

THE REVELATION

OF

THE

CENTURY

**AN ADDENDUM TO THE ADAMS MOTOR MANUAL
BY**

DR. ROBERT ADAMS

© COPYRIGHT 1996

Honour recognises contribution to the field of invention

A Whakatane scientist and inventor, Robert Adams, is honoured that his 60-year-long dedication to the field of invention and discovery has been recognised by the Open International University for Complementary Medicines.

Two weeks ago Mr Adams received a letter from the Open International University in Colombo, Sri Lanka, saying that he had been awarded an honorary doctorate of science.

Although he was very honoured, he says it came as a surprise. "The thought has gone through my mind occasionally. But this happened out of the blue. I had no idea I would receive it."

Mr Adams specialises in ferromagnetics and has been active in electrical and communications equipment research from the age of 13, when he invented a solid state amplifier consisting of two quartz crystals.



After 60 years of dedication to invention and discovery, Mr Adams has been awarded an honorary Doctorate of Science from the Open International University for Complementary Medicines.

Other major achievements include inventing the Adams Switched Reluctance Motor Generator in 1969, discovering a superior method of charging batteries in 1975 and inventing the Adams Super Power Four Pole Permanent Magnet just last year.

Mr Adams said he felt the honorary doctorate was fair recognition of his work in the field of invention and discovery and considers it his highest achievement to date.

He was also made a member of the Scientific and Medical Network in the United Kingdom, earlier this year, which he said was very pleasing.

At present Mr Adams is involved in researching and developing the Adams Switched Reluctance Electric Motor/Generator, which incorporates the development of the science and technology involved in the harnessing of ether energy via electromagnetics.

The doctorate of science will be presented to Mr Adams at a special ceremony at the World Congress of Locomotor Medicines, to be held in Sri Lanka in December.

He said he was looking forward to the ceremony, where he will also present a paper on ferromagnetics.

Robert Adams
Whakatane
New Zealand

UPDATED BIODATA

Doctor of Science (Hon)

1996

Founder of the New Zealand Section of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers Inc., New York, (I.E.E.E.) 29.5.1968.

Elected Chairman of Region 10, N.Z.I.E.E.E. (1969 and 1970).

Elected Fellow of the New Zealand Electronics Institute 1969.

Member of Auckland Institute and Museum.

Member of The Scientific and Medical Network, U.K.

Member of New Zealand Electrical Institute Inc.

- | | |
|------|---|
| 1969 | Invented the Adams Switched Reluctance Motor Generator |
| 1975 | Discoverer of the superior method of charging batteries (i.e. pulse charging). |
| 1976 | Discovered that magnets of higher energy product replacing those of lower energy product does not increase the efficiency of an electric motor. |
| 1993 | Discovered a procedure to engineer magnetic polarity reversal. |
| 1995 | Invented the Adams Super Power Four Pole Permanent Magnet. |
| 1996 | Invented the Mark 024 Thermo Switched Reluctance Motor, |

Current and Immediate Past Position:

Involved in research and development of the Adams Thermo Switched Reluctance Electric Motor/Generator which incorporates the development of the science and technology involved in the harnessing of ether energy via electromagnetics.

Other Interests and Research:

Seismology and alternative medicine, together with Dr. Wilhelm Reich's and Dr Ruth Drown's biophysics embracing the world of pleomorphic organisms, and orgone energy.

Interests and Concerns:

Surround the imperative requisite that mankind cease and desist confounding the balance of his planets' ecology and focus with urgency upon the sources of clean energy which surrounds him at all times and is free for the taking. Pollution is now unnecessary, as is the wanton destruction of rain forests, waterways and our oceans. Concentration on the pollution of the human body and a reversion to natural medicine accompanied by a sane diet.

PREFACE

Twenty-seven years ago Dr. Robert G. Adams, following success with his first invention of the Pulsed Reluctance Motor, made an incredible discovery whilst conducting a test analysis on the efficiency of his next larger improved model. In addition to finding the device running cool upon loading, he also found it to be delivering more energy than that of the applied source.

When this discovery was brought to the attention of the establishment agencies., i.e., the Electricity Department, University, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, etc., it was rejected outright and every effort was subsequently made to stall, ridicule and silence him.

At first, Dr. Adams was not immediately aware that the establishment had its own sinister objectives and agenda, so subtle and clandestine were their methods in achieving this excommunication. Adams blithely passed it off as mere orthodoxy and for a time continued in an ambience of high spirits and a certain naivety to pursue his discovery and promote his case until, over the ensuing few months, he became slowly aware of what had been going on. It did not take too long following this revelation for him to suspect and indeed realize that perhaps the rejection from the establishment was not born out of ignorance after all, nor, in fact, was it mere orthodoxy. It soon became crystal clear that their efforts to frustrate and impede his progress were deliberate and determined, following a series of incidents and events which occurred to him to be rather more eccentric than merely coincident.

Robert Adams began his own vendetta. He began digging. His investigations revealed, time and time again, that he was not alone. Throughout mountains of research and literature, he discovered, not to his real surprise, that the Dark Ages were indeed not dead and that a great many in the world had trod this evil path before him in the realm of scientific discovery and innovation.

Contrary to what would be expected under such circumstances, this knowledge only served to spur him further along to greater endeavour and subsequent achievements and discoveries in his work. Along the line he unearthed a great many secrets and intricacies relating to "establishment methods" which are still in use today in order to discredit and degrade all efforts of those endeavouring to promote the abolition of fossil fuel and its loathsome resultant pollutants - and all in the name of avarice.

Although these methods are devised to deter progressive thinkers, they did not work with Robert Adams and as at this day, he has now carried out his plan of the early seventies to one day expose to all and sundry the treatment he received from these various establishment institutions. This was first duly carried out with his publication in the Australian Magazine, Nexus New Times in the December/January 1992-93 issue.

A second and more devastating exposé has been waiting in the wings for the correct time to be released - which is now!

This particular exposé is related to "classical teachings" and has a direct link to the reasons why, way back in the 1970's, attempts were made to silence Robert Adams and his invention and resultant discovery of the time. And this is where the shroud of orthodoxy does play its part - very subtly. It is a long story, this - to treat it in its practical perspective is not the purpose of this Addendum, but as the reader progresses through the following pages, the connection will reveal itself.

Albeit as above, Dr. Adams now is in the position to challenge the teaching methods of Colleges and Universities worldwide in all matters pertaining to ferromagnetics as applied to electric motors and generators and the efficiency testing procedures of these devices whether they be conventional or space energy devices, and it is here, in this Addendum, that he does so, by addressing this particular issue at its very core.

Adams states "conventional teachings in regard to conventional electric motors that are in use today and also the methods applied to their testing for efficiency ratings are archaic, false and of no accurate substance whatsoever".

As you read on in this Addendum to the Adams Motor Manual you will see the truth emerge and, as you progress from page to page, the story will reveal true science at the fore and an insight into the phenomenal strides being made in the harnessing of free clean ether energy. You will find evidence of the Adams PEMG and the Adams Thermo Motors defying the Laws of Thermodynamics, Einstein's Relativity, Lenz's Laws, etc., etc; none of the above restrictions apply to magnetic devices capable of gating space energy.

The days of the conventional A.C. induction motors are numbered from both an efficiency and cost point of view.

In summarising, Adams states "correct evaluation of devices capable of gating ether/space energy versus conventional methods of ascertaining efficiency are the matters that require defining and understanding; it is no longer a matter of whether these devices are capable of gating ether/space energy - the evidence has already been demonstrated by a number of inventors, it is abundant, unambiguous and therefore undeniable".

