserved. And especially be sensitive to Pioneering Inventions (the Extreme Creator).

The procedure of the U.S. Patent Office must meet the requirements and needs of the applicant (the creator or contributor) and not be set up to meet unnecessary desires of Patent Office Employees, which are a detriment to the Inventor and a detriment to Creative Processes.

Mr. Paul L. Gomory
Page five
July 30, 1982

The problems I have written about I have personally experienced on the patent application, Serial No. 179,474, an extremely Pioneering Invention. The facts are in the record for all to see, who wish to see.

This invention, which I have worked so diligently and dedicatedly on for years, until it was perfected, will benefit the human race more than any other invention. It is very important to National Defense and National Economy, as it is to the entire world.

Any one or group which you could recommend that would be interested in assisting me in this important matter would be appreciated.

Sincere thanks and regards,


Joseph Westley Newman

JWN/en

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Ralph Oman

The reader should draw her/his own conclusions from the following FACTS:

- (1) Donald J. Quigg, the current Acting-Commissioner of the U.S. Patent Office, was employed as a top executive with a major oil company for 36 years before becoming the Deputy Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks on October 26, 1981.
- (2) A Federal Judge discussed in the following Chapter was appointed in 1982 by President Ronald Reagan. I have been informed by a number of individuals that President Reagan is very favorably disposed towards the oil industry.
- (3) Return to Chapter 20 (pages 169 and 170) and examine the response from President Reagan's office at the White House. An "in-house" memo (page 170) was **accidentally enclosed** with the cover letter signed by Anne Higgins. The cover letter indicates that it was not possible for President Reagan to comply with my request to examine the video film of my energy machine, yet the "in-house" memo indicates that the individuals at the White House recognized that the video film contained information of immense importance to the world and was viewed on March 3, 1984.

In addition to the above information, the facts of my Federal District Court Case 83-0001 in Washington, D.C., clearly demonstrates why the U.S. Patent Office must be immediately reformed.

"The Jewel of our civilization is its creative individuals!" Need I say more?

Chapter 25

THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

"Every community has a right to demand of all its agents an account of their conduct."

— Thomas Paine
from his book, *The Rights of Man*

Following years of *injustice* at the hands of the U.S. Patent Office, my fight for *Justice* took me to the U.S. Federal Court where, much to my dismay, I discovered further *Injustice*. The specific *Facts* of my Federal District Court case only serve to exemplify such continuing injustice.

EXAMPLE: Enclosed is a News Release which indicates that I have been forced to file with the U.S. Court of Appeals a Writ of Mandamus against Federal Judge Thomas P. Jackson. Due to the precedent-setting magnitude of this case, my legal counsel has requested that all ten Judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals hear my case.

I sincerely recommend that the news media and concerned citizens/elected officials secure a copy of my Writ of Mandamus submitted to the U.S. Court of Appeals. The facts of this case speak for themselves!

However, for those individuals who are unable to secure a copy of the Writ, I have outlined several of the pertinent facts:

(1) At the first hearing in Federal Court, Judge Thomas P. Jackson proposed that a technically competent "Special Master" be appointed by the Court to evaluate my energy machine since the Judge stated that he had no scientific expertise. (A "Special Master" is someone technically skilled in the subject under consideration by the Court.)

(2) I objected to the Judge's proposal. I stated that the Judge did not need scientific experience since he had only to follow the Law and simply *count* the actual witnesses who have attested to the operability of my energy machine. I had more than 30 such witnesses and the Patent Office had *zero!*

I indicated to the Judge that a "Special Master" would only increase the unjust expenses I had already been forced to endure as a result of the illegal actions of the U.S. Patent Office.

(3) Judge Thomas P. Jackson insisted that both the Patent Office and I submit three nominations for Special Master. If both parties could not mutually agree on a single individual, then the Judge himself would select a Special Master.

(4) I nominated two highly-qualified individuals: a Professor of Electrical Engineering at Texas A&M, and a Ph.D. graduate from Auburn University who is presently a NASA employee at Huntsville, Alabama. To avoid having a "biased nominee," I had not met either of these scientifically-competent individuals. For the same reason, I did not nominate any of the more than thirty individuals who had already testified in my behalf.

(5) The U.S. Patent Office nominated three individuals for the position of Special Master. Two were only Patent Office employees who, by virtue of their employer, would be suspected of being biased and prejudiced against my case. The third Patent Office nominee was Mr. William E. Schuyler, Jr., a former Commissioner of the U.S. Patent Office from 1969-1971 with a degree in electrical engineering. Mr. Schuyler could also be suspected of being biased since he had worked for the Patent Office.

(6) Judge Jackson refused to accept my two nominees and instead chose Patent Office nominee William E. Schuyler, Jr., whose credentials were described by Judge Jackson as "superb." I agreed to accept Mr. Schuyler as Special Master since I believed him to be an honest individual. I had once met Mr. Schuyler in 1975 and so advised Judge Jackson and the legal counsel for the Patent Office. The Judge and the Patent Office still insisted upon Mr. Schuyler's becoming the Special Master. As a result, Mr. Schuyler was appointed as the Special Master to evaluate my energy machine.

(7) Within several weeks after receiving all Disclosure Documents and case history presented to the Court, Mr. Schuyler issued his *Report of the Special Master*, dated September 25, 1984, which contained very significant statements:

(A) "Evidence before the Patent and Trademark Office and this Court *is overwhelming* that Newman has built and tested a prototype of his invention in which the output energy exceeds the external input energy; there is *no* contradictory factual evidence." (*Emphasis added.* I described this *Report* earlier in conjunction with the Patent System discussion.)

John Flannery

Janney House
Waterford, Virginia 22190
703-882-3175

3847 North Tazewell Street
Arlington, Virginia 22207
703-534-7464

Contact: Susan Braaten, 534-2918 or 534-7464

INVENTOR NEWMAN DEMANDS DAY IN COURT (April 17, 1985).....
.... Inventor Joseph Newman, whose extraordinarily efficient machine works as he says, according to a former Patent Commissioner, asked the federal appellate court to order the U.S. District Judge handling his patent case "to do his job, to decide the case, and not to shirk his constitutional duty." In short, Newman demanded "my day in court."

Inventor Newman, fighting for five years for a patent for his device, said "the Patent Office wouldn't consider my invention on its merits and I can't get the District Judge to consider it either."

Newman said, " The Court appointed the former Commissioner of the Patents, no less, as his Special Master to say what the facts were to save us time and money. At least that's what Judge Jackson said. The Master found for me. He said there was 'overwhelming evidence' my device worked and that I was entitled to a patent. And he decided that quickly, by September 28th of last year. But Judge Jackson sent me back to the Patent Office and wouldn't decide anything. Now it's costing me time and money as the Court made me pay for the Master's fees and expenses."

John Flannery, a former federal prosecutor and Newman's counsel, said in papers filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit that "the Court...having appointed a Special Master to determine what the facts were, had admittedly 'adjudged' nothing itself."

Flannery noted in his papers that:

"the Court said on October 31 it was 'not prepared' and was 'unprepared' to conclude anything. On January 31, when [Flannery] said 'nothing has changed' since the Patent Office's first rejection in 1981, the Court said, 'I don't know yet.' On March 14th, the Court said he gave the Master's Findings of Fact 'no effect whatsoever' and when asked if there were any facts the Court relied on in questioning the operability of [Newman's] device, the Court said, 'I'm not going to tell you now.'"

[See Petition for writ of mandamus at p. 30.]

Newman charged, "The Judge is not doing his job." John Flannery, a former federal prosecutor and Newman's counsel, said that "the law is that the District Court has a duty" to find out for itself what happened. Newman says that means, "The Court can't pass the buck back to the Patent Office as it has."

INVENTOR NEWMAN DEMANDS DAY IN COURT, page two

Flannery's papers include the unusual request that the entire Federal Circuit consider Newman's petition. Flannery says the case involves a "precedent-setting question of exceptional importance", namely:

"May a District Court that has appointed a Special Master to determine the facts but has itself admittedly 'adjudged' none of them, remand the civil action...[cites omitted]...to the Patent Office where [Newman] has already exhausted his administrative remedies requiring him to exhaust those remedies again and threatening him with abandonment of his patent application for his failure to comply with the extraordinary and unprecedented demands made of him upon remand?"

[See Petition for writ of mandamus at p. 1-2.]

The Patent Office has stated flatly that Newman will have abandoned his patent application if he doesn't bring from Mississippi and produce by May 30th "his [5,000 pound] operating prototype [in Maryland], [Newman's trial] evidence, notwithstanding that it might be withheld during the civil action, if not dismantled or destroyed."

[See Petition for writ of mandamus at p.4, 18-19.]

Flannery's papers refer to a case, Margolis v. Banner, where the Patent Office tried this before and the federal appellate court stopped them "dead in their tracks", according to Newman. In that case, the federal appellate court prevented "the Patent Office from using the threat of abandonment to force the [patent] applicant to give additional evidence after a final rejection."

[See Petition for writ of mandamus at 37-38.]

Backwoods Inventor Newman, 48, of Lucedale, Mississippi, has been stonewalled in his efforts to obtain a patent for the last five years. Patent Examiner Donovan Duggan, a proven incompetent, according to one federal district court, told Newman after he issued his final rejection of Newman's patent application that he "doubted he would ever allow a patent on [Newman's] invention no matter what proof [Newman] submitted (emphasis supplied)."

According to Newman, U.S. District Judge Jackson appointed the Special Master last summer to make findings of fact because of the "substantial and contradictory submissions of record before the Court." Newman charges Judge Jackson did that in part because the patent office submitted a false affidavit contradicting one of Newman's experts but the affidavit was recanted too late -- after the Master had been appointed.

(B) Under the section entitled “PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,” Mr. Schuyler wrote:

“Even though the operation of Plaintiff’s (Newman’s) system *seems* contrary to recognized scientific principles, Plaintiff has demonstrated the operation of his system by *very clear evidence* and is therefore *entitled to a patent* if he otherwise satisfies the requirements of the Patent Statute (35 USC). *In re Chilowsky 229 2d45 (CCPA1956)*” (*Emphasis added.*)

(8) *The U.S. Patent Office then responded to the Report of the Special Master* by vilifying former Commissioner Schuyler and advising the Court to “exercise some common sense and refrain from joining those who apparently still believe in the tooth fairy.”

Such an irresponsible remark by the legal counsel for the Patent Office was made *against their own nominee* — a nominee appointed by Judge Jackson who stated that the credentials of the Special Master were “superb”!

(9) Amazingly enough, Judge Thomas P. Jackson refused to accept the Special Master’s findings of fact with respect to the operability of my Pioneering Invention. Such a refusal was issued by a Judge who had already clearly admitted that he possessed *no* scientific credentials.

Even though Judge Jackson had no evidence to contradict the findings of Special Master Schuyler, and even though the Patent Office was also unable to present any evidence to refute the *Report of the Special Master* — Judge Jackson *still refused* to accept the Special Master’s findings of fact and refused to instruct the Patent Office to issue me a Pioneering Patent.

(10) Rule 53(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C.A., provides that in a non-jury action, “*the Court shall accept the Master’s findings of fact unless clearly erroneous.*” Both the Judge and Patent Office failed to present *any* “clearly erroneous” evidence.

(11) Judge Thomas P. Jackson then ordered me to pay \$11,602.20 for the *Report of the Special Master* — a *Report* which I had originally objected to as an unnecessary expense and a *Report* which was written by a man who was selected by the Court because Judge Jackson admitted that he was technically unqualified to judge the issues.

(12) Judge Thomas P. Jackson then placed the further disposition of the case **right back in the hands of the Patent Office** by ordering a remand to that office. In effect, I was “returned to square one” and once again forced to face the injustices of the Patent Office. This remand occurred *after* numerous court hearings, thousands of dollars in legal expenses, and an \$11,602.20 *Report of the Special Master* which endorsed the operability of my energy machine!

(13) I advised Judge Thomas P. Jackson that the “power” of the Honorable Court *was not “his power,” but that as a Judge he was only a custodian of the “Court’s Power.”* For the Judge to charge me \$11,602.20 for a *Report* which he refused to accept and then to order me to once again submit to the capricious behavior of the Patent Office — such judicial actions only *endorse* the Injustice I have been forced to endure for over five years.

(14) Because Judge Jackson refused to correct his deliberate injustice, I instructed my attorney to file against Judge Thomas P. Jackson a Writ of Mandamus in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit to which action my attorney readily agreed and further requested a Hearing In Banc, i.e., for all Appellant Judges to hear the Writ. As of this writing, both the U.S. Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court have refused my Writ of Mandamus and have continued to endorse the injustice initiated by the Patent Office and the Federal District Court. Such injustice proves that changes in our judicial system must occur.

I sincerely ask that the news media, elected officials, and concerned officials obtain a copy of the Court file with respect to my case. The injustice of which I write is fully documented!

I wish to pay tribute to my excellent attorney:

John P. Flannery, II, Esquire

555 Fourth Street, N.W., Suite 333 (202) 737-5708
Washington, D.C. 20001 534-7464

Possessing an intelligent and sharp mind, Mr. Flannery is more willing to “Fight for Justice” than any attorney I have ever met! Having only inherited and handled my case for several months, Mr. Flannery has fully and completely “mastered” a massive legal case.

My legal case actually represents an ideal example of the urgent need for an extreme change in the “Arrogant Authority” automatically and blindly given to Judges.

I have no doubt that there are many honorable Judges in the Judicial System who are a credit and compliment to their profession. However, the facts prove that there are many Judges whose arbitrary behavior justifies the immediate curtailment of such power with a proper system of checks and balances.

I make such a statement not because I dislike Judges, but because I have the *greatest respect and admiration* for those Judges who truly have been an asset to their profession and have consistently exhibited the very *essence of Justice*. Rather, *I make the above statement because I “love, cherish, and am devoted to Justice” while I totally despise and condemn all Injustice!*

It is for you, the public, that I write. I urge you to use your Mind to *question, think, and then act* in a manner based on Truth and Justice. Do not be complacent and unknowingly permit the “powers that be” to repress you and your loved ones. To permit Injustice to occur is to show contempt for the principles developed by the Founders of our “free” country.

The following Facts I have observed verify the truth of my statement concerning judicial abuse of power:

FACT 1: Numerous attorneys have informed me of their belief that Judges possess “Awesome Power.” Nine out of ten lawyers conduct themselves in a manner that reflects their fear of such power.

CONCLUSION FROM FACT 1: Such a belief is **totally** wrong! A Judge does not possess “Awesome Power.” *A Judge is only a custodian of the Honorable Court’s Power. The Court belongs to the Justice “of the People” — not “of the Judge”!* Just as a grown person would avoid hurting a baby, a Judge has an even greater moral obligation not to abuse the “Power of the Court.” A Judge who misuses such conferred authority should be judged accordingly.

Any Judge who conducts herself/himself as though the Power of the Court *is* the Judge’s Power should be immediately disrobed and replaced! No lawyer can properly represent her/his client (the People) if that lawyer believes the Judge possesses “Awesome Power.”

FACT 2: Many attorneys have personally told me that I should not file a Writ of Mandamus against Judge Thomas P. Jackson! Such lawyers reason that, even if I win my case in the Federal Court of Appeals, I must still return to Judge Jackson’s Court for further disposition. When this occurred, the lawyers’ opinion was that Judge Jackson would very likely try even harder to serve me *Injustice*.

CONCLUSION FROM FACT 2: In itself, Fact 2 demonstrates that Judges must be held responsible for their actions. Extremely strict judicial codes *must be enacted* since *Justice* cannot be served to attorneys’ clients (the People) when such attorneys believe FACT 2 and conduct themselves accordingly.

FACT 3: I have been informed by many attorneys that most Writs of Mandamus are rejected or opposed by higher courts because all Judges wish to “protect their own members” to an extent greater than that in other professions.

CONCLUSION FROM FACT 3: Such a Fact demonstrates the same conclusion as that expressed for FACT 2!

FACT 4: It is well known that Federal Judges are appointed by politicians. It is also well known that many politicians cater to “special interests.” Furthermore, many sensitive individuals anxiously await such appointments to determine if a Judge is politically “Conservative” or “Liberal.”

CONCLUSION FROM FACT 4: In themselves, the words “Conservative” and “Liberal” clearly demonstrate *biases* and *prejudices* — NOT JUSTICE. The “special interests” support politicians who appoint to Federal Judgeships specific individuals which the politicians hope will issue “Rulings of Law” which are favorable to the “special interests” that support the politicians. It is indeed a “vicious cycle” that is vicious in its denial of *Justice* to the People.

FACT 5: Judges have the power to determine whether a case will be tried by a Jury (the People) or by the Judge. One of the reasons for the existence of the Declaration of Independence is that the Founders of our country knew that the Colonialists had suffered the injustices of a corrupt judicial system. As it specifically states, the Declaration of Independence held the King of England in contempt “*for depriving us in many cases of the benefits of Trial by Jury.*”

In my case, I have been denied a trial by a Jury (the People). The reader should find it significant that an official of the U.S. Patent Office readily admitted to my attorney that “*they (the Patent Office) would hate to have my case tried by a Jury (the People)!*”

Judges attempt to justify their trying a case instead of a Jury by saying that “*People* (a Jury) can try a case concerning *Facts*, but only *Judges* should try a case concerning *Law.*”

**“... they (the Patent Office)
would hate to have my case tried
by a Jury (the People)!”**

CONCLUSION FROM FACT 5: The Founders of our country realized that Judges were often the pawns of “special interests” that influenced politicians, who in turn, appointed the Judges. It was for this reason that our Founders stressed the importance of Trial by Jury (the People).

If a statement represents the “Law,” then such a statement is a “Fact of Law.” Consequently, the members of a Jury (the People) are entitled to hear a case concerning the “Facts of Law.” The Jury would simply be provided with the “Facts of Law,” just as the Jury is provided with other Facts. A FACT IS A FACT, and any attempt by a Judge to claim otherwise only represents a ploy to deny the “People” a trial by a Jury (the People).

The “People” should be granted a Trial by “Jury” whenever the client (the People) request it.

Justice is not something learned from the blind memorization of a Law book. *Justice* is a natural instinct for anyone who devotes his life to living such *Justice*.

EXAMPLE: There are Judges who exemplify proper judicial behavior and are true administrators of *Justice*. Consider a Judge who has publicly opposed abortion due to the respect for and acceptance of a religious teaching but has judicially ruled in favor of “abortion” due to an acceptance of the “Essence of Justice” and the “Facts of Law.”

Consider the internal conflict experienced by such a Judge! Yet such a Judge recognized that the “Facts of Law” have demonstrated in previous centuries that many religious teachings only served to promote *Injustice* rather than *Justice* to the People. In respect for the “Facts of Law,” such a Judge rendered a decision which was most likely — in her/his opinion — to properly dispense *Justice* to the People. The Founders of our country had very clearly expressed the necessity for the separation of Church and State.

I salute those Judges who have always conducted themselves in a manner which demonstrated they were “custodians” of the “Power of the Honorable Court!” Such judicial conduct also demonstrates their recognition that such “Power” was not to be used to promote their personal biases and prejudices. Such is the “Essence of Justice.”

I am well aware that there are many religious individuals who have good intentions but would vigorously disagree with the above statement concerning “abortions.” This is certainly a very sensitive and emotional topic. I must stress that I do not wish to offend such individuals. My only intent is the rigorous pursuit of Truth and Justice.

QUESTION: Why do many religious individuals have such an attitude concerning “abortion”?

ANSWER: Because they were so taught and taught not to question.

QUESTION: Have I been able to convince you that your Mind is a precious, God-given gift which God expects should be consistently used to Question and pursue Truth?

QUESTION: Have you not been taught that God is “merciful”? I am certain your answer would be “Yes.”

QUESTION: Do you believe it likely that a merciful God would deliberately and intentionally cause children to be born in Ethiopia — only to live in misery for days, months, or years and then to die of starvation?

QUESTION: Do you believe it likely that a merciful God would deliberately and intentionally cause children to be born with severe mental and/or physical handicaps — handicaps which cause great suffering for the children and anguish for their parents?

QUESTION: Do you believe it likely that a merciful God would deliberately and intentionally cause children to be born to parents who do not want them — or to parents who cannot support them and provide proper teachings, guidance, hope, pride and *love*? A child born to such parents would only experience a life of misery and hopelessness, as well as a life possibly devoid of skill and personal pride in their ability to contribute to civilization.

Permit me to offer the following **FACT** for your *questioning* and *thinking* consideration:

FACT: Miscarriages or “natural abortions” which occur in early pregnancy are generally the result of abnormal development within the embryo or within the protective and nutritional structure derived from the trophoblast.

QUESTION: Do you think it possible that God (the Essence of Mercy) has mercifully placed such an automatic governing mechanism in the female human body and in the embryo in order to prevent some of the above-described misery from occurring?

QUESTION: Do you not think it possible that God (the Essence of Mercy) instilled Mercy within us as well as a Questioning, Thinking Mind and Free Will? Is it possible that God recognized that human action may be taken to terminate a potential human being born into a life of physical and/or mental misery — a potential human being “missed” by God’s “merciful and natural safeguard?”

THOUGHT: Consider the possibility that the physical body is not the essence of the “Soul” which remains in “limbo” until the birth of the physical body. When the physical body

is born and grows, the “Mind” proceeds to develop a sensitivity to right and wrong, and thereby brings the “Soul” out of “limbo.”

QUESTION: Do you not understand why many people accept “abortion” since, in many instances, such “abortion” could be considered “merciful?”

QUESTION: Do you not understand that to impose your belief upon those who accept abortion by saying that “they could not have an abortion,” would be as *unjust* as those who accept abortion, imposing their belief upon you by saying that “you must have an abortion?”

Perhaps you can now have greater respect and appreciation for those Judges who demonstrate a custodianship of the Power of the Honorable Court which strives to only serve Justice to the “People.”

It is most important, however, that the People and the news media apply safeguards to Judges to ensure that such Judges serve “Justice to the People” rather than serve biases, prejudices, and/or special interests.

The judicial injustices I have described must not be allowed to continue unchecked by the U.S. Supreme Court and Congress. To permit such injustice to occur would only constitute a signal to the U.S. Patent Office that patent officials can initiate against creative individuals *any* form of injustice without fear of punishment. Such injustice would only serve to discourage innovators from creating inventions which benefit all humanity.