CONTENTS

- 1) INTRODUCTION AND ADDENDUM TO THE "ADAMS MOTOR MANUAL".
- 2) ADAMS SUPER MAGNETS.
- 3) PERMANENT MAGNETS AND EFFICIENCY.
- 4) ESTABLISHMENT METHODS OF TESTING ELECTRIC MOTORS AND POWER TRANSFORMERS.
- 5) ELECTRIC MOTOR TEMPERATURE VERSUS EFFICIENCY.
- 6) LUCAS RECOMMENDED TEST PROCEDURE, D.M. Brooks, U.K.
- 7) VALUABLE HINTS ON REPLICATION OF ORIGINAL ADAMS MOTOR GENERATOR.
- 8) PH.D. SCIENTIST INDEPENDANT ANALYSIS REPORT, L. Low, USA.
- 9) "ADAMS THERMO ELECTRIC MOTOR" SPECIAL REPORT.
- 10) "THERMODYNAMICS AND FREE ENERGY", Peter Lindemann, USA.
- 11) "MODERN AETHER SCIENCE" Dr. Harold Aspden, U.K.
- 12) "OVER UNITY RELUCTANCE MOTOR EXPERIMENT" Dr. Harold Aspden(UK)
- 13) "POWER FROM ROOM HEAT", Dr. Harold Aspden (UK).
- 14) "SWITCHED RELUCTANCE MOTOR", Dr. Harold Aspden (UK).
- 15) "IMPENDING ENERGY CRISIS", Dr. Harold Aspden (UK).
- 16) "ON THE NATURE OF ELECTRICAL INDUCTION", Prof. Bruce DePalma, (NZ).
- 17) PETER LINDEMANN - CORRESPONDENCE.
- 18) "MAGNETIC BATTERY", Bert Werjefelt, USA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, SPONSORS AND CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Harold Aspden, UK.	Dick Munro, Whakatane, NZ.
Peter A. Lindemann, USA.	Dave Fitton, Whakatane, NZ.
Prof. Bruce DePalma, NZ.	Dom Dominic, Whakatane, NZ.
Lucas Electrical Research, UK.	Mike Battenburg, Whakatane, NZ.
Larry Low, USA.	Roger Zanden, Whakatane, NZ.
Bert Werjefelt, USA.	Maurice Shapley, Whakatane, NZ.
Capt. Bruce Cathie (retrd), NZ.	John Martin, Auckland, NZ.
Bruce M. Laird, (LL.M. Hons), NZ.	Colin Adams, Te Puke, NZ.
Bill Thorpe, NZ.	Margaret-Anne Adams, Whakatane, NZ.
N.Z.E.D., 1976-78, NZ.	

Duncan Roads, Editor, Nexus Magazine, Australia.

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Robert Adams releases a secret here which he has known for over 25 years and in so doing exposes the establishment false teachings in electrical engineering pertaining to the testing of electric motor efficiency. In this introduction to this Addendum, he first addresses the issue with the following statement ;--

"One must first dump the dogma of establishment obscurantists and discard forever their teachings, especially in relation to the Laws of Thermodynamics and Einstein's Relativity. Their outmoded false teaching methods of testing electrical machine efficiency based on these Laws of Thermodynamics has been going on ad nauseum for over 90 years and is still being taught in colleges and universities worldwide. A new mode of mentation must take place.

Yes, you may ponder - why? The answer to that question lies in the results they have obtained by brainwashing students, engineers and scientists alike that the Laws of Thermodynamics and Einstein's Relativity are sacrosanct and, in so doing, have deliberately and successfully impeded the progress towards and into an era of free, clean energy in denying the presence of 'ether energy'. These people, who are responsible for this state of science today need YEARS OF PSYCHOTHERAPY AND DEPROGRAMMING, as a colleague of mine in the United States so aptly puts it.

It is in this time that we find ourselves embarking upon yet another new stage of scientific and technological enlightenment. In these modern times of advanced technology, particularly in the sciences of electrical and electronic engineering, we find ourselves still using orthodox methods of testing electrical machines. Here, I refer to the BIZARRE methods of measuring power.

Why, as we head rapidly now towards the 21st century, do we, in the calculation of input/output power of modern-day new energy devices, such as electric motors and generators, find ourselves stubbornly holding fast to the age old parameters as used in the days of lore for the determination of efficiencies of the James Watt steam engine, horse-drawn carriages and Joules' water paddle experiments. (It is suggested, at this point, that you refer on to page 5, paragraph 3 of 'Thermodynamics and Free Energy' by Peter A. Lindemann of the United States America.) I cannot help but consider this to be a grotesque travesty of our modern-day science where we are all persisting in doing ourselves the injustice of 'indolence'. Yes, indolence! Why are we so torpid, hibernating our minds within the warm protective shell of such obsequious obsolescence. It seems almost obscene that, in this age, our bastilles of learning still content themselves with such sublime occurence to so ancient a regime.

To quote Peter A. Lindemann - 'Once again, we have entered a new scientific era where the exact equivalence between mechanical

work as foot pounds, electrical work as watt hours and heat work as BTU's is NOT KNOWN.'

To quote Tesla's statement, dated 10 July, 1937 - 'There is no energy in matter other than that received from the environment. It applies rigorously to molecules and atoms as well as the largest heavenly bodies and to all matter in the universe in any phase of its existence from its very formation to its ultimate disintegration.

A few words will be sufficient in support of this contention. The kinetic and potential energy of a body is the result of motion and determined by the product of its mass and the square of velocity. Let the mass be reduced, the energy is diminished in the same proportion. If it be reduced to zero, the energy is likewise zero for any finite velocity. In other words, it is absolutely impossible to convert mass into energy. It would be different if there were forces in nature capable of imparting to a mass infinite velocity. Then the product of zero mass with the square of infinite velocity would represent infinite energy. But we know that there are no such forces and the idea that mass is convertible into energy is rank nonsense.' (EQ)

To quote an eminent 20th century physicist, Professor Bruce DePalma (USA), now resident in New Zealand - 'In my early schooling (M.I.T. Class of 1958) I was struck by the attention paid to magnetism, magnetic circuits, electrical machinery and magnetic properties of materials. No attention was given to magnetism as a source of understanding of the machines and apparatus which employed it. This attitude was forced on a student because the consensus was :-

All that needed to be known about magnetism was known, because electrical machines obeyed the conservation laws, i.e., one way of generating electricity was as good as another since all machines efficiencies could be improved or designed up to the point of a maximum efficiency 100%.

To point out that electrical efficiency measurements are based on the "mechanical equivalent of heat" 746 watts/horsepower measured with a calorimeter and paddles by James Watt (inventor of the Steam Engine in the 18th century), a number suspect both in its relevance and accuracy and sensitivity to experimental vagaries, was heresy.

The concern of this paper is not with all the experiments which have demonstrated anomalous "over unity" energy production, but with the operation of machines which clearly demonstrate violation of energy and charge conservation laws through continuous production of electrical power in excess of the electrical power used to drive and/or energise the machine.' (EQ)

In summarising my experience has taught me that one must operate on inspiration and intuition - learn, analyse, search for the truth. Recognise the discrepancies between experiment

and dogma. Consider this statement by HUXLEY -

'Authorities, disciples and schools are the curse of science and do more to interfere with the work of the scientific spirit than all it's enemies.'

Also a quote from former Astronaut, Captain Edgar Mitchell, who said -

'History has shown time and again that important scientific discoveries generally happen only when someone steps outside the limits of his traditional discipline and looks at something from a fresh point of view. Then, what should have been obvious all along comes into focus.'

The dogmas of yesteryear are still with us today. Only three quarters of a century ago, lest it be forgotten, radar, jet aircraft, television, moon flights, electric trains, robotics, space stations, computers as they are today, etc., were all nothing more than the wild fantasies of science fiction.

Einstein himself has gone on record as saying -

'If a single one of the conclusions drawn from it (RELATIVITY THEORY) proves to be wrong, it must be given up; to modify it without destroying the whole structure seems to be impossible.'

According to our text books and teachings a neutral vacuum is empty; it has now been proved to be a condition of space in which electrical manifestations are present in a primordial sea of energy and in an uncondensed state, remaining unrecognisable until it begins to get into a vortex system, a field force of nature. If, indeed, there were no etheric force, then there could be no 'action at a distance', lines of force, magnetic fields or stresses, etc. No universe?!

A quote from P.H. Matthey, Switzerland, 1989 reads -

'A great teacher of Avestan Philosophy called the inventors the *Saints of Our Days*. He meant, of course, only the inventors who work constructively in harmony with the Laws of Nature and the eternal plan of Creation. We are just at the begining of the era of inventions and feel certain that better times for humanity are assured as long as inventors and inventions are appearing in our world. '

Neither Einstein, nor any other scientist, has correctly interpreted the electromagnetic stresses and force fields of the ether and Einstein gave up in his attempt and preferred to omit it from his Relativity theory.

Here is an extract from Donald Reed's paper 'Towards a New Electromagnetic Reality' New York, USA, 1983; (Address: Tachion

Energy Research, Box 192 South Wales, New York 14134: -

'Conclusion -

In conclusion, we believe that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that electromagnetic theory is by no means as closed a subject as our technically trained contemporaries would lead us to believe. As the substance of this paper amply demonstrates, there is an additional hitherto unsuspected dimension of electrodynamics which is grounded in, and perhaps governs, the very structural fabric of space and time. Accordingly, we urge the inauguration of an intensive research effort into the theoretical and experimental re-examination of electromagnetic phenomena through further study of these inventions and conceptual lines of thought outlined previously. I would also greatly appreciate communications from all researchers of a kindred spirit concerning other electromagnetic anomalies so that I may refine my own ideas on the subject.

It is our firm belief that if such a study were undertaken in earnest by diverse groups openly sharing information, not only could a new, safe, clean, abundant energy source be developed, but the foundations might be laid for a proper unified field theory which would satisfactorily clarify and account for major weaknesses of present physical theory, as well as furnishing the conceptual basis for extending the structure of contemporary knowledge, to compatibly encompass the elements of a synthesized framework of physics and metaphysics.'

Let us dispense with peer review as it is being practised today and cease continuing to ignore new scientific discoveries that are being uncovered. There is abundant evidence now that these new energy devices are here and ready to end the present situation before it is too late.

It is my fervent hope and belief that the spirit of discovery and invention will gather rapid momentum in a world of new and sophisticated parameters which will not only meet the requirements of the 21st century and beyond, but will give joy, hope and a bright light for our future to travel upon.
Dr. Robert Adams, 1996."

The reader will, upon studying the independant papers included in this up-date Addendum of the Adams Motor Generator Manual, find that much activity is now going on worldwide in this exciting new energy field and also that further evidence is coming to the fore constantly of the undeniable fact that ether and ether energy does indeed exist in a vast and fathomless sea; is clean - free - natural - and inexhaustable.

By Dr. Robert G. Adams, New Zealand.

Once construction of an Adams Motor Generator is completed and successful running has been attained, should the reader desire to carry out an efficiency analysis, he should use conventional measuring instruments AS A GUIDE ONLY. At this point I refer the reader to reading the section entitled 'Established Methods of Testing Electric Motor and Transformer Efficiency' and other relevant information in this update. On reading this section, it will become clear to the reader that establishment teaching of THERMODYNAMICS and testing procedures using the conventional measuring instrumentation DO NOT COMPUTE WITH THE TRUTH, with either conventional motors or the Adams Motor.

The question is - 'how can any electrical device claim to operate around the order of 70 - 90% efficiency and yet require a cooling facility, whether it be a motor or a transformer, without which the device would disintegrate?'

If an Adams motor can operate on load alongside a conventional motor of the same rating and, load for load, at a temperature of less than half that of the conventional machine with a claimed efficiency rating of 70 - 90%, then the Adams device will be operating around the order of 3 times that of the conventional motor, and it is, in addition, not required to radiate wasted energy with a cooling fan.

The correct method in testing a switched reluctance motor is to integrate $E \times I_{av}$ with the machine switching frequency using standard measuring instruments, the result of which is often ironically very close, if not identical, with results of the calorimetric tests, and this is obtained using the equation first outlined in the Adams Motor Manual, i.e., $I_{av} \times E \times \text{Duty Cycle}$, corroborated by the New Zealand Electricity Department 1976 and Lucas Electrical Industries, Research Division, United Kingdom 1976.

If you construct an Adams Motor which appears to be running well and is operating under load without getting hot, i.e., around the order of 20 - 25 degrees or less above ambient of 20 degrees, then it will, if calculations are carried out correctly, be operating beyond unity.

Calorimetric testing analyses, as outlined in this Addendum, is an expensive, time-consuming exercise, is complex to calculate and requires considerable experience and skill. This procedure is not recommended to those who are not very, very well prepared with the above prerequisites.

NEWSCIENCE NEWSCIENCE NEWSCIENCE

THE ADAMS SUPER-POWER MULTI-POLAR MAGNET

I have for many years theorised the existence of four poles interacting in any magnet. There is little doubt that two poles dominate from what is observed, and taught, in classical texts.

However, since my discovery of engineering magnets into forming four poles—and, in so doing, quadrupling the energy—surely some light has been shed on the theory of the existence of four poles. Bruce Cathie and I will investigate this further when time permits.

A rectangular or cube magnet, when engineered into the Adams technology, becomes a unit consisting of four twin poles, each face containing a north and a south pole, separated by a zero vortex in the centre of each of the four twin poles, and all displaying similar energies.

Ironically, but not unexpectedly, this super twin-pole magnet is a very valuable adjunct to further advancement of the Adams Motor technology. The energy found on the edges of each of the four faces is very high—25 per cent of the total energy of the full face.

The present lab magnets are approximately three-quarters-of-an-inch cube. The edge of any face will hold a five-kilogram steel or iron block in mid-air. When the full face of the magnet is attached to metal, a force of beyond 20 kg is required to remove it. In my presentation to the NEXUS Conference, I advised tests would be carried out this month to determine the strain required to remove the magnet.

The dice-sized magnet was attached to a steel plate on a ceiling rafter and, with the aid of a chain, a 15-kilogram block was first attached to it; then a 4.7-kg block added on with a nylon rope; then another 200-gram block was attached; then, a fourth 200-gram block. The magnet still hanging fast, a 100-gram block was added; then...wait for it...CRASH to the floor. The magnet was still attached to its anchor on the roof-rafter!

A magnet, approximately three-quarters-of-an-inch cube, weighing only 60 grams, capable of holding a weight of beyond 20 kilograms in mid-air, 333.333 times its own weight? Will this at last have something of an effect on the closed ignorant minds of conventional science?

The way now must surely be clear that space/gravity energy via electromagnetic forces of permanent magnets is not impos-

sible nor difficult to harness. The space/gravity energies are clean, non-exhaustible and free. The Adams technology has proved this and leaves no grounds for dispute.

Einstein's sacrosanct theories of relativity, and the laws of thermodynamics, are the most remarkable and inexplicable aberrations ever recorded in scientific history. These draconian false teachings have been instrumental in impeding the process of science towards free, clean energy.

CLASSICAL THEORY AND ADAMS TECHNOLOGY

The classical theory of magnetism from the textbooks attributes the phenomenon to the motion of electrons within the atoms of molecules. There is evidence that the orbital electrons in an atom not only revolve about the nucleus of the atom, but also each individual electron spins about an axis through its centre. It is believed that in highly magnetic materials, each atom has many more electrons spinning in one direction than in another.