I am also well aware of certain individuals throughout the country who have copied my invention and who attempt to claim the invention as their own. It is historically known that Glenn Curtiss attempted to steal the invention of the aeroplane from the Wright Brothers. Fortunately, history has done justice to both the Wright Brothers and Mr. Curtiss.

I sincerely appeal to the people of this country and the world to help stop Patent Office/judicial injustice and work to ensure that all inventors and benefactors of humanity secure the fruits of their labors. If you truly care for such justice, then I urge you to write your Senators, Representatives, as well as the President of the United States — and clearly demand that justice be served.

The injustice I have described would *totally* discourage creative individuals from pursuing Pioneering Inventions.

One individual, who has already publicly denounced my Pioneering Patent Application as worthless, has nevertheless attempted to steal my Patent Application rights by filing a patent application which utilizes my Technical Process. Such negative philosophy and destructive action is fostered by the unjust actions of the U.S. Patent Office/judicial system, and only serves to further discourage creative and pioneering individuals. It is *the people* who are the true victims of this unjust process.

You — the people — have power. EXAMPLE: When injustice to a Patent Application has occurred, your elected officials in Congress have the power to directly issue that Patent.

I sincerely ask you to question and think. Throughout history, when justice does not occur, rebellion and in many instances anarchy have resulted. In a quick and orderly fashion, you have the *power* — by your vote and/or recall of elected officials — to “alter or abolish” any form of government which is or becomes unjust. Such a right, duty, and power was clearly stated by Congress on July 4, 1776 in the Declaration of Independence and paid for by the blood of many of our ancestors. To allow injustice to occur is a mockery of the very essence of what America represents. Need I say more?

Chapter 26

THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH

"I have always found that the honest truth of our own mind has a certain attraction for every other mind that loves truth honestly."

— Thomas Carlyle

As I conclude this final Chapter, I feel a burden lifted from my shoulders. In slightly more than two months, I will be 49 years old. For nearly 50 years, I have deeply cared for humanity and strived to improve the quality of life upon the planet.

For over 20 years, I have fought for you, the *People*, who are now alive or who are yet to be born.

Many of my closest friends have sincerely urged me to include only topics relating to pure Science in my Book rather than these other numerous subjects. My friends are concerned that you, "the People," will dismiss *all* of my work if you become offended by *any* subject that I have discussed.

I told my friends that I fully recognize this possibility, and yet it does not deter me in any way. The reason is simple. *I am not promoting Joseph Newman! I am promoting you, "the People," and urging you to recognize*

Such a new, *Single Language* must be based on "Consistent Logic" (similar to mathematics) rather than memorization and imprecision. Present languages are deficient in strict logic and only serve to interfere with the creative processes one enjoys when writing one's work. I write from experience. This new, *Single Language* can be achieved if we "Question, Think, Create, and Act!"

The young children throughout the world who are taught such a new, *Single Language* will automatically feel *closer* and *less suspicious* of the children of other countries. When such children become adults, they will be more eager to *talk, share, solve, care, and produce* "Peace, Love, and Goodness."

I have provided for the world a Unified Field Technology and a New Energy Innovation which I sincerely believe — if used *creatively* — will do more to generate

"I have provided for the world a Unified Field Technology and a New Energy Innovation which I sincerely believe — if used creatively — will do more to generate World Peace than the efforts of all the Kings, Queens, Presidents, Dictators, etc., who have ever lived."

the "Sleeping Lion" that lies within you. I urge you to stir yourself, "Awaken," and begin to Question, Think, and Act to produce "TRUTH" which equals "Goodness."

I believe in you, "the People," more than you believe in yourselves.

We have been given a most precious gift: a Powerful Mind capable of Questioning, Reasoning, Thinking, Creating, Loving, being Merciful, Acting, Seeking, and Producing Absolute Truth, which equals Goodness!

So, teach your young children and stimulate their curiosity — this will do more toward producing a "meaningful, happy life" for your children than all the dogma you received via a non-educational process of memorization.

I have been discussing the "happiness," the "well-being," and the "future" of our children and of children yet to be born. To achieve and ensure these desirable goals, I warmly recommend that a *Single Language* be developed and taught on a worldwide basis to supplement conventional languages. This new, *Single Language* must be independent of any other known language in the world.

World Peace than the efforts of all the Kings, Queens, Presidents, Dictators, etc., who have ever lived. But for this to occur, it is imperative that we teach our young children to *Cherish* and *Use* the Natural Birthright of their Questioning Minds — and always, yes, always, seek the Pursuit of *Absolute Truth* which equals *Goodness*.

The energy technology I have innovated when combined with the "Merger of Economics and Mechanization" will result in a most beneficial working life and *Meaningful Life* for all humanity. I can envision the time when you, the "People," will only need to work no more than one hour a week (and possibly less) to achieve the material things of life necessary to enjoy an adequate physical existence for your family.

There are those unthinking Doomsayers who will blindly state that "If people only need to work an hour or less each week to live, then such people will become *worthless*."

I shout in response: NOT SO! I see the Truth of what I write via the "twinkling of the eyes" of our young children — especially those who are five years old or

less. Such young children need not work to live. Yet such children are consistently motivated to “Learn, Understand, Improve, Please,” and most of all to “Love.”

I shout the following: Take this natural Birthright, stimulate it, and nurture it to maturity!

If this is done, then whatever profession our “youth” pursue, they will strive to achieve a result which will be beneficial to themselves and the beholder (the People).

If children so stimulated become adults that only need to work an hour or less a week for conventional necessities — then such an adult with a “Stimulated, Natural Birthright” would consistently be productive, creative, and generate meaningful endeavors. Such endeavors would result in even greater beauty and significance to the beholder (the People). Such pleasing results consistently enjoyed by the beholder (the People) would only further stimulate the *People* to be constructive for one another.

If People have been taught what is truly important in life, then they will realize that caring and sharing for the benefit of *others* — and not material acquisition — can only bring happiness.

I speak from years of experience. *I truly physically and mentally hurt* when I see *People* suffer misery, despair, and unhappiness! *I smile* when I see *People* “smile, care, love, share, are constructive and produce Goodness.”

I am smiling now, because I can envision the *positive results* for the *People* of the future who are educated as

We are composed of the same Gyroscopic, Electromagnetic Energy throughout the Universe, and the fluctuations of such energy affect us physically and mentally. This indicates that a new electromagnetic mechanism can be developed and installed within a human habitat or carried on a person which would be physiologically/psychologically beneficial. [It should be obvious to the individual who assumes the responsibility for such a device that the effects of electromagnetic energy can be beneficial or harmful, depending upon how employed.]

I have endeavored to increase your awareness that your “brain” is a *Powerful Electromagnetic Generator*, as well as a *Receiver* of Electromagnetic Waves. Your only limitation is the limitation you place upon yourself. **It is more than likely that anything you can imagine is possible!**

I envision space travel becoming commonplace within twenty years. There will be a continuous Source of Energy and the ability to travel to other Solar Systems *at the speed of light or possibly faster.* * [*I have given this subject much thought and I have developed a technological hypothesis for the means to achieve speeds exceeding that for light.]

There will be an end to environmental pollution caused by processes involving coal, oil, gas, or nuclear fuels.

Deserts can be transformed into “oases.” Salt water can be readily and inexpensively converted into fresh water with the extracted minerals being used productively. *And on and on!*

I repeat — *I am made humble by the realization of*

“I am made humble by the realization of the Ingenious Workings of Our Universe.”

I have described. If I have succeeded to any degree in contributing to that “Goodness” of the Future, then I sense a *deep, inner peace* which is beyond all worldly, material wealth. Even at this instant, *I smile peacefully and warmly with tears in my eyes for the young children of the world who are yet to be born.*

With all of my inner-being, I speak to all young children: “You can accomplish anything — **anything** — *to which you wish to apply your Powerful Mind.*”

It does not seem improbable to me that the gyroscopic energy comprising electrical and magnetic fields of **matter-in-motion** can be utilized in the proper mathematical combinations and proportions *to create any substance in the Universe.*

It does not seem improbable to me that “aging” and “disease” can be fully controlled and reversed via this same energy.

How is the human body composed and how does it function? — by Electromagnetic, Gyroscopic Energy!

It does not seem improbable to me that the mind is fully capable of feats that have yet to even be imagined.

The physical basis of E.S.P. may be easily explained by the laws of electromagnetic induction.

I am quite certain that the entities which I have worked on throughout my life will be “toys” to future children and are very likely already toys to children inhabiting other Solar Systems.

the Ingenious Workings of Our Universe. I strive to bestow in the reader’s mind the visions of *grandeur* and *excitement* which I see so clearly for the future. Such visions lie within our immediate grasp and especially the grasp of our *young children.*

I now conclude twenty years of my life’s work. I hope that I will contribute even more in years to come. Remember, if I think you “hurt,” then I hurt for you. If I think you “smile,” then I smile with you.

I send my love to you and I hope you will “multiply” *your love to others.*

I conclude this Book with a note from my writings dated Friday, 9:00 PM, April 19, 1968:

“To all peoples whose brain burns and aches to accomplish great things and changes for the good, may God and/or the Goodness of the Universe be with you. For you are the Goodness of the Universe and do good for people in spite of themselves. *And I salute you!*”

Joseph Westley Newman
Lucedale, Mississippi
April 21, 1985

Appendix

(The items discussed below have been added to the Second Edition.)


I. Several readers of the First Edition have requested greater detail concerning test 14-F on page 17. The following represents the requested information:

The reason test 14-F convinced me that copper is "extremely magnetic" is the very fact that I do not accept the belief that one can "get something from absolutely nothing." Test 14-F clearly proved that a force was being produced and exerted between the wires of Figure 14-F2. For *any* force to exist, there must be energy participation, *i.e.*, the energy must be released from a source and this energy must be accounted for.

The results of test 14-F clearly told me that the *additional energy of this force* was not accounted for by the electrical energy input from the battery.

Since my prior work had enabled me to mechanically understand the essence of magnetism, *i.e.*, atom alignment and the subsequent release of gyroscopic particles (representing the mechanical essence of $E = MC^2$) to generate an electromagnetic field, I immediately recognized that the additional energy which produced this Unobvious Force had to originate from the atoms of the copper conductor. Consequently, I realized that while copper *is* extremely magnetic, it is also mechanically different from conventional magnetic materials such as iron, etc.

If one simply examines the Facts, such a recognition of copper's magnetic nature should be easy to grasp.



If one shorts out a battery via a short conductor as in Figure 14-F3, the result will be high current or "high power output" into the conductor. However, such a configuration would produce a very weak magnetic field. REASON: There are very few aligned atoms (less than 1 ounce) within the conductor. Moreover, such a

configuration would be incapable of causing the rotation of the 700 lb. magnet as shown in photograph 15-C1, on page 21.

14-F4. If the conductor is extremely long as in photograph 15-C1, page 21, then the 700 lb. magnet *will* rotate. REASON: There are vast numbers of aligned atoms within the conductor which weigh thousands of pounds.

With such a configuration, the 700 lb. magnet will not only rotate and produce "Obvious Work," but the vast aligned atoms of the massive coil will release *gyroscopic particles, i.e.*, electrical energy output whose current flow opposes the input current from the battery into the massive coil.


One should note, however, that the release of the gyroscopic particles from the atoms of the massive coil and from the atoms of the rotating 700 lb. magnet occurs *after* the "Fact" of the initial minute input current from the battery. The small input current represents the Hydraulic Pressure Effect (Voltage) originating from the atoms of the battery. Simply put: The 700 lb. magnet rotates *after* the atoms of the massive coil align which align *after* the "Fact" of the initial input or "Hydraulic Pressure" (voltage) from the battery. The proper timing of the hydraulic pressure (voltage) to fire/not to fire via a commutator results in 100% conversion of matter into energy in accordance with $E = MC^2$. The system *also* produces energy at the moment that the Hydraulic Pressure (voltage) from the battery is broken and the atoms of the massive coil become unaligned, *i.e.*, a collapsing magnetic field induces additional current.

Several readers have also asked: "How do the conductor's atoms align in order to cause a magnetic field to *encircle* the conductor?"


[Refer to Figure 14-B1 on page 15 and Figure 25-P on page 77.]

ANSWER: The atoms of a conductor (which is normally a *rounded* copper wire) align in a circular configuration.

EXPLANATION: This Fact can be demonstrated by placing small magnets in a circle around a non-magnetic tube composed of plastic, rubber, etc., in order to create a hollow-shaped disc. Using a thread, one should hang the disc 3-6 inches above the larger magnet. One will observe that the magnetic disc aligns with its center at right angles to the larger magnet as shown in Figure 14-B1a:



This fact clearly explains why a magnet aligns at right angles to a current-carrying conductor and why a conductor aligns at right angles to a magnetic field.

One should also realize from Figure 14-B1a that if numerous magnetic discs were placed side by side, one would have a cylindrically-shaped rod () — similar to a conductor rod or wire — which would align itself at right angles to a magnetic field. Or, viewed from another perspective, the magnetic field would be aligned at right angles to the cylindrically-shaped rod. This fact is further verification of statement 25-O(3) on page 76 as well as the entire discussion on pages 76-79 concerning the gyroscopic-particle-plane of matter.


II. ADDITIONAL WEATHER DISCUSSION (see pgs. 144-153)

Recently, I observed and experienced Hurricane Elena whose seemingly erratic path of movement over a period of several days completely baffled conventional weather experts. As a result of such movement, such experts readily admitted on local news broadcasts that they had *no idea* where Elena would finally land on the Gulf Coast.

As a result of the weather experts' inability to accurately predict landfall, inhabitants of the Gulf Coast from Florida to Texas became extremely concerned over uncertain and conflicting weather reports. In fact, many inhabitants of Florida were totally caught off-guard due to an abrupt and seemingly "unpredictable" sharp turn of Hurricane Elena towards the western Florida coast. One of these was a personal friend of mine in Fort Myers whose young son was camped with others on an island off the Florida coast. My friend thanked me for calling him at 2a.m. to inform him that Hurricane Elena was nearby.

It is with concern for the "people" that I stress that caring weather experts must *master* my teachings and combine this knowledge with conventional meteorology. This would enable weather experts to predict more accurately hurricane landfall and satisfactorily explain the erratic paths often assumed by such storms.

To "open the reader's mind," I present the following photograph and description from page 102 of the TIME-LIFE Book entitled *Planet Earth: STORM*.



In this August 1974 satellite photograph, the twin Pacific hurricanes **Kirsten** (top right) and **Ione** (bottom left) are linked by clouds as the hurricanes pinwheel about each other in a counterclockwise direction.

QUESTION: How do the hurricanes attract one another and why do they not come together? (The two hurricanes began attracting one another at separation distances up to 900 miles, thus proving that the "attraction force" is noticeable.)

ANSWER: Understand their *electromagnetic* nature!

Study carefully Chapter 3, page 13, beginning with the first paragraph in the left column and ending at the bottom right column.

You will note in Figure 13-H1 that the ends of two bar magnets placed N to S to one another will attract one another.


other. When the same two magnets are **shifted sideways** with respect to one another, **repulsion** will result.

You will also note in Figure 13-H2 that the ends of two bar magnets placed N to N to one another will repel one another. When the same two magnets are **shifted sideways** with respect to one another, **attraction** will result.

If the reader has Mastered my teachings then it should be obvious that the Pacific Pinwheel Cyclones represent **electromagnetic** phenomena.

Let's consider the view that the Pinwheel Cyclones have identical polarity orientation upon the Earth's surface, *i.e.*, a South to South and North to North polarity orientation.


Consider the fact that the Earth's surface is curved — a curvature even noticeable on the seas at a distance of only 12 miles. Consequently, there would be very noticeable curvature between two points on the Earth's surface separated by a distance of 900 miles.




Observe in Figure 13-H3 that the Pinwheel Cyclones are located at different latitudes upon the Earth's surface. Consequently, their S to S magnetic repulsion effect has been shifted to the side of one another (as the bar magnets in Figure 13-H2) causing a net **attraction**. If the two Pinwheel Cyclones continue to attract one another to the point of latitude similarity, then **repulsion** would result and separation would be maintained.

It should become obvious to the reader that the electromagnetic effects of storms will need to be carefully studied in addition to pertinent meteorological data.


Let's return to Hurricane Elena.




SATELLITE PHOTOGRAPHS OF HURRICANE ELENA — 1985, AUGUST 28 - SEPTEMBER 2




(1) VISIBLE LIGHT — 1985, August 28




(2) VISIBLE LIGHT — 1985, August 29




(3) VISIBLE LIGHT — 1985, August 30




(4) VISIBLE LIGHT — 1985, August 31




(5) VISIBLE LIGHT — 1985, September 1



(6) VISIBLE LIGHT — 1985, September 2




(A) INFRARED LIGHT — 1985, August 31




(B) INFRARED LIGHT — 1985, September 1


Courtesy of Satellite Data Service, NOAA




(1) Hurricane Elena enters the Gulf of Mexico.




(2) Hurricane Elena moves towards the Mobile Bay area. [Another storm system begins to develop over Georgia and South Carolina.]




(3) Hurricane Elena continues to move towards Mobile Bay. [Storm system continues to strengthen in intensity over Georgia and South Carolina.]




(4) Hurricane Elena moves towards FLA coast because it is electromagnetically attracted to the storm system over So. Carolina and offshore Atlantic Ocean area. The **difference** in latitude of the two storm systems causes them to electromagnetically **attract** one another.




(5) The So. Carolina storm system drops towards a latitude **more equal** to that of Hurricane Elena which now stalls off the FLA coast. The **similarity** in latitudes of the two storm systems causes them to begin to electromagnetically **repel** one another.



(6) Storm system over the Atlantic Ocean now weakens and Hurricane Elena resumes its earlier northwestward course towards the Mississippi Gulf Coast area.



(A) Infrared light depicts Hurricane Elena electromagnetically coupled to the other storm system.



(B) Infrared light depicts the Atlantic Ocean storm system beginning to lower itself to a latitude which is closer to the latitude of Hurricane Elena. This precipitates an electromagnetic **repulsion** effect between the two storm systems.

At one point during its forward motion in the Gulf of Mexico, Hurricane Elena became electromagnetically coupled to a cloud formation having intense storm activity on its northern end. These formations were clearly depicted in photographs taken by satellites.

During the time Hurricane Elena abruptly moved towards the Florida coast, the cloud formation extended over parts of Florida, South Carolina, and North Carolina with heavy thunderstorms in the northeastern portion. At one point, a high pressure front from the northwest swung down and "pushed" the north end of the cloud formation into the Atlantic Ocean. The storm activity within the cloud formation decreased and the cloud formation became placed in a closer latitude to that of Hurricane Elena.

Just as the attraction force between the Pinwheel Cyclones becomes reduced when their respective latitudes become similar, so did the attraction between Hurricane Elena and the cloud formation become reduced as the storm activity decreased within the cloud formation. When this occurred, Hurricane Elena was easily affected by conventional air currents and assumed a northward course. It should be recognized, however, that such air currents are generated by electromagnetic activity as well as temperature variances.

As further evidence of the electromagnetic effect of hurricanes, I present the fact that hurricanes normally form 10° to 30° North or South of the Earth's equator.

Correlate this fact with the fact that Sunspot activity forms 5° to 35° North or South of the Sun's equator (see page 145).

This correlation proves that hurricane spin formation is not the result of the Earth's spinning upon its axis. The greatest speed of the Earth's rotation is at its equator. Yet the equatorial region of the Earth is not the breeding ground of hurricanes and is generally devoid of hurricane formation.

The regions of hurricane formation are very likely related to the plane of the Earth's magnetic equator which acts as a "block wall" (*i.e.*, low-level, electromagnetic activity) in a conventional magnet. A globe of Earth examined with respect to that magnetic axis generally correlates with the absence or presence of hurricane activity. [The Earth's magnetic equator is approximately an $11\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ - 12° angle with respect to the Earth's true equator.]

I am convinced that the seemingly unpredictable movements of hurricanes are *electromagnetically* induced. Such movements are capable of being mechanically understood and accurately predicted if a proper understanding of electromagnetism is achieved by responsible meteorologists.

I urge meteorologists to take this discussion seriously. I am discussing the saving of life, property, and the reduction of mental anxiety for those individuals who have been subjected to those who meteorologically cry "wolf" when there is no "wolf" as well as when there is no warning and the "wolf" suddenly and unexpectedly appears at their door.

We must encourage professional meteorologists to

study an abbreviated, basic, electrical engineering course and to "Master" what I have taught. This knowledge, combined with conventional meteorology will enable such professionals to be more confident and present more accurate instructions to those whose life and property may depend upon correct meteorological data.

But as I have taught in this book, I have no doubt that in future years, the weather will be created and controlled at will!

III. SUPER-CONDUCTING MATERIALS/CRYOGENIC MAGNETS (see page 53)

It has been recommended that I present an extended discussion concerning super-conducting materials and cryogenic magnets. The following discussion of super-conducting designs is from a Declaration submitted to the U.S. Patent Office on April 8, 1982:

"By way of example as to how someone skilled in an art may proceed in a way in which these examiners may not be skilled, applicant will turn to the art of cyrogenic temperature.

Applicant will demonstrate how easily someone skilled in the art of cryogenics, once *mastering the teachings of his invention*, could easily put forth another embodiment of his invention; but which would still be following applicant's earnest and detailed teachings and instructions relative to the Specification of his extremely pioneering invention. However, it would not be obvious to those not skilled in effects of cryogenic temperatures.

By way of example:

Find attached copies of test results (Exhibit A) by other scientists, that when coupled with applicant's teachings and disclosures, proves the above device will work— if indeed niobium tin alloy instantly becomes a formidable magnet when immersed in liquid helium and also instantly bereft of its potency when pulled from its icy bath as these other scientists state happens. Applicant is taking their word this result does happen, because he has not run the test himself.


This embodiment would work efficiently in Space, because you have extreme temperature differences relative to one side of an object facing the sun and the opposite side protected from the sun.