In the submicroscopic region, i.e., the "domain", many of these atoms with electron spin in one direction create a magnetic field which effectively supplements the field engendered by the revolving electrons. Each domain thus becomes a tiny magnet. When the domains are in random state, the substance as a whole is not a magnet. The application of external magnetic field will reorient the domains and produce a magnet in the way described above.

When the application of an external magnetic force has been applied and all the domains have been aligned, the condition of MAGNETIC SATURATION has been reached, and any further increase in strength of the external force field will not increase the magnetisation of the

iron any further. With the advent of the Adams Permanent Magnet Technology, is it not further evidence that conventional text teachings have reached the stage when they should be rewritten?

From the observations of certain lab experiments with ball-bearings, it is the opinion of the discoverer that the electrons circulate in conjugate pairs and have a spin opposite to that of rotation, and that the spin is four times greater than that of the orbital rotation. I note also that conventional texts prefer not to state direction of spin, nor velocity relative to orbital motion.


I do not therefore subscribe to the statement that "in highly magnetic materials, each atom has many more electrons spinning in one direction than in another". I feel such a condition cannot pertain in light of my discoveries.

Also to be addressed is the matter of the massive energy increase resulting from the Adams applied technology. Are man-made scientific laws once again violated? If the magnetic material is saturated when subjected to an external energy source, the Adams technology must then be gating space/gravity energy.

There is overwhelming evidence that space/gravity energy can be concentrated, focused and/or magnified by permanent magnets.

© 1995 Robert Adams
Whakatane, New Zealand

Newton goes shopping



Sam Miller

*****ADAMS AND EFFICIENCY*****
THIS REPORT REFERS TO AN INHERENT CHARACTERISTIC OF
PERMANENT MAGNETS DISCOVERED SOME 19 YEARS AGO, BY
ROBERT ADAMS OF NEW ZEALAND AND RECENTLY VALIDATED:

A LENGTHY AND IN DEPTH PROGRAMME OF THE TESTING OF MANY MAGNETS
OF DIFFERENT ENERGY PRODUCT AND COMPOSITIONS IN ADAMS MOTORS HAS
NOW BEEN COMPLETED.

THIS REPORT COVERS EARLIER SIMILAR TESTS CARRIED OUT DURING 1976
AND 1979 AND DURING THE PAST YEAR OF 1994 - 1995.

AS I AM COLLABORATING WITH DR. HAROLD ASPDEN OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM IN THE ABOVE AND OTHER MATTERS, BOTH DR. ASPDEN AND
MYSELF HAVE DECIDED THAT IT IS NOW THE APPROPRIATE TIME TO BRING
THIS NEWS REPORT INTO THE NEXUS READERSHIP ARENA, SINCE OUR
COLLECTIVE FINDINGS OF THE EXTENSIVE TEST ANALYSES, CARRIED OUT
IN THE MOST RECENT PERIOD, HAVE CONCURRED.

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVEMENTIONED, I WAS, EARLIER THIS YEAR,
COMMISSIONED BY A JAPANESE CORPORATION TO BUILD AN ADAMS MOTOR
INCORPORATING THEIR Y.T. SUPER MAGNETS, WITH THEIR VIEW TO
INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADAMS MOTOR. THIS PROGRAMME
WAS DULY CARRIED OUT. THE RESULTS WERE AS I HAD PREDICTED,
I.E., THERE WAS NO INCREASE IN EXCESS ENERGY FOUND.

THIS REPORT IS IMPORTANT FROM TWO DIFFERENT ASPECTS.

FIRSTLY, IT PUTS TO REST ERRONEOUS CLAIMS BY CERTAIN INVENTORS,
ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS ALIKE THAT POWERFUL MAGNETS BUILT INTO
ELECTRIC MOTORS WILL YIELD VERY HIGH EFFICIENCY OR BEYOND UNITY.
THIS NOTION IS NOTHING MORE THAN AN ASSUMPTION ADOPTED
LETHARGICALLY OVER THE YEARS.

SECONDLY, IT WILL SAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE OUT THERE A LOT OF TIME
AND DISAPPOINTMENT IN PURSUING HIGH EFFICIENCY FROM MAGNETS OF
HIGH ENERGY PRODUCT AS CLAIMED POSSIBLE BY CERTAIN PEOPLE. I
WOULD REFER THE READER, AT THIS POINT, TO MY PAPER PUBLISHED IN
NEXUS MAGAZINE, APRIL - MAY 1993 ISSUE, PAGE 47.

RULE NO. 1: NO MAGNET, IRRESPECTIVE OF IT'S INHERENT ENERGY COUNT CAN, IN ANY WAY, GOVERN THE EFFICIENCY RESULTS OF AN ELECTRIC MOTOR.

RULE NO. 2: INPUT POWER REQUIREMENT CLIMBS IN PROPORTION TO THE ENERGY PRODUCT OF THE MAGNET/S USED, WHICH AUTOMATICALLY CANCELS OUT ANY POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN EFFICIENCY. FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY ONE MUST PURSUE THE IMPROVEMENT OF OTHER IMPORTANT LOGICAL FACTORS, I.E., MACHINE DESIGN, ETC.

NOTE: THE LAWS OF THE PERMANENT MAGNET, LIKE THE LAWS OF THE UNIVERSE, POINT TO CERTAIN CONSTANT INHERENT CHARACTERISTICS, ONE OF WHICH DEMONSTRATES THAT EFFICIENCY REMAINS CONSTANT WHEN MAGNETS ARE EMBRACED IN A MAN-MADE DEVICE, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE MAGNET ENERGY PRODUCT.

FOR SUCCESSFUL HIGH EFFICIENCY RESULTS IT IS SUGGESTED THAT ONE BRUSH ASIDE THE IMPORTANCE OF MAGNETS IN RELATION TO EFFICIENCY AND CONCENTRATE ON MATERIALS, ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL DESIGN IN THE REST OF THE MACHINE AND, OF COURSE, CONSIDER THAT INGENUITY IS A PRIME INGREDIENT IN THIS EXERCISE.

DURING THE 1970'S I DISCOVERED, ON CHANGING MAGNETS OF LOWER ENERGY PRODUCT FOR HIGHER ENERGY TYPES IN MY PULSED MOTOR/GENERATOR, THAT THERE WAS AN INCREASE IN POWER OUTPUT, BUT NO CHANGE IN MOTOR EFFICIENCY. THERE WAS, DURING THE EARLY SEVENTIES, MUCH TALK AND SPECULATION OF GREATER EFFICIENCIES BEING POSSIBLE WITH THE ADVENT OF MORE POWERFUL MAGNETS APPEARING OVER THE HORIZON IN THE NEAR FUTURE. WHEN EVENTUALLY SAMARIUM-COBOLT CAME ON THE SCENE IN THE USA, IT WAS, HOWEVER, A LONG WAY FROM BECOMING GENERALLY AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE. WHEN I EVENTUALLY OBTAINED A SUITABLE SET OF SAMARIUM-COBOLT MAGNETS, I INSTALLED THEM IN ONE OF MY MOTORS AND WAS NOT SURPRISED TO FIND, ONCE AGAIN, THAT THE MACHINE POWER

IN MORE RECENT TIMES I HAVE CARRIED OUT A PROGRAMME USING SEVERAL DIFFERENT KINDS OF MAGNETS OF VARYING ENERGY PRODUCT FIGURES, FROM A FEW HUNDRED GAUSS TO MEGAGAUSS SUPER POWER MAGNETS. NOW THAT MY PROGRAMME ON CHECKING MANY DIFFERENT MAGNETS. IS COMPLETED, WHICH INCLUDES THE MOST POWERFUL MAGNETS AVAILABLE IN THE WORLD TO DATE, TO WHICH I AM PRIVY, IT HAS BEEN FOUND THAT MY ORIGINAL DISCOVERY IN 1976 VALIDATES THE FACT THAT THE ENERGY PRODUCT OF MAGNETS HAS NO INFLUENCE WHATSOEVER ON THE RESULTS/ OUTCOME OF A SAID PERMANENT MAGNET ELECTRIC MOTOR'S EFFICIENCY. THERE WILL BE MUCH DISAPPOINTMENT TO A LOT OF PEOPLE OUT THERE TO LEARN THAT MAGNET ENERGY PRODUCT DOES NOT GOVERN EFFICIENCY IN ANY WAY WHATSOEVER.

THERE IS A CONSOLATION HOWEVER, FOR US ALL, IN THAT THERE ARE TWO VERY SIGNIFICANT ADVANTAGES IN THE USE OF SUPER POWER MAGNETS. ONE IS THE HIGH REDUCTION IN VOLUME AND THE SECOND IS THE EQUALLY HIGH REDUCTION IN WEIGHT. THESE TWO FACTORS, THOUGH NOT ELECTRICAL EFFICIENCIES PER SE, CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERALL EFFICIENCY IN THE SENSE THAT THEIR USE IN THE MANUFACTURE OF ELECTRIC MOTORS AND GENERATORS MINIMISES PRODUCTION COSTS, WHEREBY MATERIALS AND LABOUR ARE DRASTICALLY REDUCED, HENCE LIGHTER, SMALLER AND CHEAPER MOTORS AND GENERATORS.

WITH THE USE OF SUPER MAGNETS IN FUTURE MACHINES, THERE IS PROMISE OF SOMEWHERE AROUND THE ORDER OF .5 OF A KILO HORSEPOWER POSSIBLE. EXCELLENT NEWS FOR PORTABLE POWER GENERATORS.

In this section I challenge the method/s used in science and industry alike in relation to the testing of electric motor and power transformer efficiencies. The methods referred to are in the form of the well known and the outdated establishment teachings. The establishment will not attempt to take up my challenge because they know full well my claims are proven.

These outmoded methods have gone on forever over the ages and been taken as gospel never to be questioned. The time has come to pass that these outmoded methods be subject to review. With new energy devices over the horizon, application of establishment testing procedures for these do not and can not give accurate results any more than they do for present day conventional devices.

It is well past time that the establishment science and industry alike be taken to task on this matter, particularly in relation to electric motors and transformers.

Test results from universities and establishment facilities of new energy devices I have encountered are not worth the paper they are written on.

Let's start with power transformers. A simple no-moving-parts device.

Claims of upwards of 98% efficiency!

I ask one question. Why, in the case of large power transformers, as used for the National grid systems, claiming ratings of around the order of 98% efficiency, do they have to be immersed in large tanks of special transformer cooling oil to keep the transformer at a safe operating temperature? And, in addition, the transformer tank is fitted with oil circulating fins around it's outer perimeter which, in turn, cool the hot circulating oil and, so too, in many cases these transformers ALSO require a circulating pump? 98% efficiency? If the so-claimed transformer was indeed around the order of 98% efficiency, it certainly would not be required to be immersed in an oil tank, with it's ancillary devices, to keep it cool!

Now electric motors.

I ask the same one question. Why do motor manufacturers, claiming upwards of 90% efficiency, provide cooling fans in their machines with their attendant losses in order to keep the machine within a safe operating temperature? Simply because of the heat generated in the machine due to inherent inefficiency losses? What 90% efficiency? If the fan/s were not provided, the machine would surely self-destruct due to the excessive heat generated.

So much for establishment teachings of efficiency ratings of electric motors and power transformers. I have acquired and tested scores of AC and DC electric motors over many years and failed to find a single one which conforms to the manufacturers specification efficiency data claims.

ELECTRIC MOTOR TEMPERATURE VERSUS EFFICIENCY

Having been involved in the field of electric motor inventions and investigating efficiency claims by manufacturers and motor inventors alike for the past 30 years, I have failed to find in any of their literature pertaining to technical specification and efficiency figures, any reference of the temperature of the said machines operating under full load conditions.

One may ask - has this most important factor been lost sight of or is it conveniently side-stepped?

The latter I suspect.

You may ask - why?

Would the answer to this possibly be, that to quote operating temperature of the motor in question might give rise to the question in itself as to the true efficiency of the machine?

It is to be heeded that specified efficiency ratings will be inaccurate and deceptive if the vital factor of temperature of the machine running under full load is not stated. It must also be remembered that the DC resistance of the internal windings increases with temperature rise.

Exercising my experience in calorimetry I have checked scores of different AC and DC motor efficiencies and found all of them deficient as regards accuracy - evidence which points to the fact that temperature of the machine running under full load has not been taken into account.

CONVENTIONAL ELECTRIC MOTORS

Conventional electric motors, whether AC or DC, in the work force are abysmally low in efficiency, including those claiming around the order of 60-90%.

And here is why :-

If a conventional motor with a claimed efficiency of, say, 70% and 10 watts output and a motor of beyond unity and 10 watts output are both loaded equally in an ambient temperature of 20°C, the conventional motor, after 20 minutes running, will have reached a temperature of beyond 100°C; the unconventional motor (beyond unity motor), at the end of 20 minutes, would barely have reached 38°C.

ELECTRIC MOTOR TEMPERATURE VERSUS EFFICIENCY 2

The "loaded operating temperature" of motors around the order of unity and beyond is such that they do not require a cooling fan, nor do they require to be constructed of metal to dissipate the enormous loss of energy as in conventional machines. There is an obvious advantage here too, in that volume and weight are substantially reduced.

Calorimetry is an exacting and critical science. It requires timeless observance of it's principles and precepts and an almost religious attendance to the diagnostics demanded of it's nature. And so, many hundreds of hours of work and substantial monies have been applied to the "final solution" and scepticism may take a bow and accept indeed at least a share of the credit for the results - it's prayer has been answered, albeit "volte-face". All calorimeter-testing analyses and temperature parameter research carried out by myself over the past years, both on the Adams motor as well as other various types of motors, have strongly come out in favour of evidence in support of the fact that these sceptics' methods of testing the Adams Machine, and others, are outmoded and grossly inaccurate. It is almost obligatory to challenge one's sceptics, just, if for no other reason, than for the fun of it: but there is no one I know able to challenge calorimetry.

I have strived for years in an endeavour to explain to people, who really should know better, that the temperature of electric motors at work is of paramount importance and that electrical parameters are of no consequence or even required to be considered. Also that conventional mathematical/electrical measurements do not apply to switched reluctance motors; if applied, they are flawed by straight out accurate temperature measurement of the machine.

LUCAS INDUSTRIES
 NEWMARKET
 AUCKLAND
 NEW ZEALAND

JOSEPH LUCAS LTD
 GROUP RESEARCH CENTRE
 SHIRLEY SOLIHULL
 WEST MIDLANDS
 BIRMINGHAM
 GT. BRITAIN

REF. MR. R. ADAMS ELECTRIC MOTOR

Electrical Power measurements are not easy to make when the D.C. Voltages and currents fluctuate cyclically, and care is needed even in interpreting the meter readings for average voltage and current.

A better measurement of the input power to the motor itself would be obtained by positioning an average reading ammeter to measure only the winding current, and noting the duty cycle for the condition. Then by assuming that the battery voltage was constant during the 'current' pulses:-

Motor Watts

Battery V (I Average X Duty Cycle)

For instance V = 24v I average = 2.5A

Duty cycle .25 = 2.5 X .25 = .625 x 24 = 15 watts

If however the switching circuit is in series with motor windings and isolation for measurement purposes is not possible the same equation is used to calculate power input, except switching loss only is subtracted from Total power in, this will then give true motor winding input.