You will note, this energy release (Magnetic field) from the atoms of a mass in this case, are the result of a decrease of energy in the mass, and that the disappearance of that energy release (Magnetic field) from that mass, is the result of increased energy input into that mass. See pages DD19 through DD20 of the Scientific Document.

The lack of mechanical understanding of a magnetic field, atoms, and matter is exemplified by the attached pictures (Exhibit A) showing the technician holding a 3 1/2 pound Stillson wrench, which is being attracted by a cryogenic magnet at the elite Avco-Everett Laboratories. The *lack of understanding* and the amazement, excitement, and curiosity are mirrored in the *Technician's Eyes* for all of posterity to see.

Contrary to this, the detailed mechanical understanding and teachings of applicant's Specification are exemplified within the vast disclosures for all of posterity to see.

As applicant has already taught and disclosed in great detail in the patent application and its important scientific document, random atom motion slows down in materials placed in liquid helium because of temperature decrease and result in atom alignment occurring—thereby releasing their electromagnetic makeup in accordance with $E = MC^2$. See pages DD19 through page DD21 of scientific document! Also see first paragraph of Abstract of the Disclosure of patent application on page 1, and all of pages 6 and 7, and first two lines of page 17 of patent application. Also see lines 16 through 26 of page 29 of patent application. Also see lines 20 through 33 of page 35 and all of page 36 of patent application.



In the above drawing, the atoms of niobium tin No. 1 instantly align when touching ribs No. 4A of liquid helium No. 3 of closed top container No. 4 and 4A, thereby releasing a magnetic field ($E = MC^2$), which then interacts and attracts with the magnetic field coming from fixed magnetic field mass No. 5 (again, $E = MC^2$); therefore, the gyroscopic particles of the two separate magnetic field masses attract together as explained in great detail in the Disclosure Document. See pages DD23 through DD24.

However, the atoms of niobium tin No. 1 immediately disorientate when attracted out of ribs 4A of liquid helium and pulled into warm ribs No. 7 causing its magnetic field to disappear; but now the following No. 1 is now pulled into ribs 4A of liquid helium and the technical process then instantly occurs again: thereby a continuous, fast and strong rotation of Wheel and Shaft No. 2 will result because of the continuous flipping of alignment and non-alignment of the atoms ($E = MC^2$) of the niobium tin units attached to outer edge of rotatable wheel and shaft No. 2. This design can easily be adapted to Space, where extreme temperature differences can easily be maintained.

This is very similar to the effects of atom flipping and causing atom alignment and non-alignment in Figures 5 and 6 of the Third Embodiment already explained in detail as an example of the Technical Process which applicant has earnestly and dedicatedly taught and disclosed in great mechanical detail in the patent application and its important scientific document. In both cases, energy input into a mass is alternated, as to direction or amount.

This *obvious embodiment* is still only another example of the Technical Process which applicant has already taught. 'That the energy in a magnetic field is the energy that makes up the atoms of the material from which the magnetic field comes, and that it is literally Einstein's equation of $E = MC^2$ and therefore the energy moves at C.' That if you can cause the atoms of a material to align and disalign at your will, $E = MC^2$ will be released at your will. But how is this done? Simple — by varying mechanical means of causing atom alignment: applying or not applying pressure, force, or heat, or electrical or magnetic input, or by decreasing or increasing normal atom random motion or atom alignment. By varying or reversing those mechanical steps, the magnetic field coming from a Mass will exist or not exist or reverse direction.

Also, by means of applying the proper force at the proper angle to the gyroscopic type energy particles moving in a magnetic field, $E = MC^2$ will be released at will.

The point is — while these cryogenic results would not be obvious to an examiner not skilled in cryogenics, these results would be obvious to those who were skilled in cryogenics and mastered the applicant's Specification! Applicant is sure that there are already other materials and experiments now existing in exotic labs, that he does not know about, but which will be obvious to others so skilled; that those materials and experiments will be easily applicable to the vastness of what applicant has so earnestly taught and disclosed, once applicant's teachings and disclosures are mastered by those so skilled.

Applicant has taught a diligent, wide, Mechanical, and Technical Process of releasing energy from Mass or a Magnetic Field. Applicant has even taught the incorrectness of prior teachings: from the teachings concerning Work, Force and Power, to the Three Laws of Thermodynamics, to the teachings that a magnetic field represents only potential work and no kinetic work, to the 'whys' of conventional electrical production, and to the 'whys' of gravity and the motions of planets and stars. Applicant has mechanically explained matter, inertia, heat, magnetic fields, electricity, and much more — all of which has been always directed toward a single goal of releasing a new source of energy from Matter by a Technical Process which he could teach to others and for the well-being of all generations to come.

Applicant has indeed taught a diligent, wide, Mechanical, and Technical Process of releasing energy from a Mass or a Magnetic Field. This has been earnestly taught in the Specification and its important scientific document of the patent application of applicant's extremely pioneering invention.

The sincere effort of applicant is in the file wrapper for all of posterity to see and to judge. Therefore, in accordance with the Supreme Court's prior actions and the intent of Congress, and as an assured incentive for future inventors, applicant feels he is most certainly entitled to very broad coverage and interpretation of the genius and labors of his many years of diligent work, which will so greatly benefit his fellow human beings.

The undersigned further declares that all statements made herein of the undersigned's own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and, further, that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or document or any registration thereon."

7 April 1982

Joseph Westley Newman

It isn't necessary to have current traveling into the design because whenever the coil becomes superconducting it will instantly have current induced into it by the stationary, cryogenic magnet.






EXHIBIT A (THREE PHOTOGRAPHS)

“COLD” MAGNETIC STRENGTH

In the left photograph, Bell Laboratory physicists are about to immerse a small cylinder of niobium-tin alloy in liquid helium, causing the cylinder to become a formidable magnet with a strength of 24,000 gauss. Although an excellent metal for superconducting magnets, niobium-tin becomes instantly bereft of its potency when pulled from the icy bath.

221 PAPER CLIPS IN A MAGNETIC FIELD

In the photograph below, a single magnet demonstrates a considerable magnetic field when placed inside a Dewar flask of liquid helium at the Avco-Everett Laboratories in Everett, Massachusetts. [Each metal paper clip hangs freely from a tack upon the board.]



MAGNET VS. MAN

In the left photograph, the same magnet used with the 221 paper clips now demonstrates its pull upon a 3½-pound monkey wrench. The pull upon the wrench is so great that a grimacing technician exerts his pull upon the cord tied to the handle of the wrench to prevent it from clanking against the Dewar flask. Such magnets exert their considerable pull without the assistance of a single watt of electricity.

The reader can clearly see that the expression on the face of the technician holding the Stillson wrench at a right angle to the cryogenic magnet, *says it all!*

The cryogenic magnet demonstration clearly proves the following to the questioning mind:

The produced magnetic field originates from the atoms of the conductor. However, the field originates from the atoms of a super conductor and not from the current inputed into the superconductor!

IV. MAGNETIC MOTOR/PUMP

I have also developed a reciprocating magnetic motor whose design is based upon the same principles which I have disclosed in this book. Refer to photograph 15-C2 on page 36. My reciprocating magnetic motor has a different mechanical design from the energy machine pictured in 15-C2 since a cylindrical magnet has been placed *inside* the coil in order to generate a reciprocating motion.

In this new configuration, the electricity is taken off the magnets themselves via (1) one conductor through a load to ground, (2) one wire taken off one terminal of the battery through a load to ground, and (3) a load hooked across the coil itself. In addition to the electrical output of the system, one must also consider the reciprocating workload of the magnets themselves.

This design could be a magnetic pump in which the permanent magnet is both a motor piston and pump piston capable of pumping numerous types of fluids for commercial production and simultaneously generating electricity for commercial utilization!


V. ELIMINATION OF UNDESIRABLE COMMUTATOR SPARKING

I refer the reader to my discussion of undesirable commutator sparking and air ionization on page 69, left column, second paragraph, which starts with the heading "EXAMPLE OF ANOTHER DESIGN."

Since the First Edition was published, I have innovated an advanced design which will eliminate the damaging sparking effects of the earlier commutator designs.


speed of atom unalignment and releases greater energy output with respect to energy input. (With increased hydraulic pressure [voltage], the commutator discs should be further increased in number.)

The following is a commutator example for a reciprocating motor design:



In terms of reducing spark severity for a given coil at the GAP separating the brush and commutator, tests have demonstrated to my satisfaction that there is a mathematical relationship between the hydraulic pressure (voltage) and the number of times the hydraulic pressure (voltage) must be "broken" by mechanical or other switching mechanisms. Such additional "breaks" increase the overall distance the spark travels in a given instant of time while distributing this distance over a greater number of individual but smaller GAPS.

I have no doubt that the above designs will facilitate rapid production of commercial units. With such commutator designs utilizing approximately 100 firing "breaks," one can easily increase the hydraulic pressure to 100,000 volts (or greater) with a properly insulated



In Figure 22-N the commutator and brushes can simply be multiplied two or three times over the original commutator as depicted in the commutator photographs on page 64. The commutator pictured in Figure 22-N has eight breaks and fires simultaneously such that the GAP distance the spark has to travel is multiplied by a factor of eight. Such a mechanical configuration multiplies the

coil. However, numerous energy-consuming devices would need to be connected into the system to absorb the coil's high energy production.

With such an improvement in commutator design, production units of the energy machine can be built immediately by those individuals who have mastered my teachings.!

VI. ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT RECOGNITION

It has become apparent that the "scientific community" is beginning to accept my teachings without providing recognition of the fact that I developed over twenty years ago my knowledge concerning the electromagnetic field nature of the universe. Such a lack of recognition will impede their understanding of the greater implications of my teachings.

The following are several quotations from individuals featured in an article entitled "Much Ado About Nothing" in the June 1985 issue of *DISCOVER*, pages 76-80:

"Now we believe that the entire universe is nothing but a field theory," says Harvard physicist Sidney Coleman."

"Imagine that the entire universe was permeated with a constant magnetic field," Frank Wilczek suggests. "You would notice certain things that you couldn't explain unless you assumed the presence of the field. The Higgs field is similar to that situation. We see things — the particle masses — that we can't explain, and assuming the presence of the Higgs field explains them." If you couldn't get rid of this mythical magnetic field, it would be part of what you had left when you took everything else away. In other words, it would be part of the structure of the vacuum."

"Says (MIT physicist Alan) Guth, 'People are talking about questions that five years ago were considered outside physics.'

The following are two quotations from an article by Eric J. Lerner entitled, "Magnetic Whirlwinds" in the July 1985 issue of *SCIENCE DIGEST*, page 26:

"In the summer of 1984, astronomers using the VLA radio telescopes in New Mexico observed filaments of gas arcing far above the galactic plane. These twisting spirals appeared to be held together by a magnetic field, forming a magnetic whirlwind stretching across perhaps 500 light-years. The discovery, itself significant, also added to the growing evidence that such magnetic vortices play a major role in the universe — an idea given little weight until recently. As Anthony Peratt, a plasma physicist at Los Alamos National Laboratory, comments, 'It looks more and more that magnetism plays as important a part in the cosmos as gravitation.'"

Peratt continues:

"It looks like gravitation alone is not the whole story — it looks like it also takes magnetism to make the universe the way it is now."


I would hope that the reader of my book has understood the fact that the *entire* Universe represents a

gigantic electromagnetic *energy machine* composed of uncountable numbers of gyroscopic entities which mechanically interact to generate all observable phenomena.

From the evidence I have presented in this book and the extensive evidence I have contained within my files and diaries, I would also hope that the reader recognizes the fact that I have pioneered the development of these concepts over twenty years ago. If there is justice in our Universe, then I can only ask that credit be given where due. Proper credit would further stimulate not only this inventor but all future inventors for the betterment of the human race.

VII. SPACE WARPAGE

The following question has been raised: "Why isn't gravitation simply defined as the warpage of 'Space' caused by a mass simply being in that 'Space'?" In posing such a question, reference is made to Albert Einstein's view that if a heavy object is placed on an elastic plane, then the heavy object will create an indentation in the elastic plane causing any smaller objects in the larger object's vicinity to move down towards the lower indentation area.




It is not surprising to this author that at the time Albert Einstein proposed such a view of space warpage to experts in the domain of Magnetism and Electrical Theory, such experts totally rejected Einstein's mechanical/pictorial space warpage hypothesis when he attempted to apply it to their area of electromagnetic theory.

However, the brain-damaging (soiling) effect of our present teaching system is corroborated by the fact that many physicists — many of whom are not mechanically inclined — have blindly accepted Einstein's *totally inaccurate and false* pictorial hypothesis of gravity. Such blind acceptance has occurred because once Einstein's thinking ability was accepted as being above that of the average scientist, such scientists unquestioningly accepted some of his beliefs which are not mechanically tenable.

The known laws of Hydraulic Mechanics demonstrate that Einstein's hypothesis of space warpage is totally wrong. I say this not to denigrate Albert Einstein, but rather to question the blind acceptance of his hypothesis by those physicists who may not be mechanically sensitive to what is actually involved in this instance.


FACT: Space surrounds an object on a 360° basis. It is simply incorrect to view Space as a place capable of being "indented."



The Laws of Hydraulics state that the pressure of a medium is equal throughout a hydraulic system. Even the Archimedean Law of Buoyancy — developed over 2,000 years ago — states that if a given material (mass) is placed in a liquid (medium), it would displace an amount of liquid (medium) equal to the weight of the material (mass).

To prove that Archimedes' Theory of Buoyancy is correct and that Einstein's pictorial/mechanical explana-

tion of space warpage is incorrect, simply conduct the following test:



Fill two equal-sized glasses with an equal amount of liquid as shown in Figures A and B. Lower a large and a small mass into glass B. You will observe that the level of liquid has risen in glass B. However, you should also observe that the liquid equally surrounds both the large and the small mass. There will be no vacuum or indentation of empty space associated with either mass. Consequently, the smaller mass would have no mechanical tendency to move towards the larger mass, since the liquid medium (or space) surrounding the mass is equally displaced.

The identical process would apply to the medium of Space surrounding masses in Einstein's pictorial/mechanical hypothesis of space warpage — a hypothesis which is simply proven wrong by the "Facts."

Ironically, Albert Einstein was quite candid in his admission that he possessed no mechanical ability. However, many scientists who followed Einstein ignored that admission.

In proper tribute to Albert Einstein, I will state that he was mathematically correct when he said that there would be a warpage of space. However, such warpage is created by the *mechanics* of the *electromagnetic effect* that I have discussed in this book.

I have already demonstrated that one cannot bring together two electric or magnetic entities without a mechanical warpage of the electromagnetic fields (consisting of gyroscopic particles) surrounding the entities. Moreover, I have demonstrated that gravitation is simply the *unequaling effects* of this electromagnetic interaction. Consequently, Gravity, Electricity, and Magnetism consist of one and the same entity: "The mechanism of this gyroscopic entity is the essence of all matter and energy." The *observed* differences in matter and energy are a result of how we perceive the mechanical effects of the Gyroscopic Particle from the perspective of an outside observer.

VIII. IMPORTANT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Dear Fellow Human Being,

I thank you for reading a copy of my book. It is a statement of my learning and my life's work. For over two decades I have devoted my life to the perfection of a New Energy Source which will be of tremendous benefit to all "Peoples" of this World. If you have heard of my 6½-year struggle with the Patent Office to obtain a pioneer patent for my energy machine, then I hope you will assist me. This invention would dramatically benefit all Americans and people throughout the world by making available inexpensive and abundant energy. But your help is needed!

This Exciting Invention and all that it encompasses is for the "People" of the World: for you and yours and your children and your children's children. No, **not** for me, **for you**.

As a "reward" for my years of dedicated effort, an arm of our Government — the U.S. Patent Office — has deliberately, consistently, and with premeditation sought to serve me Injustice. This Injustice is not restricted to me, but is amplified millions of times over to you and yours, and to the "People" of the world.

The officials of the U.S. Patent Office have — to such an extreme extent — conducted themselves outside the law and the very purpose of the existence of the U.S. Patent Office, that when viewed relative to the "Facts" of this Pioneering Invention, one would assume that the U.S. Patent Office had embarked on a Documentary entitled, "**How To Stifle Creativity.**"

After bringing these facts to the attention of numerous Senators and Congressmen within the United States, one was moved enough and outraged enough that, on October 17, 1985, he introduced a Special Bill, Number **H.R. 3590** into the First Session of the 99th CONGRESS asking the Senate and House of Representatives "... acting through the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, shall immediately issue a pioneer patent to Joseph W. Newman for the invention described in patent application numbered 179,474 ..." No, this Congressional Representative of the "People" was not from my State of Mississippi, nor an immediate neighboring State, but rather from a far Northern State of the United States — the State of Indiana — more than 600 miles from my home in Mississippi, a far Southern State of the United States.

The "Facts" show that this Bill is not only a *special bill*, but that the man who introduced it must be a *special* human and elected Representative of the "People." That *special individual* is **Congressman Dan Burton!** Congressman Dan Burton is not only speaking for me, but for you and yours. This effort towards Justice goes way beyond the mere Joe Newman; it concerns Justice to Creative Individuals and the "People" who are the recipients of the value generated by those Creative Individuals as yet unborn. Hopefully, the Special Effort of Congressman Dan Burton will result, not only in a Pioneering Patent to me, but also in **Patent Law Changes** that will act as a Bright Shining Light, to eternally illuminate all actions taken by Patent Office Personnel. Such Patent Office Personnel are, in reality, the *Custodians* of the stimulation of the "Jewel" of our civilization — its "Creative People" — and thereby should never be allowed to stifle this priceless benefactor.

If you agree with what I have to say, are persuaded by what I've said, if you want to help right the wrongs done by the Patent Office and want to help protect my work and thereby give hope and protection to others — you can.

Congressman Dan Burton is only one individual, but only a *few* members of committees or subcommittees will really decide whether I get a patent. Please care enough to let Congressman Dan Burton know you appreciate the fact that he is and must be a *special individual*. Congressman Dan Burton is proof that you count in Congress. Call and write your Congressmen and Senators and ask them to diligently support Congressman Dan Burton's Bill, Number **H.R. 3590**, pending at this time before the 35 members of the House Judiciary Committee. If you have a close friend or relative in another state, call or write them and ask them to contact their respective Senators and Congressmen on this issue.

You compliment yourself, the Human Race, and the Future by so acting.

Thank you, the "People."

Joseph Westley Newman

IX. ADDITIONAL PROOF — NOT CONTRADICTION OF MY WORK

[This section has been added to the Third Edition.]

Several readers have asked me about the article published in the January 6, 1986 issue of Physical Review Letters which presents the opinion of several scientists who have announced the discovery of a “previously unknown force in nature called the hypercharge” and their conclusion that “it also requires a modification of our theories of gravitation.” Their evidence indicates that there will be minute variances in the speed of different objects falling toward Earth when such objects are placed in a vacuum.

In response to the above “discovery,” I simply quote from the last two paragraphs of page 9 and the first paragraph of page 10 of my Disclosure Document sent to the U.S. Patent Office in 1979 and to the U.S. Copyright Office.

“The Earth consists of innumerable other negative and positive charges and is either slightly more negative or positive.

“There can be an infinite mathematical arrangement, whereby, materials will vary *as will their attraction toward Earth*. (Emphasis added.)

“Consider now the fact that in 1974 I wrote to the National Science Foundation stating the prediction that the Cavendish Experiment conclusions were wrong. *I had no doubt that if the experiment was sensitive enough, there would be different results for different materials used.*” (Emphasis added.)

Refer to page 197 of this book for the response from the National Science Foundation in 1974 which offered a response to my statement to them that even the “speed and path of objects in their orbits” would be affected.

Also, read from Section 29-I on page 93 to Section 29-K on page 94 of this book and read the proof that matter consists of unequal negative and positive charges. This is the reason that years ago I had predicted minute differences in Gravitational Force (the unequating effect of Unobvious Electromagnetic Composition of matter consisting of different amounts of negative and positive charges.)

This effect is principally of scientific interest, rather than for practical mathematical calculations of accelerating or stopping a mass or masses.

However, I compliment the scientists mentioned in the Physical Review Letter article for their astute observations and conclusions that there are indeed differences.

The reasons for these observed minute differences are the result of the Electromagnetic Composition of All Matter. Such composition will provide many varying results to the outside observer.

We stand at the gateway to great excitement and advancement for the Human Species.

[The following sections have been added to the Fourth Edition.]

X. UTILIZING PRESENT MATHEMATICS TO PROVE AN IMPORTANT NEW ANALYSIS

[or, to express it colloquially, "The steel wedge of *truth* hit by the sledgehammer of *facts* will break open closed minds."]

The scientific community's *own* "mathematical equations" prove the validity of what I mechanically teach: "The energy in a magnetic field associated with the current in a conductor *emanates from the ATOMS of the conductor and NOT from the current.*"

The present teaching system indoctrinates students with the following premise: students are taught that "a copper wire is non-magnetic and that the magnetic field emanates from the current and not from the conductor." Moreover, students are taught that "the conductor simply carries the current, as a water pipe carries water." (See Figures 14-B5 and 15-B6.) Refer to page 15 of this book for further detail.

FIGURE 14-B5





FIGURE 14-B6



After the student has accepted the false premise described above, the student is then instructed (by "sleight of hand") that, if a current-carrying conductor is *coiled* rather than *straight*, (See Figures 14-B7 and 14-B8) —

FIGURE 14-B7





FIGURE 14-B8



then the current and its associated magnetic field are concentrated, which results in a concentration of the strength of the magnetic field. The student is then provided with the following statement:

"The strength of the magnetic field equals the current times the turns of the conductor" (also called amp turns).

The above two underlined statements concerning the origin of a magnetic field vis-a-vis a current/conductor **are not the same!** In fact, these two statements contradict one another!

QUESTION: What comprises a conductor?

ANSWER: Atoms, of course.

What the statement "the strength of the magnetic field equals the current times the number of turns of the con-

ductor" *really* means is that "the strength of a magnetic field of a coiled conductor equals the input current times the number of 'turns of ATOMS' which comprise the coil." [Refer to Chapter 8, beginning with page 49 for further detail.]

For those who have been "mentally lobotomized" by the effects of our present unjust teaching system, I refer them to pages 238-242 of this book.

The only issue of fact is whether the current or the atoms of the conductor produce the associated magnetic field. No other deception or excuse — e.g., time of the magnetic field's expansion, changing resistance of the coil turns due to the changing diameter of the coil as more coils are added, etc. — has absolutely any scientific merit or bearing upon the truth and validity of the facts presented in this discussion.

Then there are those who blindly state that the cur-

rent in the longer coil produces a magnetic field identical to that of the shorter coil. The facts prove such people totally wrong! [The currents are not the same.]


The following *facts* and graphs prove that 1 amp of current must be maintained in the “atoms” of one turn of the conductor to sustain a magnetic field of strength Z. And 10 watts of power must be maintained to sustain that magnetic field of strength Z. [1 amp x 10 volts = 10 watts]

At the opposite end of the mathematical spectrum, a miniscule .00000000000001 amp has to be maintained in 100,000,000,000,000 turns of the atoms comprising the conductor to sustain the same magnetic field of strength Z. In this case, a miniscule 1/10,000,000,000,000 of a watt of power must be maintained to sustain the same magnetic field of strength Z.

In other words, the fact that the input current and the number of atoms (turns of wire) can vary tremendously with respect to one another while the **same magnetic**

field is sustained in all cases — proves that this resultant magnetic field emanates from the atoms of the conductor and is **not** produced by the input current.

The following drawings, explanations, and graphs which utilize mathematically-accurate, scientific *facts* will “cement” the truth of what I teach: The magnetic field associated with a conductor-carrying current originates from the atoms of the conductor and *not* the current. **The current is simply the medium which transfers the hydraulic pressure of the volts and causes this hydraulic pressure to align the atoms of the conductor.** Under such hydraulic pressure (voltage), the aligned atoms release their gyroscopic particles — the basic building blocks of all matter — which emanate beyond the physical boundary of the conductor and behave exactly as a permanent magnet. (Refer to Figures 14-B9a/b and 14-B10a/b.)



Even the basic premise proposed by the present scientific community — “a moving charge produces a magnetic field and a stationary charge does not” — demonstrates their conclusion to be incorrect as discussed here. Because if the charge produces no magnetic field when stationary, and then produces a magnetic field when moved, it would then seem only logical that the faster the charge moved — the greater the magnetic field, and the slower the charge moved — the weaker the magnetic field.

The mechanical facts demonstrate in Figures 14-B9a and 14-B9b that a given charge will quickly exit from the end of a conductor exactly as a molecule of water from a short pipe.

The mechanical facts demonstrate in Figures 14-B10a and 14-B10b that a given charge would, by some degree, move slowly and exit from the end of an extremely long conductor exactly as a molecule of water from an extremely long water pipe.

Therefore, such mechanical analogies would have one believe that the magnetic field associated with the conductor in Figure 14-B10a would be very weak, and the magnetic field associated with the conductor in Figure 14-B9a would be very strong.

The facts prove these magnetic fields are equal!

No deceptive or prejudiced comment will alter the fact that in Figure 14-B9a a large volume of current and power input is necessary to sustain a magnetic field of strength Z. In Figure 14-B10a, only a miniscule volume of current and power input is necessary to sustain a magnetic field of strength Z.

The facts clearly prove that the magnetic field Z associated with a conductor is not a result of the current or power input into the conductor, but rather is the result of the number of atoms which comprise the turns of the conductor. This underscores the fact that the magnetic field comes from the atoms of the conductor and not from the current.

Those individuals who are not afraid to think for themselves will quickly see the truth of these facts.

Those individuals who have been unjustly and

seriously affected by the present teaching system will uncomfortably feel that they must resist these facts.

The following mathematics, based upon the teachings of the present scientific community, proves "mathematically" that what I have consistently taught "mechanically" is absolutely correct.

Remember — the following mathematical results are provided by the present scientific community and **not** by me. The present scientific community states that a magnetic field of a given strength is achieved by the amount of current multiplied by the number of turns of a conductor. Consequently, the following mathematical results are presented for your consideration:

Using a 10-Volt battery the following results occur —

$$(\text{volts} \times \text{current} = \text{watts})$$

$$1 \text{ amp} \times 1 \text{ conductor turn} = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ — } 1 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 10 \text{ watts}$$

$$100 \text{ M.A. (or .1 amp)} \times 10 \text{ conductor turns (CT's)} = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ — } .1 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 1 \text{ watt}$$

$$10 \text{ M.A. (or .01 amp)} \times 100 \text{ CT's} = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ — } .01 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 1/10 \text{ of a watt}$$

$$1 \text{ M.A. (or .001 amp)} \times 1,000 \text{ CT's} = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ — } .001 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 1/100 \text{ of a watt}$$

$$.1 \text{ M.A. (or .0001 amp)} \times 10,000 \text{ CT's} = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ — } .0001 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 1/1,000 \text{ of a watt}$$

$$.01 \text{ M.A. (or .00001 amp)} \times 100,000 \text{ CT's} = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ — } .00001 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 1/10,000 \text{ of a watt}$$


— additional intermediate steps not listed —

$$.000000000001 \text{ M.A. (or .0000000000001 amp)} \times 100,000,000,000 = 1 \text{ amp turn} \text{ —}$$

$$.0000000000001 \text{ amp} \times 10 \text{ volts} = 1/10,000,000,000,000 \text{ of a watt}$$

FIGURE 14-B11

GRAPH OF THE ABOVE MATHEMATICS:



The mathematical facts and graph described above prove that the amount of current has consistently decreased while the strength of the magnetic field has remained constant as a result of a consistent increase in the

number of "turns of atoms" comprising the conductor.


These scientific and mathematical facts prove that what I have consistently taught mechanically is correct. These facts also prove that the magnetic field associated

with a current-carrying conductor emanates from the atoms of the conductor and not from the current which consistently diminishes. Such a current could reach an infinitesimally small number while the conductor would produce an infinitely large magnetic field. [Refer to Chapter 8, page 49 of this book for additional details.]

Let's now consider the relationship between Faraday's Laws of EMF (electromotive force) induction and the strength of the magnetic field as it expands or collapses through an increasingly larger number of turns of wire (atoms). When one considers the graph in Figure 14-B11 and Faraday's Laws of EMF induction, one finds *mathematical proof* of the following:

As a consistently-*decreasing* current is input into a consistently-*increasing* number of turns of conductor-coil wire (atoms), the produced magnetic field remains constant. Even more important is the fact that whenever the input current is stopped, one produces an ever-greater back EMF from the collapsing magnetic field through an ever-*increasing* number of turns of atoms comprising the conductor — this occurs with an ever-*decreasing* current input.

These mathematical facts verify my teaching that the power from a conductor can be greater than the power input into the conductor! (Refer to page 51 of this book for additional details.)



To rephrase the colloquial title of this section: "The sledge hammer of *facts* has now hit the steel wedge of *truth* even into closed minds."


The mathematics I have presented in this section are from materials published by the present scientific community. These mathematics are not original to me. I have simply but precisely combined my mind with their mathematics in an exacting logic whereby the consistent mechanical teachings I have developed are proven mathematically correct.

The energy in a magnetic (electromagnetic) field is literally the mechanical essence of $E = MC^2$. This energy can be mechanically understood, anticipated, utilized, and released at will to generate the tremendous release of energy without any harmful effects to humanity and to the environment.

Tremendous excitement, hope, dreams and accomplishments will quickly ensue from what I teach since no aspect of science will remain unaffected by these concepts. A magnificent future lies at the "fingertips of our imagination" because the entire universe reacts electromagnetically and has a fundamental electromagnetic composition which can be harnessed to benefit humanity.


PRIOR (CONVENTIONAL) TEACHINGS STATE THAT THE MAGNETIC FIELD COMES FROM THE CURRENT AND NOT THE CONDUCTOR. BY THIS REASONING, IF ONE WANTS MORE POWER FROM A MOTOR, ONE DESIGNS IT TO USE MORE CURRENT. [EXAMPLE: THE CONVENTIONAL FAN DRAWS OVER 100 TIMES MORE CURRENT THAN THE FAN POWERED BY THE NEWMAN ENERGY MACHINE.]

IN PRIOR DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE CONVENTIONAL FAN VS. THE NEWMAN-MOTOR-POWERED FAN (BOTH FANS RUNNING AT THE SAME RPM), THE CONVENTIONAL FAN DREW 16 WATTS; THE FAN POWERED BY THE NEWMAN ENERGY MACHINE DREW APR. 2.8 WATTS — AND APR. 6 TIMES MORE CURRENT IS GOING BACK INTO THE BATTERY THAN COMES OUT OF THE BATTERY!



Current in coil
or watts required to sustain
magnetic field

Volts output
from coil




XI. ELECTROMAGNETIC PROPULSION TECHNOLOGY FOR EARTH AND SPACE TRAVEL

[The following diagrams represent a comparison of conventional science technology with those concepts innovated by Joseph Newman. Section XII features a Declaration by Dr. Hastings describing Joseph Newman's electromagnetic propulsion (levitation) technology.]

CONVENTIONAL SCIENCE TEACHES:

Electric Charges





Like Charges Repel — Unlike Charges Attract

Magnets



Like Poles Repel — Unlike Poles Attract

Conducting Wire • Electricity • Magnetism




Current going one way in a conductor attracts one pole of a magnet — if current direction reverses, magnet is reversed.

Gravity is different




— it always attracts.

JOSEPH NEWMAN TEACHES THAT THE BASIC BUILDING BLOCK OF ALL MATTER IS THE GYROSCOPIC PARTICLE — A PARTICLE THAT CAN BE MECHANICALLY UNDERSTOOD AND ANTICIPATED AS TO THE NATURE OF ITS ACTION.



The spins of the GYROSCOPIC PARTICLES which comprise and emanate from the atoms of the conductor are at right angles to the spins of the GYROSCOPIC PARTICLES which emanate from the atoms of the magnet. As a result of this mechanical interaction, the conductor wire is *repelled* from the magnet regardless of the *direction* of the current which passes through and aligns the atoms of the conductor. The conductor should be short enough to intersect with the straighter center line of force and not extend out over the curved lines of force because of the changing mechanical relationships.

The spin of the GYROSCOPIC PARTICLES which comprise and emanate from the atoms of the conductor are at right angles to the spin of the GYROSCOPIC PARTICLES emanating from the atoms of the magnet. As a result of this mechanical interaction, the conductor wire is *repelled* from the magnet regardless of the fact that the magnet's polarity is *reversed* while the direction of the current in the conductor remains the *same* in each instance.



This mechanical explanation for the gyrosopic composition of all matter explains these observed and demonstrated results that defy presently-accepted, but false "scientific" teachings which claim to be absolute.

Such an understanding and subsequent physical effect serves to demonstrate the *opposite* force to gravity which can occur between matter and will enable safe, efficient space travel to become a reality.

8/22/86
1204 Circle High Dr.
Burnsville, Mn. 55337

To Whom It May Concern:


On August 18 and 19, 1986 I visited Joseph Newman's laboratory in Lucedale Mississippi, witnessed the operation of Newman's latest motor, and witnessed his demonstration of levitation from the Earth's magnetic field.

The motor is intended as a prototype of an electric automobile motor. It is approximately eight inches in diameter, and eighteen inches long, with a 3/8 inch diameter shaft emerging from one end. Other components were a 1,400 Volt d.c. battery pack consisting of 250 volt batteries and 9 volt batteries connected in series, and a mechanical commutator. The d.c. current was a fraction of one milliamp nominally. I attempted to stop the motor by holding the rotating shaft with my right hand and applying pressure. While I could not stop the shaft or reduce its speed to below perhaps 100 r.p.m., the motor never drew more than 1.5 milliamps. My examination was brief and qualitative, however I have had many similar experiences with conventional d.c. motors, and I would estimate the power generated at the shaft of this motor to be in excess of 100 Watts. Newman's motor never drew more than 2.5 Watts. The primary purpose of this prototype is to verify that the earlier model (demonstrated and documented earlier as a fan motor) can be scaled up to power a car. The verification appears to be successful, and I recommend immediate efforts to produce the automobile engine prototype.

While at Newman's demonstration in Jackson, Mississippi on August 20, I also witnessed the operation of a Newman motor which was built independently by a Memphis engineer. This motor was running a ceiling fan using 1.5 Watts of d.c. power taken from 13 nine volt transistor batteries. An identical blade was turning at the same speed, driven by a commercial ceiling fan and drawing 40 Watts of a.c. line power. The Newman motor was run continuously for about four hours without noticeable degradation of the batteries. This demonstration independently verifies the conclusion that huge energy savings can be realized by converting from conventional motor technology to Newman motors in appliances, compressors, automobiles, pumps, and all other energy intensive motor applications.

The levitation experiment demonstrated a vertical force exceeding the force of gravity on strands of #40 copper wire when a few hundred milliamps were applied. Application of standard equations for the interaction of the wires with the earth's magnetic field gave approximate agreement that the wires were in fact levitated on the earth's field. Return wires were at the same time forced downward. Newman disclosed to me a design in which the force on the "go" wires should exceed the downward force on the "return" wires. I estimated that a vehicle of Newman's design (with perhaps some modifications to further reduce the force on the return wires) could be made with a self contained power source and passenger compartment which is 1,000 feet or more in diameter. Such a vehicle should be investigated immediately as a replacement for rockets, and as a future means of interplanetary space travel.

The above statements are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.



Roger Hastings, Ph.D.

XIII. Events occurring between **FALL 1985** and **FALL 1986** concerning the effort to secure a pioneer patent for Joseph Newman's energy machine.

Chapter 25 of **THE ENERGY MACHINE OF JOSEPH NEWMAN** described the September 1984 REPORT OF THE SPECIAL MASTER to the Federal District Court in Washington, D.C. which has been the site of Joseph Newman's suit against the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). In the Report, Special Master William E. Schuyler, Jr. wrote that the "*Evidence before the Patent and Trademark Office and this Court is **overwhelming** that Newman has built and tested a prototype of his invention in which the output energy exceeds the external input energy; there is **no** contradictory factual evidence.*" and "*Defendant [PTO] intentionally did not consider the formalities of Plaintiff's (Joseph Newman's) application or the patentability of Plaintiff's claims under 35 USC sec. 102/103.*"

For many months and expensive trips to Washington, D.C., Mr. Newman and his attorney, John Flannery, attempted to obtain a decision from Judge Thomas P. Jackson either accepting or rejecting the Special Master's findings. Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that the Judge "*shall accept the findings of the Special Master.*" Finally, in June of 1985, Judge Jackson rejected **without reason** [and as of this writing we *still* await his reason] the findings of his own Court expert and Special Master. However, Jackson did see fit to charge Joseph Newman \$11,602.20 for this ignored and rejected Report.

Judge Jackson originally stated that he chose the Special Master to assist in "the speedy disposition of the trial" and to "reduce the Applicant's (Joseph Newman's) expenses." However, the Judge's *actions* belie his words: After many hearings, two trial dates have been canceled with a new date set for December 8, 1986; moreover, the litigation expenses to Joseph Newman have been **compounded** by Jackson's actions!

Also, to return to an earlier event: In December, 1984, PTO Commissioner Gerald Mossinghoff arranged to have \$100,000.00 of Energy Act funds — intended by Congress to finance the development of new energy systems — misappropriated to discredit Mr. Newman's invention. Mossinghoff made an unprecedented agreement with the National Bureau of Standards (NBS). Mossinghoff ran little risk from the NBS since he had the NBS "expert" Jacob Rabinow file a sworn declaration that Mr. Newman's device did not operate. Jacob Rabinow gave this opinion without even testing the energy machine.

After rejecting the findings of the Special Master in June, 1985, Judge Jackson remanded the case **back** to the Patent Office — Mr. Newman's judicial adversary — for further action. The PTO then recommended that the NBS formally test Mr. Newman's invention.

In the original test conditions, Judge Jackson **1)** refused to order the NBS to prepare a testing program in advance of delivery of the energy machine to the NBS, **2)** refused to permit Mr. Newman the right to have an ex-

pert present for testing, **3)** stated that the test results would be issued in secret to Judge Jackson who said in the court record that "it (the test results) will be held under seal until we determine that it ought to be exhibited to the public," and **4)** gave the NBS an open-ended period of testing.

On behalf of Mr. Newman, John Flannery filed a WRIT OF MANDAEMUS with the U.S. Court of Appeals, seeking to reverse Jackson's unfair testing conditions in favor of those test conditions proposed by Mr. Newman.

On January 13, 1986, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued a court order [*In re Newman*, 782, F2d 971, 974-75 (Fed Cir. 1986)] **upholding** Joseph Newman's WRIT OF MANDAEMUS against Judge Jackson. The higher court sternly rebuked Jackson for ordering "highly irregular" testing procedures that denied Joseph Newman "fundamental fairness" guaranteed him by the Federal Rules. Jackson had originally ordered Joseph Newman to surrender his energy machine to the NBS so that Office might dismantle or even destroy it. Instead, the U.S. Court of Appeals rejected **all** of Jackson's conditions for testings and supported Mr. Newman's position. [As it turned out, this action did no good, because Jackson/NBS/PTO did exactly what they wanted to do!] The higher Court criticized Jackson for authorizing the destruction of Joseph Newman's invention and giving "no reason for barring petitioner from observing all the tests on his device, or from knowing in advance what tests are to be conducted [by NBS]." The Court concludes; "Such procedures are highly irregular, and taint the evidentiary value of the test results."

Specifically, the U.S. Court of Appeals ordered that: **1)** the NBS tests be prepared in advance of the energy machine's delivery to the NBS, **2)** Joseph Newman could be present for testing as well as have an expert on his behalf, **3)** the energy machine could not be dismantled or destroyed without Joseph Newman's consent, **4)** the NBS would have 30 days **AND NO MORE** to test the energy machine [this was reaffirmed by the higher Court in a letter issued on February 12, 1986 during the original and authorized 30-day test period from January 24 - February 23, 1986], and **5)** the results would be issued openly and publicly to all parties.

During the original 30-day test period (from January 24 - February 23, 1986) the NBS did not conduct a *single* test. The PTO and the NBS asked the Court of Appeals to change its mind and let the NBS dismantle and destroy the energy machine. On February 12, 1986, for the second time, the Court of Appeals said **no**: "[NBS's] Dr. Hebner has not attested to his inability to test the device or that its [the energy machine's] structure is concealed, or that a test program cannot be reasonably conducted to ascertain whether the device performs as disclosed in the patent application" and "on reconsideration, we affirm the prior order."

The NBS *still* refused to test the energy machine and to run a single test unless they were permitted to destroy the energy machine. Even *before* any tests had been performed, NBS representatives told the Court of Appeals that the energy machine was a hoax. This attitude was one of the reasons that the higher Court recognized that the NBS had acted in a biased manner towards Joseph Newman and his work. Meanwhile, the NBS offered a thousand excuses — each of which Joseph Newman answered — in an effort to run the clock while they waited for permission to destroy the energy machine *e.g.*, the NBS insisted on communicating by mail, rather than by phone. In another instance, the NBS required Joseph Newman to travel 1,000 miles from Mississippi to Maryland to move a single wire a distance of one inch. Joseph Newman and attorney John Flannery gave the NBS permission to reconnect the wire that had come loose in shipping from Mississippi to Maryland. The NBS insisted that Joseph Newman do it. Even after Joseph Newman did this — after he traveled 1,000 miles — the NBS refused to test the energy machine or even tell Joseph Newman when or how they would test it.

During this 1,000-mile trip to reconnect the wire by one inch, an event occurred which would have great significance later on. The approximately 135-pound energy machine delivered to the NBS facility in Maryland would — if not restricted by resistance — “pump” back-EMF into the battery pack and thus proceed to over charge and damage the batteries by shorting them out internally. Normally, Joseph Newman placed 4 ft. fluorescent bulbs in the circuit to act as a release valve to reduce this back-EMF into the batteries. Since it was inconvenient to carry 4 ft. fluorescent bulbs on the plane to Maryland the day Joseph Newman reconnected in several minutes the loose wire, Mr. Newman simply grounded the energy machine to shunt away the back-EMF and prevent it from damaging the batteries.

What is most ironic is that NBS officials saw Joseph Newman **ground** the energy machine and therefore **assumed** that he **always** grounded it — even for testing! The NBS officials were not interested in mastering Joseph Newman’s technical process and understanding the principles involved. Instead — like “monkey see — monkey do” — they later grounded the energy machine during their secret testing of the confiscated energy machine. This action would have important ramifications re the validity of the NBS test. [It should also be added that Joseph Newman had *no* intent of “educating the NBS personnel.” They were supposed to be the experts; Joseph Newman’s attitude was, “let’s see what the experts do.”]

The experts did nothing during the authorized 30-day test period that expired on February 23, 1986. On Monday, 10:30AM on February 24, 1986, John Flannery appeared at the NBS building in Gaithersburg, Maryland where the energy machine was being held. Joseph Newman had asked Mr. Flannery to return the energy machine to Mississippi. Armed guards met Mr. Flannery and refused to permit him to obtain Mr. Newman’s prop-

erty. Mr. Flannery was informed that he had until 12 noon of that day to appear at an emergency meeting in Judge Jackson’s courtroom. Should he fail to appear, Jackson would issue a warrant for his arrest.

Mr. Flannery did appear in the courtroom by 12 noon. He was promptly informed by Judge Jackson that the energy machine of Joseph Newman was now the property of Jackson’s court and the invention would not be turned over to Mr. Newman. Mr. Flannery asked Jackson for his reasons for such confiscation. The Judge refused to give any. Mr. Flannery then asked Jackson to remove himself as the Judge in the case because of demonstrated personal bias and prejudice. Jackson denied that he was prejudiced and continued to refuse to tell Mr. Flannery what authority permitted the Judge to violate the Court of Appeals Order. As Joseph Newman said: *“Since when in this country can a court take a person’s property, seize it without even a hearing and in violation of a standing order of an appellate court? Something is very wrong here.”*

On March 3, 1986, as a result of the Court’s questionable procedures, Joseph Newman submitted an Affidavit in support of a motion to disqualify Judge Jackson for his demonstrated personal bias and prejudice. On March 7, 1986, the District Court held a status conference to consider giving the NBS more time to test the energy machine in violation of the 30-day period authorized by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Immediately before this status conference began, Judge Jackson’s law clerk handed John Flannery an order denying Joseph Newman’s motion to disqualify Jackson as insufficient, but without any discussion as to why the pleadings were factually insufficient. Jackson even held John Flannery in contempt for merely mentioning the pending motion to disqualify him. Jackson then gave the PTO/NBS until June 26, 1986 to test the energy machine — **150 days** after the energy machine was originally delivered.