Yours sincerely,

D.M. Brooks,
 Research Officer, (Projects)
Engineering Section.

VALUABLE HINTS ON REPLICATION

- 1) Use only pure iron for stator/drive windings, not laminated steel core.
- 2) Wind stators with a resistance in the range of ten to twenty ohms each for a small model.
- 3) For 2) above, use voltage/s of between 12 and 36.
- 4) For small machine make contactor star disk one inch maximum diameter.
- 5) Keep wiring short and of low resistance.
- 6) For small machine install fuse/holder 500m.a. to 1 amp.
- 7) Install switch for convenience and safety.
- 8) Use small bearings. Do not use sealed bearings as these are pre-packed with a dense grease which causes severe drag.
- 9) Use only silver contacts for pulse switch.
- 10) If using high-energy-product magnets, vibration becomes a serious problem if constructional materials and design are faulty.
- 11) Air gap is not critical; however reduction will increase torque and also increase input power in proportion.
- 12) For higher speed, lower current, series-connected stators recommended.
- 13) a) If machine stator windings are of low resistance and drawing high current at higher input voltage, it is advisable to install a switching transistor which will completely eliminate sparking at points.

b) On calculating input power, however, the transistor switch burden must be subtracted from total input.
- 14) a) Points tuning and pressure are vitally important; experiment will indicate optimum settings.

b) If, however, all electronic switching process is preferred, i.e., using photo, magnetic, hall effect, etc., then the above in a) is completely eliminated.
- 15) If constructing a large model involving large super-power magnets, note the following:- The greater the magnetic energy product, the greater the power required to drive the machine, the greater the torque, the greater the vibration problem, greater copper content, greater cost etc. Read section on "Permanent Magnets and Efficiency" by Dr. Robert Adams 1996 (Also published in NEXUS April/May 1996 issue).

ADAMS MOTOR

20

ANALYSIS REPORT FROM (PH.D.SYSTEMS ENGINEERING SCIENTIST) OF DETROIT, OHIO

This is a "Vax" computer system analysis together with computer graphs of the parameters and analysis carried out by the above Scientist, confirming the validity of various claims made by the inventor. The graphs are very comprehensive and therefore of considerable value to aid design work, particularly of the motor proper, of the "Adams" Motor Generator. The following analysis are results of the original Mark I Adams Motor Generator, taken in a magnetic attraction mode.

GENERAL ANALYSIS REPORT RECEIVED BY THE INVENTOR

Note on battery tests:

I have done a battery charging test and I enclose the results for your examination. As you can see, the input battery voltage stayed virtually constant over the time involved, while the output battery voltage climbed considerably. Are you interested in what the device I was using between the two batteries was? It was a "conventional" RESISTOR. Yes, I actually duplicated your battery charging curves using a resistor, not an Adam's Machine. I hope you find this informative.

Simulation run:

I am including some printouts from my simulation program confirming several of the features you describe in your literature. The plots with angle on the horizontal axis are showing 1/4 of a revolution by one degree increments. The plots with speed on the horizontal axis are showing the effect on the variable speed changes. As you see from the TORQUE-ANGLE PLOT, positive torque is indeed applied twice during each cycle, as you state. The EFFICIENCY VS SPEED PLOT shows the "resonance effect" in a rather dramatic way, don't you think? (Here the lighter shaded area is the area of OVER-UNITY operation). The TORQUE-SPEED PLOT is quite interesting, since the load line intersection with it determines at which speed the motor will run. The simulated coil voltage and coil current waveforms shown are similar to those observed on my scope (and yours according to your diagrams), confirming the basic validity of the simulation equations I have developed. The BATTERY CURRENT VS ANGLE PLOT shows current flowing back into the battery, again as you indicated.

Isn't it interesting that the simulations show areas of operation under certain conditions which will produce over unity results? Maybe we don't have to throw out as much of "conventional" physics as you think we do. Maybe "over unity" has been hidden in conventional physics all along and we just haven't seen it, because we haven't looked in the right way with eyes to see.

7.8.93

L.L. PH.D

Detroit, Toledo, Ohio

BATTERY CHARGING TEST

4

2


46 1510


10 X 10 TO THE CENTIMETER
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.

INPUT BATTERY VOLTAGE

12.67
12.69
12.70
12.71
12.72
12.73

TIME - HOURS





Torque
vs
Angle

Coil Config. Used to Drive Motor: COIL 6B IN SERIES COIL 7B

Generator Voltage File	-	VOPRO1.DAT	Rotor Radius	-----	5.750 In
Force Function File	----	LBPA01.DAT	Rotor-Stator Gap	-----	0.375 In
Has Zero-Current Force?	YES		Angle ON	-----	55.000 Deg
Mode of Operation	-----	ATTRACTION	Angle OFF	-----	80.000 Deg
Rotation Direction	-----	CLOCKWISE	Duty Cycle	-----	0.278
Windage Drag at 100RPM	0.002	FtLb	Reporting Intv for Cal	-----	1.000 Deg
Coil Inductance	-----	13.530 Mhn	Integrate Steps/Rep Intv	-----	100
Capacitance	-----	200.000 Ufd	Total Loops Calculated	-----	6
Coil Resistance	-----	1.300 Ohm	Intervals to SW Close	-----	55
Capacitor Resistance	---	0.200 Ohm	Intervals to SW Open	-----	80
Battery Resistance	-----	0.800 Ohm	Resonant Frequency	-----	96.751 Hz
Battery Voltage	-----	12.900 Vlt	Resonant Freq Equivalent	-----	1451.268 RPH

SPEED/AV ELECTRIC VARBL				---AVERAGE ROTOR VARIABLES---				---PERFORMANCE VARBL---			
AVRG	AVRG	AVRG		TOTAL	TOTAL	NET	AVRG	EFFIC	SPEED/	SPDSQ/	
BATCUR	BATPR	VINPR		TORQ	DRAG	TORQ	ROTPW	PR/PB	PBAT	PBAT	
RPM	Amps	Watts	Watts	Ft-Lb	Ft-Lb	Ft-Lb	Watts	PRCNT	RPH/W	RPHsq/W L	
540.	1.15	14.80	9.65	0.195	0.184	0.010	14.925	100.81	36.5	17696.	

III Variable on Vertical Axis is INST TORQUE(T):DRAG(g),(d)(32)-

```

*** Range of Variable is..... -0.21 to      -1.26 -EI-LB

```

MILLISECONDS		ANGLE
0.00	-----+T-----d-----	55.0
0.31	+sT.d.....	56.0
0.62	+sT.d.....	57.0
0.93	+sT.d.....	58.0
1.23	+sTd.....	59.0
1.54	+sTd.....	60.0
1.85	+sTd.....	61.0
2.16	+sTd.....	62.0
2.47	+sTd.....	63.0
2.78	+sTd.....	64.0
3.09	+sTd.....	65.0
3.40	+sTd.....	66.0
3.70	+sTd.....	67.0
4.01	+sTd.....	68.0
4.32	+sTd.....	69.0
4.63	+sTd.....	70.0
4.94	+sTd.....	71.0
5.25	+sTd.....	72.0
5.56	+sTd.....	73.0
5.86	+sTd.....	74.0
6.17	+sTd.....	75.0
6.48	+sTd.....	76.0
6.79	+sTd.....	77.0
7.10	+sTd.....	78.0
7.41	+sTd.....	79.0
7.72	=====+sTd=====	80.0
8.02	=====+sTd=====	81.0

[illegible]