Joseph Newman could not afford to be present with counsel and expert for the 12-hour work-days the NBS claimed they worked each day. It would have cost Joseph Newman over \$60,000.00 to attend the tests and is one of the reasons why the U.S. Court of Appeals authorized the original 30-day test period. Former PTO Commissioner Mossinghoff misappropriated \$100,000 to run these unprecedented tests. According to the Patent Office, the tests cost approximately \$75,000.00. Although Joseph Newman had the “right” to attend the later, unauthorized tests on his confiscated energy machine, it was a “right” that he could not afford to exercise. Joseph Newman is not a large corporation. He is an inventor who lives by what he invents. Worse, the PTO had said that they expect Joseph Newman to reimburse the PTO for all NBS tests!

It is, in fact, Joseph Newman’s position that **all** PTO/NBS/Jackson actions taken *after* the February 24, 1986 confiscation without-due-process of his property are illegal and unconstitutional. As a result of this position and of the expense in attending 90 additional days

of testing, Joseph Newman would not in any way wish to appear to endorse the NBS proceedings by being present for their testing. Also, it should be noted that before the NBS ran any tests, John Flannery forwarded to the NBS a schematic diagram of the circuit used to test Newman's device. It plainly showed **not** to connect the energy machine to ground.

Prior to the expected release of the NBS test [conducted by three individuals] on June 26, 1986, Joseph Newman issued a national press release sent to over 1500 members of the press which predicted that the NBS test results would be negative and that "a mockery of justice is expected to continue in the chambers of Judge Thomas P. Jackson." On June 26, 1986, the NBS unsurprisingly said that Joseph Newman's invention did not work. Moreover, Judge Jackson set a trial date for **December 8, 1986**. (Up to this point, Jackson had held a series of expensive hearings to determine if a trial was warranted and had canceled two earlier trial dates.) Jackson continued to refuse to relieve himself from this case due to bias, and Jackson refused to allow Joseph Newman a trial by jury. In fact, a Patent Office attorney once told Joseph Newman's attorney, "*We would hate to see this case tried by a jury.*"

It is ironic that as a consequence of the Patent Office's disregard of the Court of Appeals' requirement that the NBS notify Joseph Newman of what tests they intended to run during the 30-day test period authorized by the Court of Appeals, Joseph Newman did not know how the NBS "tested" his machine until **after** the NBS issued its report on June 26, 1986. Consequently, Joseph Newman discovered that the NBS did not actually test his invention at all.

In one of his PRESS RELEASES, Joseph Newman writes: "In his April 9, 1984 Statutory Declaration before a Federal Court, page 10, NBS expert Jacob Rabinow claimed the following — 'It is my opinion since Mr. Newman does not use a tightly-coupled iron structure around his armature, that the efficiency of his motor should be very low when use purely as a motor.' Following the release of the June 26, 1986 NBS Report (which has been challenged by Dr. Hastings and other scientific experts), NBS spokesman Matt Heyman boastfully stated to the newsmedia that: 'the energy machine invention was so inefficient that if one wanted to operate an **electric fan**, then don't use the Newman Invention hooked to a battery, but rather use a simple conducting wire from a battery to a conventional motor.' The above two statements by NBS representatives Rabinow and Heyman are *especially ironic* because on July 30, 1986 — in conjunction with an appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Energy Hearing — Joseph Newman demonstrated his latest, portable energy machine prototype which operates as a **motor** (without Rabinow's 'tightly-coupled iron structure around the armature') to power a home-appliance, **electric fan** at an efficiency rate that proved the Patent Office and the NBS dead wrong. Again."

Dr. Roger Hastings, Senior Physicist with a major

research corporation, concluded that the PTO's trial expert, the NBS — the 'preeminent national testing laboratory' — failed to measure the energy in Joseph Newman's energy machine although it had the energy machine for 150 days. His evaluation was that the NBS personnel did not know what they were doing. As John Flannery said, "*The Court of Appeals gave the Patent Office 30 days to test the energy machine and required the Patent Office to inform us in advance what tests they were going to run during the 30-day test period authorized by the U.S. Court of Appeals. But their expert, the NBS, kept the device 150 days and never told us what tests they were going to run during this 30-day period.*" In his evaluation, Dr. Hastings wrote that the NBS "*results reflect a total lack of communication between the NBS and Newman or any other expert on Newman's technology.*" As John Flannery put it, "*If they told us what they were going to do, we might have been able to avoid this waste of time and resources by Mr. Newman and the taxpayers as well.*"

Specifically, Dr. Hastings said in his evaluation that the NBS allowed energy to escape from Mr. Newman's energy machine and then, instead of measuring the output energy from the energy machine, they measured the power consumed by resistors "placed in parallel with the Newman motor, and called this power the motor output." Dr. Hastings concluded, "the primary r.f. (radio frequency) power was shunted to ground." As for measuring output, Hastings said that the NBS's test was "equivalent to stating that the output of an electric motor plugged into a wall socket is given by the power used by a lightbulb in the next room which is on a parallel circuit." "*The NBS test results came as no surprise to me,*" said Mr. Newman, "*I never expected that we would get a fair shake from the Patent Office's expert. What I am surprised about is how badly they did the job.*"

If the PTO and the NBS had complied with the Court of Appeals Order, Joseph Newman would have had a second opportunity to reinforce what was already obvious from the schematic diagram forwarded by John Flannery to the NBS — that they should **not** connect Joseph Newman's energy machine to ground. The NBS could have been told that they were in error. But since the NBS and PTO failed to give Joseph Newman any notice — contrary to the U.S. Court of Appeals Order — of the tests they intended to run during the 30-day test period authorized by the Court of Appeals, they wasted Joseph Newman's resources and, by their estimates, \$75,000.00 of federal taxpayer's monies misappropriated by former PTO Commissioner Gerald Mossinghoff.

The REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE of Congress wrote in its May 9, 1986 REPORT: "Joseph Newman has received arbitrary and unfair treatment at the hands of the PTO and Judge Jackson. Congress should act because the Executive and Judicial branches have failed this American citizen. In light of Congress' oversight responsibilities and the fact that it is empowered by the Constitution to issue patents, the fact that the preponderance of

Notable public events of the past year:

- 1) **OCTOBER 9, 1985:** Joseph Newman conducted a public demo at the Hilton Hotel in New Orleans — over 2500 people attended.
 - 2) **OCTOBER 16, 1985:** Joseph Newman addressed the New Orleans section of the IEEE at the International Hotel.
 - 3) **DECEMBER, 1985:** REGARDIES MAGAZINE published an excellent and comprehensive article on Joseph Newman.
 - 4) **JANUARY 14, 1986:** Joseph Newman addressed the Mississippi Engineering Society (Gulf Coast Chapter) in Gulfport, Mississippi
 - * 5) **FEBRUARY 25, 1986:** Joseph Newman formally presented his theories and technical processes before 1500 people at Louisiana State University [sponsored by Am. Soc. of Mech. Engr., Student Chap., LSU College of Design, & the HELENE Foundation].
 - 6) **FEBRUARY 27, 1986:** Joseph Newman appeared with Johnny Carson on the TONIGHT SHOW.
 - * 7) **APRIL 11-17, 1986:** Joseph Newman held a nat'l public demo of his EM in the LOUISIANA SUPERDOME. Over 8,500 people attended from across the U.S. It was a very successful presentation that was well received. On Wed., April 16, 1986, Joseph Newman challenged any scientist and/or PhD with teaching or professional credentials to publicly debate w/him at the SUPERDOME the fundamentals of electromagnetism. No one accepted his challenge.
 - 8) **MAY 9, 1986:** The Republican Study Committee of Congress issued its **Report** in support of Joseph Newman entitled: "THE PATENT OFFICE AND JOSEPH NEWMAN: AN ABUSE OF POWER."
 - 9) **MAY 29, 1986:** Joseph Newman addressed the Mississippi House of Representatives & demonstrated his portable, appliance-fan-powered EM. JN received a standing ovation & both the Miss. House & Senate passed Resolutions supporting his Congressional effort to obtain a patent.
 - 10) **JULY 30, 1986:** Joseph Newman, John Flannery, Dr. Roger Hastings, Milton Everett, Congressman Thomas Kindness, Congressman Dan Burton, and PTO/NBS representatives testified before Senator Thad Cochran's Senate Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, & Government Processes.
 - * 11) **AUGUST 20, 1986:** Joseph Newman demonstrates his latest fan-powered prototype & his new electromagnetic propulsion (popularly called "anti-gravity") system at a news conference at the Sheraton Regency Hotel in Jackson, Mississippi.
 - 12) **SEPTEMBER, 1986:** LIFE MAGAZINE published a 2-page feature story on Joseph Newman.
- * VCR tapes of these presentations are now available.

evidence is in Newman's favor, and the fact that this invention is potentially beneficial to hundreds of millions of people, it is totally in order for Congress to grant Newman a patent and to allow the American marketplace to decide the value of this invention."

During June-August, 1986, nationally-syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick wrote three different articles on Joseph Newman's struggle with the Patent Office. In addition, numerous articles appeared in publications, newspapers, with interviews on radio, and on the TV (National ABC WEEKEND NEWS, CNN National News, Johnny Carson's TONIGHT SHOW, etc.). It is important that this issue remains a public issue until the patent is issued — this is Joseph Newman's only protection from the unjust actions of a Federal Bureaucracy and a Federal Court. The ENERGY MACHINE NEWSLETTER contains news updates concerning Joseph Newman's work. Those interested in obtaining information about the NEWSLETTER should write Joseph Newman at Route 1, Box 52, Lucedale, Mississippi 39452.

Meanwhile, the Patent Office continues to issue statements that are totally false. PTO Commissioner Donald J. Quigg (a former top executive at PHILLIPS PETROLEUM for 33 years) wrote in a form letter dated June 17, 1986 sent to people who wrote him about PTO mistreatment of Joseph Newman: "Mr. Newman has filed an application for a patent on his invention of a method and apparatus for obtaining more energy from a machine than is put into it. This application is related to several earlier filed applications, *all since abandoned by Mr. Newman.*"

This is typical of the Patent Office's misleading rhetoric and represents a concentrated effort on the part of the Patent Office to discredit Mr. Newman and misinform the public. In a June 25, 1986 letter by Joseph Newman's patent attorney C. Emmett Pugh, Pugh writes: "In summary, you have **never** in fact or in law abandoned in any way any of your patent rights or your efforts to obtain

your due patent rights, and each later application carried forth the disclosures of your earlier applications and added to them your then current, up-dated information. The later filings benefit the public, and your rights and claims are in no way diminished or considered abandoned by the up-dating process."

Added to this Edition of the book are a number of Declarations by Dr. Roger Hastings which endorse the operation of the energy machine, the portable fan-motor prototype, and the new electromagnetic propulsion system.

The New Orleans City Council unanimously adopted a Resolution on November 7, 1985 which read in part: "BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, that it hereby endorses the adoption of H.R. 3590 induced by U.S. Representative Dan Burton which would put an end to the costly multi-year litigation over the Joseph Newman energy machine by resolving any doubts in favor of the applicant and providing for the issuance of a patent because it is the Council's firm belief that the best judge of Joseph Westley Newman's invention is not a Court listening to experts testifying on either side, but the American free market with its harsh but fair test of practicality."

The Senate and House of Representatives in Mississippi issued a CONCURRENT RESOLUTION #294 (dated April 10-11, 1986) which stated in part: "WHEREAS, Federal District Court Judge Thomas P. Jackson ordered highly irregular testing procedures which denied Mr. Newman fundamental fairness in receiving patent approval; and WHEREAS Judge Jackson has taken Mr. Newman's property without even a hearing and in violation of a standing order of an appellate court and has subsequently ordered secret tests by NBS of the illegally confiscated energy machine, again totally contrary to the order of the U.S. Court of Appeals; NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, THE SENATE CONCURRING THEREIN,

John Flannery

Janney House
Waterford, Virginia 22190
703-882-3175

3847 North Tazewell Street
Arlington, Virginia 22207
703-534-7464

October 24, 1985

Dear friend,

Joe has asked me to give you a summary of (1) why you should encourage members of Congress on the relevant committee(s) to support a private bill, H.R. 3590, recently introduced by Rep. Dan Burton, and (2) briefly state the facts in support. And so I have.

There are four reasons why a private patent bill for Mr. Newman is worthy of your support:

Firstly, no citizen should be so shabbily treated as has Newman by both administrative and judicial tribunals -- the Patent Office and by the Courts -- in direct contravention of the Constitution and the statutes of Congress,

Secondly, if Newman had been fairly treated, the Patent Office and the Court would have seen that Newman's device works -- as a former U.S. Patent Commissioner has so attested -- and that he is entitled to a patent,

Thirdly, if Newman secures the protection for himself to manufacture this device, it shall mean a new source of inexpensive and efficient energy, and

Fourthly, this bill doesn't cost us as taxpayers a dime and may instead save us money -- in energy bills.

A Statement of the Facts

As for the salient features, a statement of the facts, that I find disturbing:

Newman's patent application when it arrived at the Patent Office in 1980 was assigned to a Patent Examiner found incompetent by the federal district Court in Texas. The Patent Office refused to look at Newman's evidence including a prototype he constructed to prove it worked. The Patent Examiner said he doubted he would ever grant Newman a patent no matter what proof he presented and the Patent Office refused to replace the prejudiced patent examiner. Thus did the Patent Office deny Newman a patent.

Newman appealed his Patent Office rejection to the US District Court in January 1983. See 35 U.S.C. Section 145. The Patent Office again refused Newman's offers made during civil discovery to have them test his device; the Patent Office said they "must" rely on the applicant's tests. The Court said it was technically incompetent to decide the case and appointed former Patent Commissioner Schuyler to consider the case. The former Patent Commissioner concluded:

(more)

PAGE TWO

- (1) there was overwhelming evidence, without contradiction, that Newman's device operated as claimed,
- (2) that the Patent Office had disregarded its own rules in rejecting Newman's claims,
- (3) that the Patent Office's determination that Newman machine was "impossible" was "clearly erroneous", and
- (4) that a patent should issue.

The Court refused to accept the Master's findings and reopened discovery.

Newman offered again to permit the Patent Office to test his device. But the Patent Office doesn't want to test it; not fairly anyhow; they say they will only conclude Newman's device operates if he'll permit them to destroy it.


Thus the need for a private bill.

Conclusion

I believe no doubt as you do that a private bill should only issue rarely and under special circumstances. Mr. Newman's case is certainly rare and the circumstances cry out for relief. A private bill, in the waning days of Congress, is the way to give Newman the relief he needs and deserves.

Thanks for your time and, I hope, for your support of Joe. Joe is absolutely right your letter(s) to members of the House and Senate can make the difference.

Sincerely yours,



JOHN P. FLANNERY II

JPF/pm

That we do support Mr. Newman in this endeavor and do hereby commend the Mississippi Congressional Delegation for their past and continued support.”

On May 29, 1986 the Senate of Mississippi issued RESOLUTION #3 which stated in part: “BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MISSISSIPPI STATE SENATE, That we do hereby memorialize the United States Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, and the United States Patent and Trademark Office to issue a patent to Joseph W. Newman for the energy machine and memorialize the United States Congress to adopt legislation directing that such patent be issued.”

As of this writing, ten Congressmen — who are outraged over the treatment of Joseph Newman by the Patent Office and Judge Jackson — have introduced 10 House Bills to grant Joseph Newman a pioneering patent for his invention.

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 3590

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 11, 1980
Mr. BENTON introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, shall immediately issue*
- 5 *a pioneer patent to Joseph W. Newman for the invention*
- 6 *described in the patent application numbered 179,474 and*
- 7 *filed in August 1980. Such patent shall be accorded rights*
- 8 *equal to the rights accorded to patents issued under title 35,*
- 9 *United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 3977

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 11, 1980
Mr. LOTT introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, is authorized and di-*
- 5 *rected to immediately issue a pioneer patent to Joseph W*
- 6 *Newman for the invention described in the patent application*
- 7 *numbered 179,474 and filed in August 1980. Such patent*
- 8 *shall be accorded rights equal to the rights accorded to pat-*
- 9 *ents issued under title 35, United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 4081

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 29, 1980
Mr. KENNEDY introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, shall immediately issue*
- 5 *a pioneer patent to Joseph W. Newman for the invention*
- 6 *described in the patent application numbered 179,474 and*
- 7 *filed in August 1980. Such patent shall be accorded rights*
- 8 *equal to the rights accorded to patents issued under title 35,*
- 9 *United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 4200

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 19, 1980
Mr. LATTIN introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, is authorized and di-*
- 5 *rected to immediately issue a pioneer patent to Joseph W.*
- 6 *Newman for the invention described in the patent application*
- 7 *numbered 179,474 and filed in August 1980. Such patent*
- 8 *shall be accorded rights equal to the rights accorded to pat-*
- 9 *ents issued under title 35, United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 4220

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 24, 1980
Mr. TOLSON introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, shall immediately issue*
- 5 *a pioneer patent to Joseph W. Newman for the invention*
- 6 *described in the patent application numbered 179,474 and*
- 7 *filed in August 1980. Such patent shall be accorded rights*
- 8 *equal to the rights accorded to patents issued under title 35,*
- 9 *United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 4490

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 21, 1980
Mr. DANFORTH introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, shall immediately issue*
- 5 *a pioneer patent to Joseph W. Newman for the invention*
- 6 *described in the patent application numbered 179,474 and*
- 7 *filed in August 1980. Such patent shall be accorded rights*
- 8 *equal to the rights accorded to patents issued under title 35,*
- 9 *United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 4707

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 29, 1980
Mr. TAYLOR introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, is authorized and di-*
- 5 *rected to immediately issue a pioneer patent to Joseph W*
- 6 *Newman for the invention described in the patent application*
- 7 *numbered 179,474 and filed in August 1980. Such patent*
- 8 *shall be accorded rights equal to the rights accorded to pat-*
- 9 *ents issued under title 35, United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 5032

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOE 12, 1980
Mr. BART introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, is authorized and di-*
- 5 *rected to immediately issue a pioneer patent to Joseph W*
- 6 *Newman for the invention described in the patent application*
- 7 *numbered 179,474 and filed in August 1980. Such patent*
- 8 *shall be accorded rights equal to the rights accorded to pat-*
- 9 *ents issued under title 35, United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 5149

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 26, 1980
Mr. POWERS of Mississippi introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, shall immediately issue*
- 5 *a pioneer patent to Joseph W. Newman for the invention*
- 6 *described in the patent application numbered 179,474 and*
- 7 *filed in August 1980. Such patent shall be accorded rights*
- 8 *equal to the rights accorded to patents issued under title 35,*
- 9 *United States Code.*

97th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 5315

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOE 31, 1980
Mr. HALE introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A BILL

For the relief of Joseph W. Newman.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *in full of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 *That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Com-*
- 4 *missioner of Patents and Trademarks, is authorized and di-*
- 5 *rected to immediately issue a pioneer patent to Joseph W*
- 6 *Newman for the invention described in the patent application*
- 7 *numbered 179,474 and filed in August 1980. Such patent*
- 8 *shall be accorded rights equal to the rights accorded to pat-*
- 9 *ents issued under title 35, United States Code.*

These ten Congressmen include Dan Burton of Indiana, Trent Lott of Mississippi, Thomas Kindness of Ohio, Robert Livingston of Louisiana, Robert Torricelli of New Jersey, William Dannemeyer of California, Billy Tauzin of Louisiana, Hal Daub of Nebraska, Wayne Dowdy of Mississippi, and Henry Hyde of Illinois. From the lobbying perspective, the **more** House Bills that are introduced, the greater the pressure on Congressman Robert Kastenmeier (Chairman of the House Subcommittee on COURTS, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE) to schedule hearings on these Bills. If the reader knows of people living in Robert Kastenmeier's Southern Wisconsin (Madison area) District, urge them to pressure Kastenmeier to act. As of this writing, we still need our *first* Senate Bill — consequently we urge *everyone* throughout the country to write Senator Thad Cochran of Mississippi and urge him to act promptly to introduce a Senate Bill identical to the ten House Bills.

The July 30, 1986 hearing before Thad Cochran's Senate Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes was quite interesting. Subcommittee member John Glenn of Ohio acted very irresponsibly during the Hearing which was attended by

over 200 people in the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Following testimony by Joseph Newman, John Flannery, Dr. Roger Hastings, Milton Everett, and others, Joseph Newman demonstrated his latest fan-motor prototype.

The considerable mechanical torque produced by this fan-motor version of the energy machine will have a significant impact upon the development of motors for many commercial uses. At the Senate Hearing, Joseph Newman demonstrated a fan powered by his energy machine and a second, identically-modeled fan plugged into the wall. The watts needed to power the Newman-motor-connected fan at high speed is 6.9 watts (.003 amps X 2300 volts). In addition to powering the fan, six times the current goes back into the batteries than comes out of the batteries. A fluorescent bulb is also simultaneously lighted. At 7.4 watts (.2 amps X 37 volts) — an input approximately equal to that of the Newman motor — the conventional fan motor (plugged into the wall) barely turns. To equal the speed of the Newman-motor-powered-fan, the input into the conventional fan must be raised to 28.5 watts (.38 amps X 75 volts).