8.33		82.0
8.64		83.0
8.95		84.0
9.26		85.0
9.57		86.0
9.88		87.0
10.19		88.0
10.49		89.0
10.80		90.0
11.11		91.0
11.42		92.0
11.73		93.0
12.04		94.0
12.35		95.0
12.65		96.0
12.96		97.0
13.27		98.0
13.58		99.0
13.89		100.0
14.20		11.0
14.51		12.0
14.81		13.0
15.12		14.0
15.43		15.0
15.74		16.0
16.05		17.0
16.36		18.0
16.67		19.0
16.98		20.0
17.28		21.0
17.59		22.0
17.90		23.0
18.21		24.0
18.52		25.0
18.83		26.0
19.14		27.0
19.44		28.0
19.75		29.0
20.06		30.0
20.37		31.0
20.68		32.0
20.99		33.0
21.30		34.0
21.60		35.0
21.91		36.0
22.22		37.0
22.53		38.0
22.84		39.0
23.15		40.0
23.46		41.0
23.77		42.0
24.07		43.0
24.38		44.0
24.69		45.0
25.00		46.0
25.31		47.0
25.62		48.0
25.93		49.0
26.23		50.0
26.54		51.0
26.85		52.0
27.16		53.0
27.47		54.0
27.78		55.0

CLIP OFF

2 POSITIVE TO POSE TIMES

TORRUE 16 AUG 1968

>>>> TEST OF AUTO RUN - CAPACITOR CHECK

```

+<-----+ VCOIL - ----->+ <<UPHSH-V7.5.93>>
|          +-----+
|          +-----+
| / \ / \ / \ +VIN-|---|()()---+ COIL/ROTOR DRIVE SEGMENT
| + RL - +-----+ + IND - |
|          ICOIL=IL ----> |
|          + CAP - |
|          | | |
| / \ / \ / \ +-----+ CAPACITOR SEGMENT
| + RC - IC ----> | | |
|          | | |
|          + VDC - o \ SWITCH
|          | | |
| - RB + IB <---- | | |
| / \ / \ / \ +-----+ BATTERY SEGMENT
|          | | |

```

EFFICIENCY
VS
SPEED *LE*

Coil Config. Used to Drive Motor: COIL 6B IN SERIES COIL 7B

Generator Voltage File -	VOPR01.DAT	Rotor Radius -----	5.730 In
Force Function File ----	LBPA01.DAT	Rotor-Stator Gap -----	0.375 In
Has Zero-Current Force? YES		Angle ON -----	55.000 Deg
Mode of Operation -----	ATTRACTION	Angle OFF -----	80.000 Deg
Rotation Direction -----	CLOCKWISE	Duty Cycle -----	0.278
Windage Drag at 100RPM -	0.002 Ftlb	Reporting Interv for Cal	1.000 Deg
Coil Inductance -----	13.530 MHn	Integrate Steps/Rep Intv	100
Capacitance -----	200.000 Ufd	Total Loops Calculated -	6
Coil Resistance -----	1.300 Ohm	Intervals to Sw Close --	55
Capacitor Resistance ---	0.200 Ohm	Intervals to Sw Open ---	80
Battery Resistance -----	0.800 Ohm	Resonant Frequency -----	96.751 Hz
Battery Voltage -----	12.900 Vlt	Resonant Freq Equivalent	1451.268 RPM

*** Variable on Vertical Axis is EFFICIENCY-ROT-RV/BAT PW (9)

*** Range of Variable is 2.11 to 1298.61 PERCENT

SPEED(RPM)		SPEED(RPM)
40.00 %	-----d	40.00
60.00 %	d	60.00
80.00 %	d	80.00
100.00 %	d	100.00
120.00 %	d	120.00
140.00 %	d	140.00
160.00 %	d	160.00
180.00 %	d	180.00
200.00 %	d	200.00
220.00 %	d	220.00
240.00 %	d	240.00
260.00 %	d	260.00
280.00 %	d	280.00
300.00 %	d	300.00
320.00 %	d	320.00
340.00 %	d	340.00
360.00 %	d	360.00
380.00 %	d	380.00
400.00 %	d	400.00
420.00 %	d	420.00
440.00 %	d	440.00
460.00 %	d	460.00
480.00 %	d	480.00
500.00 %	d	500.00
520.00 %	d	520.00
540.00 %	d	540.00
560.00 %	d	560.00
580.00 %	d	580.00
600.00 %	d	600.00
620.00 %	d	620.00
640.00 %	d	640.00
660.00 %	d	660.00
680.00 %	d	680.00

100% LINE

720.00	+++++:::Z	d	720.00
740.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	740.00
760.00	+++++:::Z	d	760.00
780.00	+++++:::Z	d	780.00
800.00	+++++:::Z	d	800.00
820.00	+++++:::Z	d	820.00
840.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	840.00
860.00	+++++:::Z	d	860.00
880.00	+++++:::Z	d	880.00
900.00	+++++:::Z	d	900.00
920.00	+++++:::Z	d	920.00
940.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	940.00
960.00	+++++:::Z	d	960.00
980.00	+++++:::Z	d	980.00
1000.00	+++++:::Z	d	1000.00
1020.00	+++++:::Z	d	1020.00
1040.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1040.00
1060.00	+++++:::Z	d	1060.00
1080.00	+++++:::Z	d	1080.00
1100.00	+++++:::Z	d	1100.00
1120.00	+++++:::Z	d	1120.00
1140.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1140.00
1160.00	+++++:::Z	d	1160.00
1180.00	+++++:::Z	d	1180.00
1200.00	+++++:::Z	d	1200.00
1220.00	+++++:::Z	d	1220.00
1240.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1240.00
1260.00	+++++:::Z	d	1260.00
1280.00	+++++:::Z	d	1280.00
1300.00	+++++:::Z	d	1300.00
1320.00	+++++:::Z	d	1320.00
1340.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1340.00
1360.00	+++++:::Z	d	1360.00
1380.00	+++++:::Z	d	1380.00
1400.00	+++++:::Z	d	1400.00
1420.00	+++++:::Z	d	1420.00
1440.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1440.00
1460.00	+++++:::Z	d	1460.00
1480.00	+++++:::Z	d	1480.00
1500.00	+++++:::Z	d	1500.00
1520.00	+++++:::Z	d	1520.00
1540.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1540.00
1560.00	+++++:::Z	d	1560.00
1580.00	+++++:::Z	d	1580.00
1600.00	+++++:::Z	d	1600.00
1620.00	+++++:::Z	d	1620.00
1640.00	+++++:::Z	d	1640.00
1660.00	+++++:::Z	d	1660.00
1680.00	+++++:::Z	d	1680.00
1700.00	+++++:::Z	d	1700.00
1720.00	+++++:::Z	d	1720.00
1740.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1740.00
1760.00	+++++:::Z	d	1760.00
1780.00	+++++:::Z	d	1780.00
1800.00	+++++:::Z	d	1800.00
1820.00	+++++:::Z	d	1820.00
1840.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1840.00
1860.00	+++++:::Z	d	1860.00
1880.00	+++++:::Z	d	1880.00
1900.00	+++++:::Z	d	1900.00
1920.00	+++++:::Z	d	1920.00
1940.00	+++++:::Z-----	d	1940.00
1960.00	+++++:::Z	d	1960.00
1980.00	+++++:::Z	d	1980.00
2000.00	+++++:::Z	d	2000.00

HAEMONIC

PRIMNOY

```

+-----+
+---/\---+VIN---+---+---+ COIL/ROTOR DRIVE SEGMENT
| + RL - +---+ + IND - |
| ICOIL=IL ---> |
| + CAP - |
| | | |
+---/\---+-----+ |---+ CAPACITOR SEGMENT
| + RC - IC ---> | | |
| | | |
| + VDC - o \ SWITCH
| - RB + IR <--- | | |
+---/\---+-----+ | | |---+ BATTERY SEGMENT
| | | |