In August, 1986, Mr. Newman issued a PRESS RELEASE describing in detail John Glenn's irresponsible actions

which included: entering the chamber of the Senate Hearing **after** Congressman Thomas Kindness completed his favorable testimony concerning the energy machine [John Glenn is opposing Kindness in the upcoming Ohio Senate election] which only proved that Glenn valued “politics as usual” over hearing the evidence presented before the Subcommittee of which he was a member; Glenn falsely implied that Mr. Newman had a possible conflict-of-interest relationship with the Special Master since Joseph Newman had once met the Special Master several years before the Special Master’s Report was issued [this fact had been related *in detail* to Judge Jackson by Joseph Newman **before** William E. Schuyler, Jr. was appointed as Special Master: Joseph Newman had met Schuyler at the offices of a former patent attorney — a firm to which both Schuyler and the patent attorney belonged — and had met Schuyler for about 10 minutes; Schuyler later told Judge Jackson that he didn’t even remember meeting Joseph Newman and Judge Jackson was fully satisfied as to Schuyler’s impartiality. Moreover, why didn’t Glenn just as rigorously question the PTO representative at the Senate Hearing since the *same* Patent Office official who nominated Schuyler to be Special Master had been a **subordinate** of Schuyler while Schuyler was the PTO Commissioner several years earlier!]; and although Glenn asked to see more demonstrations and tests of the energy machine, he failed to walk down two flights of stairs to witness Joseph Newman’s latest demonstrations of his fan-motor prototype.

As CONGRESSMAN TRENT LOTT says, “I do not feel that the Patent Office has done enough to process Mr. Newman’s Patent Application. Therefore, I feel that the legislative process is now the best alternative ... In light of Congress’ oversight responsibilities and the fact that it is empowered by the Constitution to issue patents, and the fact that this invention is potentially beneficial to hundreds of millions of people, I feel it is totally in order for Congress to grant Mr. Newman a patent.”

According to SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, “Mr. Newman has made repeated efforts to get his machine patented and has encountered substantial obstacles at every turn ... If every inventor ran into as many problems in trying to get a patent as Joe Newman has, I doubt that we would have made much scientific progress in the last two centuries, and we certainly would not enjoy many of the products that we take for granted today.”

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT LIVINGSTON asks these questions: “Why has the Patent Office, which has been entrusted by Congress with the important task of promoting scientific progress, gone to such lengths to deny this man the legal right to his invention? Why has the Federal Judge’s treatment of Newman been so arbitrary and high-handed? Why did it take four months and \$82,000 to test an invention which supposedly doesn’t work, and where did the money come from? Clearly, Mr. Newman is being denied his Constitutional right to due process of law. I strongly feel that Congress should act because the Executive and Judicial branches have failed this American Citizen ... It is totally in order for

Congress to grant Newman a patent and to allow the invention to be tested where it should have been tested a long time ago — in the American marketplace.”

In his recent testimony before the Senate Hearing concerning Joseph Newman’s patent plight, CONGRESSMAN THOMAS KINDNESS states the issues very succinctly when he says, “This is a case where extraordinary action is appropriate. One need only look at the convoluted, tortuous path that this case has taken to know that Mr. Newman has been denied the fundamental fairness and objectivity that is the right of every potential patent holder.” He adds, “When reasonable men differ, as they have in this case, the final result should not be a decision by bureaucratic fiat but rather an accommodation should be reached that allows the device to rise or fall on its own merits!” CONGRESSMAN KINDNESS concludes, “The technically competent former head of the PTO and Special Master in this case, Mr. Schuyler, said that a patent should be issued and in light of Judge Jackson’s refusal to follow federal law with respect to the findings of such a Special Master, I believe Congress should step in and grant the patent; then the people can decide if it actually works.”

CONGRESSMAN WAYNE DOWDY says that “no one should have to endure the treatment Mr. Newman has undergone at the hands of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO).” And he adds that “instead of promoting Mr. Newman’s invention, the PTO has spent thousands of taxpayer dollars to thwart him ... Mr. Newman has submitted an impressive list of experts who substantiate his claims. On the other hand, tests conducted by the PTO have cast more doubt on its methods than on the effectiveness of Mr. Newman’s machine ... Furthermore, ***if the PTO denies this country the benefits of what could be a revolutionary energy device, then its obstinancy would, in my mind, be criminal.***” CONGRESSMAN DOWDY concludes, “In my opinion, the PTO has failed and it is up to Congress to take corrective action ... I hope the Senate will support Mr. Newman and move to grant him a pioneering patent.”

Hopefully, Senator Thad Cochran will **act soon** and introduce a Senate Bill to grant Joseph Newman a pioneer patent by Congressional action. As of this writing, your letters to Senator Cochran are *very* important!

From the very beginning, Joseph Newman has asked only for the equal opportunity to present his invention in the marketplace with patent protection despite the fact that Mr. Charles H. Duell, Director of the Patent Office, declared in 1899, “*Everything that can be invented has been invented.*”

On Wednesday, August 20, 1986 at a news conference in Jackson, Mississippi, Joseph Newman demonstrated the practicality of a revolutionary electromagnetic lifting and motion device for Earth and Space travel. He demonstrated — contrary to conventional scientific teaching — that the electromagnetic effect occurring between objects can be made to **consistently repel** regardless of whether a magnetic entity has its poles reversed or whether the current in a conductor is reversed. Dr. Hastings testified to

the extreme significance of such an electromagnetic display and said "such a demonstration can be visually viewed by everyone, and it either works or it doesn't." In his Declaration of August 22, 1986, Dr. Hastings wrote: "The levitation experiment demonstrated a vertical force exceeding the force of gravity on strands of #40 copper wire when a few hundred milliamps were applied."

Despite the fact that Joseph Newman has repeatedly demonstrated the efficacy of his invention, has over 30 scientists who have tested and endorsed his invention, and has the endorsement of a technical expert to the Court and former Patent Office commissioner — our government is still denying Mr. Newman a patent at a cost of thousands of dollars to the taxpayer!

As of this writing, Joseph Newman is endeavoring to work on a motor capable of powering an automobile and is in the process of forming and financing (based upon foreign support) a manufacturing, research, and development corporation.

In conclusion, Joseph Newman wishes to express his gratitude to the thousands of people who have written and have called to show their encouragement and support. Such support is needed if this invention is to become a reality to benefit the people of this country and the world. And such support is necessary to overcome the same bureaucratic opposition to innovation that has throughout history impeded the progress of knowledge.

As Max Planck said: "A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."

With all due respect to Max Planck, let's prove his prognosis incorrect in this case, and work to ensure the application and expansion of "an invention whose time has come." **Thank you for your continuing support!**

Saturday, April 12, 1986 The Times-Picayune/The States-Item

METRO NEWS

Energy Machine wows crowd at Superdome

By MICHAEL PERLSTEIN
Staff writer

Mississippi inventor Joseph Newman brought his Energy Machine to the Superdome Friday to convince the public of something he's been trying to get the U.S. Patent Office to believe for 20 years: that the device can produce unlimited amounts of energy for free.

More than 1,500 people paid \$1 admission to see the machine Friday, the first day of a week of demonstrations.

They came from as near as Houma and as far as Switzerland and South Africa, and many said they were convinced Newman's invention will work.

But the U.S. Trademark and Patent Office has not been nearly as sympathetic. Officials have repeatedly told Newman that his claims are impossible, and they have refused his request for a patent.

However, physicists and engineers who once scoffed at Newman's ambitious ideas spoke Friday in his behalf.

Newman claims the machine swallows energy from any power source and generates up to 14 times as much, without polluting.

The Lucedale, Miss., inventor claims he has discovered the principle of magnetic energy, a puzzle that still baffles physicists, and uses it to create electricity.

"I challenge any Ph.D. to get up on the stage and debate with me and prove me wrong," he said.

There were no takers, and many in the audience said they believed him.

Victor Melillo traveled from Cherry Hill, N.J. to see the machine.

"This machine is the greatest thing ever to happen to mankind," Melillo said. "What the

patent office is putting this man through is a travesty."

Cindy Dickinson of Atlanta admitted she didn't really understand Newman's ideas but thinks "it's crucial to get this to the people. If this machine works the people deserve to know what the government is keeping from them."

Stanley Higgins of New Orleans said, "If what he says is true, this is the biggest thing that's ever happened. How can you miss that when you live only 20 minutes away?"

20th September 85

9-20-85

Dr. Jerry R. Harvey
Dr. Orma Jon Holland D.C.DISCLOSURE DOCUMENT

On September 19 and 20, 1985 Joseph Newman disclosed and demonstrated to me his 130 pound motor with reciprocating magnet armature, operating with high voltage input. The primary problem which has been encountered in the past with scaling the Newman motors to large and practical output power levels was the need to go to higher voltage input, and the destruction which occurred when the coil was switched at high voltages. Joe has now solved the high voltage switching problem with a new commutator design, and it appears that arbitrarily high input voltages can now be reached.

The significance of high voltage on the Newman motor is that our data show that 1.) the output power increases as the square of the input voltage; 2.) the input power increases linearly with the voltage; 3.) the motor efficiency increases linearly with the voltage; 4.) output power levels required, for example, to power a home will require input voltages estimated at ten to twenty kilovolts.

On September 19, 1985 the motor was operated at 1,000 and 2,000 volts battery input, with output powers of 50 and 200 Watts respectively. Input power in these tests were 7 and 14 Watts, yielding efficiencies of 700% and 1,400% respectively.

In addition, the motor was operated for the first time using a high voltage transformer plugged into the a.c. power socket. The transformer output voltage was roughly 2,000 volts. The input power was readily measured using an a.c. milliammeter to be 25 Watts, while the output was measured again at approximately 200 Watts. The higher input in this case reflects the inefficiency of the transformer.

It now appears to me that the Newman motor can be readily scaled to power levels which will make it practical for commercial and home energy needs, and this should be accomplished in the very near future.

The above statements are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Roger Hastings 9-20-85
ROGER HASTINGS, Ph.D.

DECLARATION CONCERNING JOSEPH NEWMAN MOTOR PROTOTYPE

On June 11, 1986 I witnessed a demonstration of Joseph Newman's latest motor prototype in Atlanta, Georgia. Newman's motor weighed about ten pounds, consisting of copper and a powerful magnet rotor. The rotor was attached to a 15 inch fan blade taken from a commercial fan. Newman's motor turned the fan blade at approximately 660 r.p.m.. It was connected through a mechanical commutator to 2500 volts of dry cell batteries. The d.c. input current was 1.8 mA, for a total power input of 4.5 Watts.

Also displayed was a commercial fan with a five inch blade. This fan was advertised as an energy saving motor. Examination of the motor revealed a precision motor design. It drew 25 Watts in operation. Newman's motor was obviously doing several times the work of the commercial motor, while drawing 5.5 times less power. A later experiment was performed in Mississippi in which a commercial fan with an identical 15 inch blade was powered from a Variac and run at the same speed as the Newman motor. The commercial fan drew 30 Watts compared to Newman's 4.5 Watts. It should also be noted that a 15 Watt fluorescent tube, connected across Newman's motor coil to prevent sparking, was simultaneously lit to perhaps one fourth of its full brightness. Also, as in past prototypes, a large negative current (r.f. envelope) flows back into the battery from the motor coil.

My testing, and observations of Newman prototypes which are electronically commutated, indicate that Newman's fan prototype can be improved to run on external input of about 2 Watts. Thus further development can lead to a fan motor which consumes 1/15th the power of an efficiently designed commercial motor.


This result is significant in view of Mr. Newman's announcement of his intention to build an automobile motor prototype. I firmly believe that the above quoted results will scale up, and that Mr. Newman's car will consume at least 15 times less energy than present commercial electric cars. This energy savings could be utilized for any combination of longer running time, higher speed, or larger vehicle compared to present designs. Newman's car motor will operate on high voltage, will have high torque at low current, and will probably consume a fraction of one horsepower. If such a motor powered our nation's cars, air pollution would be greatly reduced, and the nation would become energy independent.

I swear that the above statements are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Roger Hastings, Ph.D.

*Subscribed and sworn before me
this 20th day of June, 1986*

9574 J Dennis




Roger Hastings

AN EVALUATION OF N.B.S. TESTING OF THE NEWMAN MOTOR

I have read and evaluated the Newman motor test results reported by R.E. Hebner, G.N. Stenbakken, and D.L. Hillhouse in National Bureau of Standards report #NBSIR 86-3405. While the reporters display fine credentials and demonstrate the use of precision equipment, they obviously did not test the Newman motor. Instead they measured the power consumed in resistors placed in parallel with the Newman motor, and called this power the motor output. In layman's terms, this is equivalent to stating that the output of an electric motor plugged into a wall socket is given by the power used by a lightbulb in the next room which is on a parallel circuit. The measurement of power consumed by these parallel resistors is clearly irrelevant to the efficiency of the Newman motor. The actual input power to the Newman motor (battery input minus power consumed by their resistors) is referred to in the report as "internal losses." No attempt was made to measure the mechanical output of the Newman motor. Nor was any measurement made of heat generated in the motor windings.

It has been demonstrated by myself and others that much of the excess energy generated in the Newman machine occurs at very high frequencies (in particular between 10 and 20 MHz). It has also been demonstrated that the high frequency current will flow to ground if given the opportunity. If Newman's machine is grounded through a high resistance, heat will be produced in the resistor which represents an additional motor output. In the N.B.S. testing, the Newman motor was connected directly to ground, thus eliminating the excess r.f. power from the system. The report states that "the power flow in the device is primarily a low frequency phenomena." This result was guaranteed by the test set-up. Again, the oscillographs shown on page 3 of the report show clean low frequency waveforms. All oscilloscope waveforms which I have observed on Newman motors which are properly connected have by contrast been dominated by extremely large high-frequency components.

In conclusion, the N.B.S. failed to measure the output of the Newman motor, and instead measured the output of parallel resistors. In addition, the primary r.f. energy generated by the machine was shunted to ground. Their measurements are therefore irrelevant to the actual functioning of the Newman device. These results reflect a total lack of communication between the N.B.S. and Newman or any other expert on Newman's technology. Considering the importance of Newman's Machine and its potential applications, this waste of N.B.S. resources and misrepresentation of Newman's device is an insult to those seriously interested in the machine and to those who may benefit by its future applications.



Roger Hastings, Ph.D.

- XV. Testimonies by Joseph Newman, Dr. Roger Hastings, John Flannery, and Milton Everett before the Senate Subcommittee on Energy, July 30, 1986

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH NEWMAN
BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ENERGY, NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND GOVERNMENT PROCESSES
DATED JULY 30, 1986**

Good morning. Thank you for inviting me to appear today. My name is Joe Newman. I come here today from Lucedale, Mississippi. It may be in the backwoods. But that doesn't mean we are backward. No more than any other out-of-the-way place, like, say Kitty Hawk. I am an inventor. That is how I make my living and, in the course of making my living, I have obtained patents for a number of devices and machines. None, however, have been as dramatic as the one I've been fighting to patent for the last seven years.

I have invented a machine which uses the properties of magnetism and electricity to generate power. The reason my machine is a technological breakthrough is that my machine creates more external output energy than the amount of external input energy required to run it. My prototype is powered only by dry cell batteries. Various tests run by independent scientists have shown this machine can obtain efficiencies greater than 1000%. That means we have proven my machine can release more than ten times the energy than it takes to start it. The technology itself shows my device can produce much more than that. Think of the practical application of my machine to power your home, your car, or any other use that requires energy.

The thing that surprised me is that instead of being greeted by the Executive Branch and the Patent Office with curiosity and searching inquiries, I was greeted instead with incompetence, inconsistency, obstruction and worse. In the bargain some misleading impressions have been given some currency.

Firstly, my device does not — as some say — create energy. It releases available unused energy.

Secondly, I do not claim my machine is a perpetual motion machine as the Patent Office falsely and repeatedly says. Far from it. Through more than 21 years of hard work I have harnessed the properties of magnetism in a new way to obtain the unprecedented efficiency I've described. I do not claim my machine runs forever. I only claim it runs longer than any other motor or generator invented thus far.

Thirdly, I have proof for what I have to say. Thirty independent scientists including a principal physicist for Sperry Univac, Roger Hastings, with me here today, and Milton Everett of the State of Mississippi Geology Department, also present, have submitted sworn affidavits stating my machine works. My proofs persuaded no less than a former Commissioner of the Patent Office that my device works as I claim. This former Commissioner, Major William Schuyler, with an electrical engineering background, nominated by the Patent Office, not by me, was appointed by Federal Judge Thomas Jackson on his own motion, over my objection, to render an opinion for this Judge. Major Schuyler, who bears the title of Special Master, concluded that there was overwhelming evidence that my machine works. More than that, this former Commissioner stated there was no contradictory evidence and that the Patent Office had knowingly not followed patent law and that the Patent Office's position that the machine was impossible was "clearly erroneous" and that they were overruled, and that the patent should issue if the applicant met the balance of the patent statute.

My counsel, John Flannery, has provided you with additional details. But let me add a few comments. I filed my first patent application on March 22, 1979 — more than seven years ago. Since then the Patent Office has done nothing but throw up barriers to block me from obtaining a patent. However, I assembled the proof I've discussed that my machine works. I also complied with the Patent Office's other requirements. There is no question that my device is new or that it works. More than 30 credible scientists have listened to my technical process and ran their own tests and put their hard-earned reputations on the line to state that my device works. The Special Master gave those courageous individuals their due by stating the evidence before the Court and the Patent Office was overwhelming that the invention worked as I claimed it did.

Since 1979, I have suffered eight different rejections by the Patent Office. Dealing with the Patent Office is like having a starring role in the movie CATCH 22. I have had a trial scheduled on three different dates: June 1984, February 1986, and now December 1986. I'm not sure I'll ever get a trial. And then my counsel tells me there is the appeal. Even when I get a Court of Appeals Order disciplining the lower Court, it is ignored by the lower Court, the N.B.S., and the Patent Office. The N.B.S. has just run these tests behind closed doors, and they did it wrong as Roger [Hastings] shall tell you in a moment and they expect me to pay for it — \$75,000. Imagine that. That's not fair. That's why I've turned to you as the representatives of the people, my Mississippi neighbors and others across this nation, who I believe want to give me a chance to succeed (or even to fail).

Please try to understand my frustration as an inventor who believes he has a new way to generate power.

Benjamin Franklin said:

"There are everywhere a number of people who, being totally destitute of any inventive faculty themselves do not readily conceive that others may possess it."

Franklin and others saw the power granted to Congress as a protection for such individuals. That promise of protection has been withheld in recent years from me — and others.

I have proven my machine works. I believe I am entitled to a pioneering patent as dictated by the guidelines of the Supreme Court. I appealed to the Patent Office to accept my proofs, to acknowledge my submission was "new" and to grant my pioneering patent so my pioneering invention could benefit others. Instead, they turned a deaf ear, disregarded their own procedures, knowingly and consistently violated patent and federal law, and the Courts have equally condoned this injustice. That is why I have turned to you on behalf of myself and all inventors and citizens who believe the purpose of the patent system is to promote, not stifle, inventors because the jewel of our civilization is our creative people. Stop creativity and one stays the advancement of the human race. That is why I ask you Senators to give me the relief I've fought so long to obtain. If I have what I claim, no one loses. If I'm dead wrong, and I tell you with all my heart and soul I'm not, then no one loses for I shall fade from sight. But I'm right and I ask you to give me the chance to prove it in the marketplace, to grant me a pioneering patent.

Thank you again for your attention and this opportunity.

**STATEMENT OF ROGER HASTINGS, Ph.D.
BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ENERGY, NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND GOVERNMENT PROCESSES
DATED JULY 30, 1986**

My name is Roger Hastings. Thank you for the opportunity to address this Committee. Before I discuss Mr. Newman's device, let me tell you something about my background, how long I've known Joe Newman, and then I'll make my observations about Newman's device, and repeat my criticism of the recent N.B.S. tests of Newman's device.

I. BACKGROUND

My education, through the Ph.D., is in physics. I have served as a Professor of physics for four years, and for the past five years I have worked as a physicist for the Sperry Corporation in St. Paul, Minnesota. My current title is Senior Staff Scientist, and I am the manager of Sperry's Superconductive Electronics Technology Center. I have known Mr. Joseph Newman for five years. During this time I have tested most of the many prototype motors which he has constructed, and I have witnessed testing by other technical people. I have become familiar with Mr. Newman's theories and attitudes. I represent myself in this matter, and have never represented Sperry Corp. regarding Mr. Newman or his machine.

II. NEWMAN'S DEVICE

Newman's motors all consist of a very powerful permanent magnet which rotates or reciprocates within or near a coil consisting of a very large number of turns of copper wire. The coil is energized by a battery pack, and the magnetic field produced by the coil provides the torque or force required to rotate or reciprocate the permanent magnet. A mechanical commutator reverses the direction of current flow through the coil each half cycle, and in some models also chops the current input between current reversals. Technically, the motor may be described as a two pole, single phase, permanent magnet armature, d.c. motor. The difference between Newman's design and the prior art is one of scale: very large magnet and very large coil. Newman's large motors contain conventional ceramic magnets weighing up to 700 pounds. His smaller motors use powerful rare earth magnets. The coils typically are wound with more than 100,000 turns of copper wire. Since the coil resistance is therefore high, the machines operate on battery voltage which is sufficiently high (hundreds to thousands of volts).

The torque applied to the magnet in these motors is proportional to the product of the strength of the magnet, the number of turns of copper wire, and the current flowing through the wire. In Newman's machines extremely large torques can be developed with very small current inputs. If we scale up Newman's motor, it is theoretically possible to obtain infinite torques with infinitesimal current flow (and not violate any laws of physics). However, according to conventional thought, as soon as this magnet begins to rotate, doing work against some load applied to its shaft, the back emf (electromotive force) produced by the rotating magnet would produce a back current which nearly cancels the input current, and the torque would be reduced to nearly zero. The magnet could not rotate, or would rotate extremely slowly with the shaft power output less than the battery input.

Consider what has happened to conventional thought in the past when people have experimented with the limits of very high speeds (relativity), very small dimensions (quantum mechanics), very low temperatures (superconductivity and superfluidity). Newman's motors probe the limits of very large torque with very small current input. And they do rotate at relatively high rates. For example, witness Newman's latest prototype (on demonstration following this hearing today in an auditorium in this building) which runs on 0.0008 amps at 3000 volts and turns a 16 inch fan blade at more than 500 r.p.m. How much torque can this motor produce? Try to stop the motor by holding the two inch diameter shaft. This will not be possible for a normal human, although the motor is a scale model of a motor which Newman intends to build to power an automobile.

Newman's motors are unconventional in other ways. One notices the fluorescent tubes which are placed across the motor coil. These tubes are lit by the coil's collapsing magnetic field occurring when the battery voltage is switched. They are used to protect the mechanical switch from damage due to arcing. The additional power produced in these tubes (and flowing through the system) occurs at very high frequencies, primarily in the range of ten to twenty million cycles per second. This r.f. (radio frequency) current has been accurately measured, and exceeds the battery input current by factor of five to ten in the various motors. One of Newman's motors was monitored with a computerized high speed data sampling system, with the following results:

- (1) The r.f. appears in bursts, with the repeat time between each burst approximately equal to the length of the motor winding divided by the speed of light in copper. The r.f. bursts showed little attenuation during their travel through the coil, maintaining their shape and amplitude.**
- (2) The r.f. current and voltage were in phase, representing the real power.**
- (3) The r.f. current and voltage waveforms were offset from ground, indicating a net d.c. component.**
- (4) The net r.f. power at the battery pack represented a negative power which exceeded the d.c. input power from the batteries.**

The last statement may explain why Newman has been able to demonstrate the charging of dry cell batteries placed in his system. Battery failure has occurred through internal shorts which develop within the batteries rather than by depletion of the energy stored within the batteries. When you witness the demonstration of Newman's latest prototype, if you attend the demonstration following this hearing, bear in mind that the batteries will last many times longer than expected for a drain of 0.0008 amps. A prominent battery company is working with Newman to develop batteries which will stand up to the r.f. power levels, and perhaps last even longer.

Newman's motor design is based on his theory of gyroscopic particles which he explains in his book "The Energy Machine of Joseph Newman." Full utilization of his machine will require a detailed mathematical representation of the phenomena based on a thorough understanding of the atomic processes at work. This will require a parallel program of experimentation using the finest resources available. Application programs have already been conceived (for example, the car motor), and will require prototyping and manufacturing efforts. Newman should be immediately awarded a patent and become recognized in the scientific community for his accomplishments to date.

III. AN EVALUATION OF N.B.S. TESTING

I have been asked whether the recent N.B.S. tests alter the opinions I've expressed before and I'm repeating here today. The recent N.B.S. tests don't alter my opinion because N.B.S. failed to test Newman's device.

I have read and evaluated the Newman motor test results reported by R.E. Hebner, G.N. Stenbakken, and D.L. Hillhouse in National Bureau of Standards Report #NBSIR 86-3405. [See "Report of Tests on Joseph Newman's Device," U.S. Dept. of Commerce, dated June 26, 1986, hereinafter referred to as "the NBS Rpt. at ____."]]

A. N.B.S.'s Energy "Output" Measurements

While the reporters display fine credentials and demonstrate the use of precision equipment, they obviously did not test the Newman motor. Instead they measured the power consumed in resistors placed in parallel with the Newman motor, and called this power the motor output. [See NBS Rpt. at 7 (Fig. 4.) "Schematic Drawing of Newman device and input and output power measurements circuits," reproduced with comments plainly referring to the "Resistors" as such in the accompanying chart.]

In layman's terms, this is equivalent to stating that the output of an electric motor plugged into a wall socket is given by the power used by a lightbulb in the next room which is on a parallel circuit. The measurement of power consumed by these parallel resistors is clearly irrelevant to the efficiency of the Newman motor.


The actual input power to the Newman motor (battery input minus power consumed by their resistors) is referred to in the report as "internal losses." No attempt was made to measure the mechanical output of the Newman motor. Nor was any measurement made of heat generated in the motor windings.

B. The Additional Energy N.B.S. Lost From The System

It has been demonstrated by myself and others that much of the excess energy generated in the Newman machine occurs at very high frequencies (in particular between 10 and 20 MHz). It has also been demonstrated that the high frequency current will flow to the ground if given the opportunity. If Newman's machine is grounded through a high resistance, heat will be produced in the resistor which represents an additional motor output. In the N.B.S. testing, the Newman motor was connected directly to ground, thus eliminating the excess r.f. power from the system [See NBS Rpt. at 7 (Fig. 4.) "Schematic Drawing of Newman device and input and output power measurement circuits," reproduced with comments plainly referring to the "Ground" as such in the accompanying chart.] The report states that "the power flow in the device is primarily a low frequency phenomena." This result was guaranteed by the test set up. Again, the oscillographs shown on page 3 of the report show clean low frequency waveforms. All oscilloscope waveforms which I have observed on Newman motors which are properly connected have by contrast been dominated by extremely large high frequency components.

C. Conclusion

In conclusion, the N.B.S. failed to measure the output of the Newman motor, and instead measured the output of parallel resistors. In addition, the primary r.f. energy generated by the machine was shunted to ground. Their measurements are therefore irrelevant to the actual functioning of the Newman device. These results reflect a total lack of communication between the N.B.S. and Newman or any other expert on Newman's technology. Considering the importance of Newman's machine and its potential applications, this waste of N.B.S. resources and misrepresentation of Newman's device is an insult to those seriously interested in the machine and to those who may benefit by its future applications.




GROUND (NBS shunted energy from Newman device to ground without measuring and lost it.)

RESISTORS (NBS measured energy spent in resistors but not in or by Newman's Device.)

Prof. Hastings:

"In the NBS testing the Newman motor was connected directly to ground, thus eliminating the excess r.f. power from the system."



COMMUTATOR COIL

Prof. Hastings:

"... This is equivalent to stating that the output of an electric motor plugged into a wall socket is given by the power used by a lightbulb in the next room which is on a parallel circuit."

Principal points concerning deficiencies of the NBS test conducted by three individuals:

- 1) The input voltage into the energy machine was restricted. This is exactly opposite to the Technical Process taught by Joseph Newman who teaches that the input voltage should be maximized and the input current should be minimized. The three individuals at the NBS did the opposite.
- 2) As Dr. Roger Hastings wrote in his statement: "In the NBS testing, the Newman motor was connected directly to ground." — as a result, the excess output power was shunted away.
- 3) The NBS tests did not measure the output of Newman's motor — instead, he says, the tests measured the output of parallel resistors. As a result, Dr. Hastings says, "Their measurements are therefore irrelevant to the actual functioning of the Newman device."
- 4) No attempt was made to measure the mechanical output of the Newman motor — only the electrical output.
- 5) No attempt was made to measure the heat generated in the motor windings.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN P. FLANNERY, III
BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ENERGY, NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND GOVERNMENT PROCESSES
DATED JULY 30, 1986**

Thank you Mr. Chairman and the members of this subcommittee for inviting us here today to discuss how the Patent Office has failed to treat fairly or to protect, as is merited, the device backwoods inventor Joseph Newman has invented.

I represent Joseph Newman. I am his counsel.

I represent just one inventor, among many, who has spent his resources fighting a tangled bureaucracy, rather than devoting himself exclusively to his work.

Mr. Newman, 49, seeks a patent denied him for six years not because of Patent Office bungling (they ignored their own procedures), incompetence (the patent examiner who rejected his patent application admittedly doesn't have a college level understanding of physics), bad faith (the Patent Office's Deputy Solicitor filed an admittedly false sworn declaration, later recanted, knowing it was false in a desperate effort to rebut Newman), unlawfulness (former Commissioner Mossinghoff misappropriated \$100,000 of federal energy monies to discredit Newman by an irregular and unprecedented testing procedure just before Mossinghoff resigned the Patent Office in December, 1984) contemptible and unfair (the Patent Office's expert, the National Bureau of Standards, ran tests behind closed doors in violation of a Court of Appeals Order requiring them to give notice of the tests they intended to run and to complete the tests within thirty days; they did neither).

The U.S. District Court has confessed its technical incompetence, ignored the findings of the Special Master it appointed, seized inventor Newman's property without notice or hearing, and defied the plain language of a writ issued by the Court of Appeals to correct the District Court's "highly irregular" procedures.

As a result of what the executive and judicial branches have done (and what they have failed to do), this, the legislative branch of government has responded by introducing private legislation in the House that might accomplish what Newman has otherwise been unable to obtain and provided us this hearing in the Senate. We hope that this hearing shall result in the Senate introducing private legislation so that Joe Newman may finally have a fair shot at the marketplace. Again, we thank you for this opportunity.

As you may know, there has been a great deal of media coverage of Mr. Newman's case including magazines like **REGARDIE'S**, local and national newspapers and wire services such as **ABC WEEKEND NEWS**, **CNN**, and even Johnny Carson's **TONIGHT SHOW**. But I thought I might serve this Committee best by summarizing the facts of this case.

I. THE FACTS

A. The Patent Office

What's happened is simple and tragic. Newman holds a number of patents and, in 1980, he applied for another one. But the Patent Office was entirely unable to understand — at least so they could claim at the outset — Newman's claim that his device produced more energy out than required to run it.

The Patent Office said you can't do that, that is, get more energy out than you put in. They were, however, dead wrong. Newman's notion is just like what occurs when you strike a match to dry wood; you release more energy from the wood (the fire) than the energy required to get it going (the match). The only difference is that Newman's device doesn't release stored chemical energy (due to photosynthesis) but stored electromagnetic energy (due to permanent and induced magnetic fields).

In 1980, Newman built a prototype proving his device operated. But the Patent Office refused Newman's offer to test it. More recently, they have been somewhat eager to test it but only on their own schedule, without describing the tests beforehand, and only if the public is excluded during the tests. In essence, they refused to test Newman's device fairly, and under circumstances that Newman could afford to attend, and have otherwise defied an appellate court order directing them how to proceed — but more about that shortly.

The Patent Office ignored the sworn statements of 30 scientists and engineers, including a principal physicist for Sperry Corp., Dr. Roger Hastings, that Newman's device operates as he claims.

In one earlier affidavit by Dr. Hastings, based on several experiments he ran, he found:

- (a) for the **same input power**, Newman's motor ran *seven hours* as compared with an 80% rated efficient D.C. motor that ran only *six minutes*,
- (b) batteries run down so that they were **unable to power** even a 1 ½ -volt *toy motor*, when connected to Newman's device, not only turned Newman's 90 pound rotor, but even caused it to *accelerate within only 20 seconds*, and
- (c) Newman's device — in 1982 — measured **unprecedented efficiencies** of 800% (output/input).

B. The Court

In January, 1983, Newman filed a suit in federal district court in the District of Columbia asking the Court, as is provided for by statute, 35 United States Code, Section 145, to compel the Commissioner to issue him a patent as the Patent Office had refused him one. The case was assigned to U.S. District Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson, appointed to the bench in 1982.

This case was first set down for trial in June 1984. But Judge Thomas P. Jackson said he was incompetent, technically incompetent, to consider the matter, and appointed a Special Master, proposed by the Patent Commissioner, over Newman's objection, to determine if Newman's device operated. The Master, former Patent Commissioner William Schuyler (an electrical engineer), reviewed all the evidence and concluded: **(1)** there was "overwhelming evidence," without contradiction, that Newman's device operated as claimed, **(2)** that one "skilled in the art" could make or use Newman's device, **(3)** that the Patent Office had disregarded its own procedures in denying Newman a patent, **(4)** that the Board of Patent Appeals decision that Newman's device was impossible was "clearly erroneous" and, **(5)** as a matter of law, a patent should issue.

Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that the Judge "shall accept the findings" of the Special Master, but the Court did not. No more technically competent than when the Court appointed the Master, the Judge set aside the Master's findings citing a body of scientific knowledge that he admitted was beyond his comprehension. Judge Jackson also ordered Newman to pay for the Master's services and expenses; so this exercise cost Newman about \$12,000.00.

In December 1984, Commissioner Mossinghoff arranged to have \$100,000.00 of Energy Act funds misappropriated to discredit Newman's device. Commissioner Mossinghoff made an unprecedented agreement with the National Bureau of Standards. He ran little risk as he already had N.B.S. expert Jacob Rabinow file a sworn declaration that Newman's device did not operate. So the Patent Office ran little risk of the N.B.S. contradicting itself with tests.

We believed as part of pre-trial discovery that they were entitled to prepare their defense but we wanted to know what they were doing so we could defend against their critical claims at trial. It was not reassuring that the supposed national laboratory, the N.B.S., had already said the device didn't operate without ever testing it. Nor was it reassuring that this same N.B.S. expert Rabinow sat in on the meeting when the Patent Office struck this agreement with its sister agency, the N.B.S.

Thus did we insist on five safeguards: **(1)** presence (we be there so we could keep an eye on what the Patent Office and N.B.S. were doing), **(2)** a limitation on the duration of the test (so that presence was affordable to Newman, his counsel and an expert), **(3)** destruction (there be none because Newman develops and demonstrates his prototypes and, if the device was destroyed, how could we contradict the results they claimed), **(4)** that the Patent Office describe in advance the tests they intended to run, and **(5)** N.B.S. report the results of any "test" they did run.

Commissioner Quigg rejected these conditions out of hand. He asked the Court to order Newman to surrender his device, to exclude Newman from "preliminary tests" — whatever they were — and to permit N.B.S. to destroy the device; the Patent Office made the astonishing admission in a letter to Representative Trent Lott that they wouldn't say Newman's device operates until after they had destroyed it. The N.B.S. expert Hebner said the same thing in a sworn declaration.

Judge Jackson obliged the Patent Commissioner and issued the Order as requested.

In October 1985, as I asked the Court of Appeals to stay the extraordinary Order, particularly as Newman would suffer irreparable harm if he was forced to comply. The Court of Appeals issued the stay.

I also asked the Court of Appeals to take the extraordinary step of issuing a Writ of Mandamus.

On January 13, 1986, the Court of Appeals did. The Circuit Court sternly rebuked District Court Judge Thomas P. Jackson for his unprecedented, "highly irregular," and fundamentally unfair procedures. *In Re Newman*, 782 F.2d 971, 974-75 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Appellate Court also ordered the safeguards we requested. They said we could be present for all tests, N.B.S. had to tell us what tests they were going to run in advance. They had thirty days, that's all, to run the tests and issue a report. Newman thought he finally had the level playing field he fought for six months to obtain. But as you will see, the N.B.S. and the Patent Office ignored the court-ordered safeguards from the moment Newman timely produced his device on January 24, 1986.

C. The National Bureau of Standards

N.B.S. refused to run a single test unless they were permitted to destroy Newman's device. They told the Court of Appeals before they ran the test, that Newman's device was a hoax. N.B.S. came up with a thousand excuses, each of which Newman answered, to run the clock while they waited for permission to destroy Newman's device. For example, they insisted on communicating by mail, rather than by phone. In another instance, they required Newman to travel 1,000 miles from Mississippi to Maryland to move a wire a single inch. Newman and I told N.B.S. they could connect it. But they insisted Newman do it. Even after Newman did, after he traveled a thousand miles to do it, they refused to test Newman's device or even to tell him when or how they would test it.

The Patent Office and the N.B.S. kept Newman's device for thirty days without running a single test. During that time, the Federal Circuit reaffirmed its decision refusing to let the Patent Office or N.B.S. destroy Newman's device; they issued an unreported Opinion on February 12, 1986. But the Court of Appeals Order made not a bit of difference. The N.B.S. didn't describe or run a single test in the thirty days they were given to do so. On several occasions they asked us to tell them how to run the tests. We refused to tell, although we did tell them how we had run past tests. It is of critical importance that we told them **not** to connect the device to ground.

On February 24, 1986, when the thirty days that the Court of Appeals allotted ran out, without a single test having been described or conducted, I went to pick up Newman's device with the knowledge and consent of National Bureau of Standards Deputy Director Kramer.

But before I could retrieve the device, the Court seized it without prior notice, much less any hearing. Upon arriving at N.B.S. to retrieve the device, I was told that the Court had summoned me to court threatening my arrest if I did not appear in court within the hour. Upon arriving in the court, I was ordered, under penalty of contempt, not to retrieve my client's property. We objected but complied with the Court's order.

On March 3, 1986, as a result of the Court's questionable procedures, Mr. Newman made an affidavit in support of a motion to disqualify the sitting District Judge for his demonstrated personal bias and prejudice.

On March 7, 1986, the District Court held a status conference to consider giving the Patent Commissioner's expert more time to test Joseph Newman's device beyond the thirty days authorized by the U.S. Court of Appeals. *In Re Newman, supra*, at 975.

Immediately before the status conference began, the Judge's law clerk handed me an order denying Newman's motion to disqualify the Judge as insufficient, but without any discussion as to why the pleadings were factually insufficient. The Judge held me in contempt for merely mentioning our pending motion to disqualify him. During that same hearing the Court allowed the Patent Office to continue to have Newman's device and to test it, day to day, until June 26, 1986 — 150 days after Joseph Newman produced the device for testing.

Newman could not afford to be present with counsel and an expert for the 12 hour work-days N.B.S. claimed they worked each day. It would have cost Newman about \$60,000, or more, to attend the tests. Former Patent Commissioner Mossinghoff misappropriated \$100,000.00 to run these unprecedented tests. The tests, we have been told, cost about \$75,000.00. Sure Newman technically had a right to attend the tests, but it was a right he could not afford to exercise. He is not a large corporation. He is an inventor who lives by what he invents. Worse, the Patent Office earlier said they expect Newman to reimburse the Patent Office for what the tests cost.

On June 26, 1986, the Patent Office's expert finally issued its report. Unsurprisingly, the N.B.S. said Newman's device did not operate as Newman claims it does. It is ironic that as a consequence of the Patent Office's disregard of the Court of Appeals requirement that the N.B.S. notify us what tests they intended to run during the 30-day test period authorized by the U.S. Court of Appeals, Newman did not know until **after** N.B.S. issued its report how N.B.S. "tested" his device. Only afterwards did Newman discover that the N.B.S. did not test his device at all.

Professor Hastings will say more about this, but, as I said earlier, before N.B.S. ran any tests, I forwarded to N.B.S. a schematic of the circuit used to test Newman's device. It plainly showed not to connect Newman's device to ground. But N.B.S. nevertheless allowed energy to escape from the device, literally to the ground, and then measured the power spent in a load (resistors) wired in parallel to the device. Therefore, N.B.S. did not measure the energy produced in (or by) the device itself.

If the Patent Office and the N.B.S. had complied with the Court of Appeals Order, Newman would have had a second opportunity to reinforce what was already obvious from the schematic diagram forwarded to N.B.S., that they should not connect Newman's device to ground. We could have told N.B.S. they were in error. But as N.B.S. and the Patent Office failed to give us any notice — contrary to the Court of Appeals Order — of the tests they intended to run during the 30-day test period authorized by the Court of Appeals, they wasted Newman's resources and, by their estimates, \$75,000.00 of federal taxpayer's monies misappropriated by former Commissioner Mossinghoff.

D. The Congress

Newman's device never had a chance in the Patent Office. Nor has Newman gotten a fair shake from the District Court. Nor has the Court of Appeals Order compelled the Court, the Patent Office or N.B.S. to act fairly. The Patent Office continues to spend taxpayer's money in an effort to grind down Newman's resources if they can't otherwise fairly meet and contradict his arguments.

As Newman could not get his "day in court," I asked Congress to give Newman his "day in the marketplace." We respectfully repeat and renew that request today.

That is why Representative Dan Burton (R-Ind.) last October introduced H.R. 3590 on Newman's behalf. Joseph Newman seeks a pioneering patent. That is a patent for something that has not been done before. As the Patent Office claims Newman's device is impossible, but we have proved to the contrary, then it is a pioneering patent. The Supreme

Court has ruled on 6 occasions since the latter part of the 19th Century that such patents should be liberally interpreted from the narrowest to the widest to interpretation of the claims and as much as possible the claim language will be interpreted in the language of the applicant to uphold the fruits and labor of his genius. This is also why Representative Trent Lott abandoned his position that Newman should wait on the outcome of the litigation and last December introduced his own bill identical to H.R. 3590. More recently, Representatives Kindness, Torricelli, Dannemayer, Tauzin, Daub, Dowdy and Livingston introduced identical private bills. Representative Livingston has called for an investigation of the matter. The House of Representatives has not yet held its hearing, but you have. We are grateful for this opportunity.

II. CONCLUSION

Newman has stated before, as he shall again shortly, that he shall continue to press his case.

We respectfully request that after this hearing, after hearing what we've had to say, and after considering the evidence that the members of this Committee join and introduce a private pioneering patent bill in the Senate so that Joseph Newman may finally have a patent as protection for his work.

Thank you for your attention and, after Mr. Newman and the other members of this panel make their statements, we would all be glad to answer any questions you may have.

STATEMENT OF MILTON EVERETT BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY, NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND GOVERNMENT PROCESSES DATED JULY 30, 1986

Thank you for inviting me to be here today. My name is Milton Everett and I am with the State of Mississippi Geology Department although I am appearing here today on my own behalf.

Throughout Mr. Newman's struggle, one thing that has struck me as astounding for an agency supposedly interested in science is the total absence of curiosity by the Patent Office.

My only direct contact with the Patent Office officials occurred when Mr. Jerry Sears, Solicitor for the Patent Office, attended my deposition at Mr. Newman's Lucedale, Mississippi home.

Mr. Sears assumed an adversarial, not an inquisitive attitude toward me and the others present. I do not believe this is a proper attitude for an official of the Patent Office.

Mr. Sears' travel expenses were billed to Mr. Newman and much to my amazement, he was neither interested in seeing or testing Mr. Newman's device.

It became evident in the course of the proceedings that his sole intention was to discredit all evidence in support of Joe Newman's patent.

What I had to say, I suppose, didn't suit his purposes. I testified about a water pumping test I had taken part in and in which I found the Newman device efficiency to be 10 times greater than the conventional electric motor. Indeed, the conventional motor's efficiency was about 40% which yields a Newman device efficiency of at least 400%.

I have submitted a number of statements in the three and one-half years I have known Joe Newman. I have attested to the numerous tests I've observed: mechanical tests, electrical tests, and thermal tests.


But let me tell you this. In each and every case where the Newman device has been properly tested, it has shown an efficiency of greater than 100% and I'd stake my professional reputation on that assertion.

XVI. ADDITIONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To Dr. Nicholas Tsoupas: an exceptional Physics Teacher, Research Scientist, and the very first teacher with a doctorate in Physics who cared enough to express in writing the immense importance of this invention to the "People" with the full knowledge that many of his colleagues — in a knee-jerk (unthinking and unquestioning) response — would disapprove.

To the alumni of the university who may be fortunate enough to have Dr. Tsoupas as a member of its faculty and especially to the students of that university who have a class or classes instructed by Dr. Tsoupas — be aware of the meaning and essence of the word "Teacher." The following courageous letter by Dr. Tsoupas says it all!

Joseph W. Newman



YALE UNIVERSITY

A. W. WRIGHT NUCLEAR STRUCTURE LABORATORY

P.O. Box 6666, 272 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Nov. 16, 1985

Representative Bruce A. Morrison
437 Cannon Bldg.
3rd District, Fairfield, Middlesex, New Haven Counties
House Judiciary Committee
Washington, D.C. 20515

RE: H.R. Bill 3590

Dear Mr. Morrison:

I am writing on behalf of the inventor Joseph Westley Newman of Lucedale, Mississippi, to urge you to support the special private bill H.R. 3590 introduced in the House of Representatives on October 17, 1985.

I am a resident of New Haven, Connecticut and work at Yale University as a Research Associate in the physics department, doing research in nuclear physics and also teaching physics at Yale University, and at times in Southern Connecticut State University and University of New Haven. As a scientist I consider myself open-minded and I welcome and support new ideas and inventions intended for the well being of the human race.

Mr. Newman has demonstrated many working models of his invention, an "energy machine" which is based on his own ideas. In spite of this earthshaking invention, the U.S. Patent Office has denied him a patent. I know for a fact that many scientists consider his invention unorthodox and unacceptable, possibly because his theories do not fully comport with today's University teachings. However, as Mr. Newman has demonstrated that his invention works the way he claims, the Patent Office should not have denied him a patent. This invention means an unlimited source of energy and will introduce new ideas into the science of physics.

I fully trust that you will support this bill and thus Mr. Newman will be able to devote more time to his inventions and in developing his energy machine for commercial uses, instead of draining his energy and financial resources by fighting the Patent Office personnel.

Sincerely,

Nicholaos Tsoupas, Ph.D

NT/amt

XVII. The following was written in response to the introduction of Senate Bill S. 2832 by Senator Thad Cochran of Mississippi.

To whom it may concern:

Senator Thad Cochran is clearly taking a stand as an enemy to the people of the State of Mississippi, the country, and the world. He has now introduced Bill S. 2832 in which he seeks more testing of the energy machine of Joseph Newman and more unjust examination by the Patent Office. This unjust position of Senator Thad Cochran flies in the face of the direct order by both the Mississippi Senate and House which overwhelmingly stated that the Judicial System, Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson, and the Patent Office have failed to serve justice to Joseph Newman. The Mississippi Legislature also ordered that the Patent Office be forced to issue a patent to Joseph Newman.

This same position was also stated by the Republican Study Committee of Congress (Chaired by Congressman Bob Livingston of Louisiana), the City Council of New Orleans, the City Council of Lucedale, Mississippi, and by eleven different Congressmen who have introduced eleven Bills seeking to have Joseph Newman issued a patent for his pioneering invention. It was most properly stated by Congressman Wayne Dowdy of Mississippi when he said, **"If the Patent Office denies this country the benefits of what could be a revolutionary energy device, then its obstinacy would, in my mind, be criminal."**

Senator Cochran has chosen to ignore my letter to him of August 27, 1986, in which I wrote:

"To ask for additional testing flies in the face of the clear, deliberate violation of the laws by the Patent Office and Federal Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson. These facts have been verified by the Republican Study Committee Report and both the Mississippi State House and Senate.


*"Relative to any institution or lab that does not presently have ties to receipt of funding or work contracts from the U.S. Government Agencies, I know of none, and I will agree to no testing where that government influence can or could be feasible. Nor will I agree to any testing procedure which will infer that the **criminal**, consistent injustice put forth by the Patent Office, Thomas Penfield Jackson, and the National Bureau of Standards was O.K.*

"My strong and unbending position is that anyone who condones these past injustices of the Patent Office, the National Bureau of Standards, and Thomas Penfield Jackson, is just as guilty as they."

Senator Thad Cochran's position also flies in the face of Joseph Newman's earnest and eager attempt to establish a Research, Development, and Manufacturing Company of his energy machine technology in the State of Mississippi. Such technology will create many new jobs and spur "a new Industrial Revolution which will flow from the State of Mississippi and spread across the world."

The facts clearly show that Senator Thad Cochran is an enemy of the people of the State of Mississippi and I, Joseph Newman, urge every resident in Mississippi to call, wire, or write Senator Cochran to inform him that he will not be elected in November of 1988, and that he cannot blatantly defy the will of the people of the State of Mississippi and of the State Legislature since the power of this State belongs to the people and **not** to Senator Thad Cochran.

Thank you.



Joseph W. Newman

U.S. SENATOR COCHRAN IGNORES THE MISSISSIPPI STATE LEGISLATURE AND SANCTIONS PATENT OFFICE MISCONDUCT AGAINST JOSEPH NEWMAN The Mississippi Legislature, sitting in extraordinary Session, resolved that Mississippi energy machine inventor Joseph Newman has suffered "arbitrary and unfair treatment" by the U.S. Patent Office and asked the Mississippi Congressional delegation in Washington to do something about it — to grant Newman a patent.

U.S. Senator Thad Cochran has ignored the State Legislature's request. Indeed, he's helping the Patent Office to make matters worse. Senator Cochran made the surprising admission on the floor of the U.S. Senate, even after holding hearings, that he couldn't figure out what the Patent Office did wrong. More than that, he said there "oughta be a law" to give them the opportunity to do it again and then he introduced a bill — S. 2832 — to make it possible for the Patent Office to do it again.

Where did the Senator go wrong?

During the Senate hearings Senator Cochran held in late July, it was clear that although his staff was familiar with the case, the Senator was not. Neither the Patent Office nor the National Bureau of Standards produced anyone to testify who had been involved in the case. The Senator's "searching inquiry" of the Patent Office witnesses who appeared consisted of "softball" questions such as, "Did the Patent Office disregard its procedures in the Newman case?" yielding the unsurprising response, "No, Senator." Newman said, "The Senator didn't seem to know anything about the case or even to care to know what happened although we certainly sent him sufficient background materials and my counsel briefed the Senator's staff a number of times. I guess the Senator was just going through the motions, you know, allowing me to speak my piece but never intending to do anything about it. That's what happens when you spend too much time too close to Washington. You get Potomac fever."

During the hearings, Senator Cochran asked whether Newman — who has just retrieved his device from the National Bureau of Standards after 150 days of testing — would submit his device for more testing elsewhere; the Patent Office has said they expect Newman to reimburse them for the \$100,000 they spent in trying to prove Newman's device didn't operate. Roger Hastings, a principal physicist with the Sperry Corporation, responded to the Senator's question that scientists always welcome more testing, but, as far as Newman's patent application went, that should not be linked with more testing. Newman has already demonstrated his device operated to the satisfaction of a former Patent Commissioner and Congress should direct that a patent issue to Newman without any more testing and further delay.

Despite the testimony by Mr. Newman, Dr. Hastings, and others, as well as the documents they submitted, Senator Cochran proposed legislation requiring Newman to select one of five universities for more testing of his device but, even if Newman agreed and the Universities agreed and then they enthusiastically endorsed Newman's device, Senator Cochran's bill **makes no demand of the Patent Office. It doesn't even require the Patent Office to issue him a patent.** It only requires that the Patent Office "re-examine" Newman's patent application again.

Newman's counsel, John Flannery said, "It's the kind of political posturing you expect of any politician who's afraid to take a stand. We much prefer those who outright tell us they disagree. The Senator waited until the last two weeks of this Session of Congress to introduce the bill; it won't be considered, at the earliest, until January of 1987. In the meantime, Senator Cochran is, by this bill, actively discouraging any other Senator from introducing a patent bill and insisting instead on legislation that grants Joe [Newman] nothing but another gauntlet to run with no prospect for a patent at the end of the line. This ain't my idea of good government. It is little wonder that the way we found out about it was from the press, not from the Senator's office."

In essence, Joseph Newman is **totally** opposed to S. 2832 which represents an apparent attempt by Cochran to confuse the issue and cost the taxpayer more money. A bill calling for a Congressional patent (identical to the 11 House bills) is straightforward and does not cost anything. Cochran is attempting to "straddle the fence" with S. 2832 — a bill that has been referred to a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee and will probably die in Committee after months of inaction.

In other words, through such sandbagging tactics, Cochran has wasted everyone's time with this bill. If the effort is made to pass a bill, then such an effort should be focused on a Bill granting a Congressional patent. The Patent Office has proven itself to be biased and incompetent — and yet Cochran wants to have this same bureaucracy "re-examine the patent"! We urge all Mississippians to contact Thad Cochran and demand that he demonstrate a **sincere** concern by immediately introducing a Senate bill identical to the 11 House bills to grant Joseph Newman a Congressional patent. Unlike Cochran's bill, these 11 bills do not cost the taxpayer anything.

Nine of the 11 House members who have introduced these 11 bills are from states *other than* Mississippi. It is ironic that these nine Congressmen better represent the interests of the people of Mississippi than does Thad Cochran. As one of the 11 bill sponsors, Congressman Wayne Dowdy of Mississippi, states, "no one should have to endure the treatment Mr. Newman has undergone at the hands of the United States Patent and Trademark Office." And he adds that "instead of promoting Mr. Newman's invention, the Patent Office has spent thousands of taxpayer dollars to thwart him. **If the Patent Office denies this country the benefits of what could be a revolutionary energy device, then its obstinacy would, in my mind, be criminal.**"

And yet Thad Cochran would have the Patent Office "re-examine" Newman's patent application at more expense to the taxpayer.

For further information contact:

Joseph Newman, Route 1, Box 52, Lucedale, MS 39452 (601) 947-7147

Bibliography

Books

- Black, Joseph. *Lectures on the Elements of Chemistry*, published by John Robinson, Printed by Mundell and Son, for Longman and Rees, London, and W. Creech, Edinburgh, 1803.
- Brancazio, Peter J. *The Nature of Physics*, MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1975.
- Corliss, William R. *Handbook of Unusual Natural Phenomena*, Sourcebook Project, Glen Arm, Maryland, 1977.
- Fite, Gilbert and Reese, Jim. *An Economic History of the United States*, The Riverside Press, 1959, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Hoyle, Fred. *Astronomy*, Rathbone Books, Ltd., London 1962.
- . *Frontiers of Astronomy*, New American Library, New York, 1964.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. *Earth and Sun*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1923.
- Lapp, Ralph E. *Matter*, pgs. 70 and 71, LIFE SCIENCE LIBRARY, Time Inc., New York, 1965.
- Newton, Isaac. *Principia*, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1934.
- Paine, Thomas. *The Age of Reason*, Citadel Press, a division of Lyle Stuart, Inc., 1974, Secaucus, New Jersey.
- Sherrill, John L. *They Speak With Other Tongues*, a SPIRE book published in New Jersey by Jove Publications, Inc., 1984, by arrangement with McGraw-Hill from the 1964 edition.
- Tolstoy, Ivan. *James Clerk Maxwell: A Biography*, Canongate Publishing Ltd., Edinburgh, 1981.
- Watts, Dr. Isaac. *The Improvement of the Mind*, London, 1809.
- Whipple, A.B.C. *Planet Earth: STORM*, pg. 102, TIME-LIFE BOOKS INC., Chicago, Illinois, 1982.
- Williams, L. Pearce. *Michael Faraday*, Chapman and Hall Ltd., London, 1965.

Articles

- Discover*, "Much Ado About Nothing," pgs. 76-80, June, 1985.
- Science Digest*, "Magnetic Whirlwinds," pg. 26, July, 1985.
- Science News*, "When the Sun Went Strangely Quiet," pgs. 154-156, March 6, 1976.
- . "Seismicity in sync with the sun?" pg. 271, April 27, 1985.
- Time Magazine*, "The Wandering Poles," pg. 54, December 13, 1968.
- Time Magazine*, "The Case of the Cosmic Bends," pg. 57, August 6, 1984.
- U.S. News and World Report*, "Patent System ... A Drag on Innovation," pgs. 45 and 461, February 2, 1981.

Additional Reading of Interest

- Huntington, Ellsworth. *Civilization and Climate*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1922.
- . *The Human Habitat*, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1927.
- . *Mainsprings of Civilization*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1945.
- . *World-Power and Evolution*. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1920.

INDEX

In some cases, the listed page numbers only represent the principal areas where the subject is discussed.

A

action-reaction effect, 50
Affidavits:
 Gillis, Dr. John P., 232
 Hastings, Dr. Roger, 36-39, 229
 list of endorsers, 40-41
 Matherne, Robert J., 235-237
 Meatyard, Michael, 42-48
 Newman, Joseph, 261-262
 Smythe, Arnold R., Jr., 230
 Soule', Evan R., Jr., 231
 Szuter, Eric, 234
 Trinko, Dr. J. Richard, Jr., 233
Appendix, 283
Archimedian Laws of Leverage, 57
Astronomy, 112-153:
 central electromagnetic field, 116ff., 135
 central entity, 141-143
 complex motions, 141
 Earth's magnetic field, 88, 116ff., 118
 Earth's magnetic poles, 121-128
 Earth's orbit, 145
 earthquakes and tornadoes, 144-153
 experiments of Joseph Newman, 130-134
 Jupiter's magnetic field, 136
 Moon's magnetic field, 117ff., 125
 our galaxy's magnetic arc, 141-142
 planetary alignment, 146-148, 151-152
 planets' tilts, 132
 Pluto's inclination, 128
 right-angular orbits, 143
 stellar alignment, 138
 Sun's magnetic field, 117ff., 131-132
 sunspots, 120-121, 133-135
 weather effects, 137-153, 284-288
atoms, 52, 73
atom alignment, 8, 10-11, 49-50, 53, 55, 58, 68, 76f., 83-84

B

Bacon, Francis, 103
battery, 50-52, 56, 60, 69
Bermuda Triangle, 138-140
Bernoulli, Daniel, 104
Black, Joseph, 102-110
Boyle, Robert, 104
Brancazio, Peter J., 71, 96
Brewster, David, 74
Burton, Dan, 295

C

Caloric Theory, 102ff.
cancellation effect, 55, 58, 65, 83
capacitor, 69
Carnot, Sadi, 109
catalyst, 18, 50, 57, 62, 66, 69
Charles, Jacques, 104
Clausius, Rudolf, 109

coil discussion, 16-20, 49, 55, 57
cold, 102-110
commutator, 21, 60-69, 292
CONDUCTING coil embodiment (Energy Machine), 18-69
conducting system, 53, 58
Congressional Action, 295
conversion efficiency, 20-21
Cooper, Paul R., 253
copper, nature of, 15
Corliss, William R., 140
correspondence (Achievement vs. Apathy), 154-237
cryogenics, 289-290
current spike, 65, 69

D

Dalton, John, 74, 104
Davy, Humphry, 103, 107
Devil's Sea, 138-140
Dirac's Equation, 72
Duggan, Donovan F., 258

E

Earth and Sun, 133ff.
Earth's magnetic field, 88, 116ff., 118
economics, 253-257
Edison, Thomas, 84
Einstein, Albert, 72, 101, 294
Einstein's Equation of $E = MC^2$, 9-11, 13, 15, 20, 55-56, 59, 60, 70, 74, 79, 81-82, 101-103, 108-110, 116
Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, 97
electric charges, 9, 72, 74, 91ff.
electric current, 16-18, 58-59, 69
electric field, 76, 95
electrical storms, 88, 149ff.
electrolysis, 51, 59-60, 70, 87
electromotive series, 93
Energy Machine:
 back-emg flow, 21, 57
 commutator, 21, 60-69, 292
 CONDUCTING COIL EMBODIMENT, 18-69
 Large Prototype (5000 lbs.), 66, 20-21, 22ff.
 Medium Prototype (900 lbs.), 22ff., 56ff.
 Small Prototype (200 lbs.), 36ff., 59, 67
 GAS EMBODIMENT, 88-90
 gyroscopic particles, 62-63
 new magnetic motor/pump design, 292
 photographs, 21, 36, 67
 proper design, 53-55, 65, 68
 rotating magnet, 65-67
 STATIC EMBODIMENT, 83-84
 test results by Dr. Hastings, 22-39
 test results by Michael Meatyard, 42-48
 torque created, 57
 universal energy machine, 140, 293
entropy, 110
Everett, Milton, xi, 14

Joe Newman's Philosophy: 'If It Can't Be Done, It Interests Me.'

PHOTO BY MARY ANN WELLS



Joe Newman

A great thinker is seldom a disputant. He answers other men's arguments by stating the truth as he sees it.

— Daniel March

Joseph Newman is an original thinker who has the ability to visualize the mechanical essence of what he evaluates.

For the past 23 years, he has made his living by inventing. He holds eight patents for inventions which include plastic-covered barbell sets, a mechanical orange picker, a bike that does "wheelies," a knife that always lands point forward, and a new type of automobile rain-deflector.

Joe's formal education ended after his junior year of college so that he could pursue his true love — inventing. He did, however, continue to use his own brains and books to teach himself physics, chemistry, astronomy, and other areas of science.

At one point, Joe began to study the experiments and writings of the famous English scientist Michael Faraday, whose ideas led to the development of the modern electrical generator. Following 15 years of independent study, Joe explained his theory in a 133-page document which described a new technical process for understanding and utilizing a source of unlimited energy.

According to previously written statements, the Newman energy generator (its formal name) works successfully because "all mass is made up of electromagnetic energy, and if the proper, mechanically-designed mechanism is

built, one can change mass into pure electrical energy and/or rotational motion in a 100-percent conversion process." His three operational prototypes — one small, one medium in size, and a third weighing over 5,000 pounds with a 600-pound rotating magnet — have already been constructed. He built the three machines several years ago in his workshop, and he repeatedly emphasizes that he developed his conceptual theory over a period of 15 years before building the first physical prototype.

Joe Newman says that his invention is far more efficient than conventional nuclear energy and doesn't release any harmful radiation. He also says that his invention will replace all other forms of energy. It will be utilized in the home, by industry, and to produce commercial electrical energy at a small fraction of today's cost.

More than 30 competent physicists, electrical engineers, and technical individuals have signed Affidavits which state that Joseph Newman's invention does what he says it does: the external energy output exceeds the external, electrical energy input. This additional energy output is the result of the internal, magnetic energy within Joe's invention being converted to electrical energy. [This process is described in this book.]

Those who have signed the Affidavits include Milton Everett (biomass energy specialist from the Mississippi Department of Energy and Transportation), Mike Meatyard (electrical engineer for the Alabama Corps of Engineers), Eike Mueller (European Space Agency mission coordinator with NASA), and Dr. Roger Hastings (a principal physicist for Sperry-Univac, Inc., St. Paul, Minnesota).

In his endorsement, Dr. Roger Hastings writes: "To date we have been pouring huge funds into nuclear fusion in search of this dream. It appears that Mr. Newman has found the solution on a scale which will allow immediate and economically reliable development."

As Joe Newman says, "The finished prototype of what I teach will change the world drastically for the good of mankind, more so than any invention before this time."

For the first time in our history, this book — THE ENERGY MACHINE OF JOSEPH NEWMAN — discloses the principles and technology required to create a totally new method of energy generation via "an invention whose time has come."

THE AUTHOR'S PURPOSE

To those who may be inspired by what I have written within this book – it is to you that I write the following:

There has never been anything written before my work that was complete in terms of answering all there is to know on any given subject. There is also nothing that I have written in this book which represents any final aspect of knowledge and, for the future, I doubt that there will ever be an end to the quest for knowledge in any intellectual domain.

Any previously established and accepted subject matter is incomplete if it cannot clearly and distinctly provide an answer to any question (appropriate to that subject matter) which is posed by the mind of an honest and inquisitive person.

With what I present in this book, I do not endeavor to awe you but, on the contrary, I wish to *inspire* you to “stand on my shoulders and see further than I have seen” (to paraphrase Isaac Newton). It is my purpose to enable you to teach others to question everything and to accept nothing blindly. Likewise, do not blindly accept what I present in this book, just as you should not blindly accept that which is taught in any given historical age. You have before you the evidence of history to verify the error of blind, non-intellectual acceptance of dogma. In essence, I wish to encourage all people to “THINK FOR THEMSELVES.”

The new source of energy which I disclose in this book is not the ultimate discovery. On the contrary. The energy which I have discovered is as basic as the WHEEL itself, and such energy will vastly improve the qualitative life of our human species. Moreover, World Peace can result from such improvement.

I foresee in the future that expanded space travel will become an exciting reality as a result of the utilization of this new source of energy. All aspects of science will be greatly enhanced by the thorough mastery of what I present in this book and, as a result, beneficial changes of a phenomenal nature will quickly occur for our species.

If I can only bestow upon the reader the excitement and enchantment which I foresee within the immediate grasp of our human species: access to energy will no longer be a problem and there will be a successful merger between economics and automation. Moreover, the mysteries within the Universe will be experienced by our children and their descendants.

The reader will find that I discuss many different but related topics within this book. Read carefully what I have written and you will discover that I have no ulterior motive other than a sincere quest for “Absolute Truth.”

Over sixteen years ago, I wrote –

To all peoples whose brain burns and aches to accomplish great things and changes for the good, may God and/or the Goodness of the Universe be with you. For you are the Goodness of the Universe and do good for people in spite of themselves. And I salute you!

JOSEPH WESTLEY NEWMAN

“The future of the human race may be dramatically uplifted by the large scale commercial development of this invention.”

– DR. ROGER HASTINGS

Principal Physicist, Sperry-Univac Corporation

\$34.95 (add \$3.50 for shipping and handling in U.S.)

To order, send **\$38.45** total to:

JOSEPH NEWMAN PUBLISHING CO.

Route 1, Box 52, Lucedale, Mississippi 39452

FOR POSTAGE COSTS TO CANADA AND MEXICO ADD:

\$7.50 (Airmail) or \$2.50 (Surface*)

FOR OVERSEAS POSTAGE COSTS TO EUROPE, FAR EAST, ETC., ADD:

\$22.50 (Airmail) or \$2.50 (Surface*)

[* Allow 8 weeks for shipping time.]

ISBN 0-9613835-4-2