```

TORQUE
VS
SPEED *4*

Coil Config. Used to Drive Motor: COIL 6B IN SERIES COIL 7B

Generator Voltage File -	VOPR01.DAT	Rotor Radius -----	5.750 In
Force Function File ----	LBPA01.DAT	Rotor-Stator Gap -----	0.375 In
Has Zero-Current Force? YES		Angle ON -----	55.000 Deg
Mode of Operation -----	ATTRACTION	Angle OFF -----	80.000 Deg
Rotation Direction -----	CLOCKWISE	Duty Cycle -----	0.278
Windage Drag at 100RPM -	0.002 FtLb	Reporting Interv for Cal	1.000 Deg
Coil Inductance -----	13.530 Mhn	Integrate Steps/Rep Intv	100
Capacitance -----	200.000 Ufd	Total Loops Calculated -	6
Coil Resistance -----	1.300 Ohm	Intervals to Sw Close --	55
Capacitor Resistance ---	0.200 Ohm	Intervals to Sw Open ---	80
Battery Resistance -----	0.800 Ohm	Resonant Frequency -----	96.751 Hz
Battery Voltage -----	12.900 Vlt	Resonant Freq Equivalent	1451.268 RPM

*** Variable on Vertical Axis is AVG TORQUE:DRAG:G=GEN,d=TOT(4)

*** Range of Variable is 0.01 to 0.25 FT-LB

SPEED(RPM)		SPEED(RPM)
40.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 40.00
60.00	+++++d+++T	d 60.00
80.00	+++++d+++T	d 80.00
100.00	+++++d+++T	d 100.00
120.00	+++++d+++T	d 120.00
140.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 140.00
160.00	+++++d+++T	d 160.00
180.00	+++++d+++T	d 180.00
200.00	+++++d+++T	d 200.00
220.00	+++++d+++T	d 220.00
240.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 240.00
260.00	+++++d+++T	d 260.00
280.00	+++++d+++T	d 280.00
300.00	+++++d+++T	d 300.00
320.00	+++++d+++T	d 320.00
340.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 340.00
360.00	+++++d+++T	d 360.00
380.00	+++++d+++T	d 380.00
400.00	+++++d+++T	d 400.00
420.00	+++++d+++T	d 420.00
440.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 440.00
460.00	+++++d+++T	d 460.00
480.00	+++++d+++T	d 480.00
500.00	+++++d+++T	d 500.00
520.00	+++++d+++T	d 520.00
540.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 540.00
560.00	+++++d+++T	d 560.00
580.00	+++++d+++T	d 580.00
600.00	+++++d+++T	d 600.00
620.00	+++++d+++T	d 620.00
640.00	+++++d+++T-----	d 640.00
660.00	+++++d+++T	d 660.00
680.00	+++++d+++T	d 680.00

700.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	700.00
720.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	720.00
740.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	740.00
760.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	760.00
780.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	780.00
800.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	800.00
820.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	820.00
840.00	+++++g+++++T-----	dd	d	840.00
860.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	860.00
880.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	880.00
900.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	900.00
920.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	920.00
940.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	940.00
960.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	960.00
980.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	980.00
1000.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1000.00
1020.00	+++++g+++++Td	d	d	1020.00
1040.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1040.00
1060.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1060.00
1080.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1080.00
1100.00	+++++g+++++Td	d	d	1100.00
1120.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1120.00
1140.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1140.00
1160.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1160.00
1180.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1180.00
1200.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1200.00
1220.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1220.00
1240.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1240.00
1260.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1260.00
1280.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1280.00
1300.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1300.00
1320.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1320.00
1340.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1340.00
1360.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1360.00
1380.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1380.00
1400.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1400.00
1420.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1420.00
1440.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1440.00
1460.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1460.00
1480.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1480.00
1500.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1500.00
1520.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1520.00
1540.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1540.00
1560.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1560.00
1580.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1580.00
1600.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1600.00
1620.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1620.00
1640.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1640.00
1660.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1660.00
1680.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1680.00
1700.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1700.00
1720.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1720.00
1740.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1740.00
1760.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1760.00
1780.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1780.00
1800.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1800.00
1820.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1820.00
1840.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1840.00
1860.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1860.00
1880.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1880.00
1900.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1900.00
1920.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1920.00
1940.00	+++++g+++++T-----	d	d	1940.00
1960.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1960.00
1980.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	1980.00
2000.00	+++++g+++++T	d	d	2000.00

```

>>> Test of Minimum Battery Current Speed - 1000RPM
+-----+ VCOIL -----+ <<UPHSH-07.7.93>>
| +-----+ |
+---/\/\/\---|+VIN-|---()()()---+ COIL/ROTOR DRIVE SEGMENT
| + RL - +-----+ + IND - |
| ICOIL=IL ----> |
| + CAP - |
| | | |
+---/\/\/\---| |---+ CAPACITOR SEGMENT
| + RC - IC ----> | | o
| | | | \ SWITCH
| + VDC - o \
| - RB + IB <---- | | |
+---/\/\/\---| | |---+ BATTERY SEGMENT
| | |

```

BATTERY CURRENT
VS
ANGLE

```

Coil Config. Used to Drive Motor: COIL 6B IN SERIES COIL 7B
Generator Voltage File - VOPR01.DAT Rotor Radius ----- 5.750 In
Force Function File ---- LBPA01.DAT Rotor-Stator Gap ----- 0.375 In
Has Zero-Current Force? YES Angle ON ----- 60.000 Deg
Mode of Operation ----- ATTRACTION Angle OFF ----- 80.000 Deg
Rotation Direction ----- CLOCKWISE Duty Cycle ----- 0.322
Windage Drag at 100RPM - " 0.002 FtLb Reporting Interv for Cal 1.000 Deg
Coil Inductance ----- 13.530 Mhn Integrate Steps/Rep Intv 100
Capacitance ----- 100.000 Ufd Total Loops Calculated - 6
Coil Resistance ----- 1.300 Ohm Intervals to Sw Close -- 60
Capacitor Resistance --- 0.200 Ohm Intervals to Sw Open --- 80
Battery Resistance ----- 0.800 Ohm Resonant Frequency ----- 136.927 Hz
Battery Voltage ----- 12.900 Vlt Resonant Free Equivalent 2052.402 RPH

```

```

|SPEED|AV ELECTRIC VARBL|---AVERAGE ROTOR VARIABLES---|---PERFORMANCE VARBL|---|
| | AVRG AVRG AVRG | TOTAL TOTAL NET AVRG | EFFIC SPEED/ SPDSQ/ |
| | BATCUR BATPR VINPR | TORQ DRAG TORQ ROTPW PR/PB PBAT PBAT |
| RPM | Amps Watts Watts | Ft-Lb Ft-Lb Ft-Lb Watts | PRCNT RPH/W RPHsq/W |
-----
1000. -0.01 -0.10 7.54 0.081 0.253 -0.172 11.492*****-9709.9-9709988.

```

*** Variable on Vertical Axis is INSTANT BATTERY CURRENT (10)
 *** Range of Variable is -1.84 to 4.28 AMPS
 MILLISECONDS

```

|-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
0.00 |-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+ 60.0
0.17 | . . . . . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 61.0
0.33 | i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 62.0
0.50 | i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 63.0
0.67 | . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 64.0
0.83 | . . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 65.0
1.00 | . . . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 66.0
1.17 | . . . . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 67.0
1.33 | . . . . . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 68.0
1.50 | . . . . . . i+++++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 69.0
1.67 | . . . . . . . i+++ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 70.0
1.83 | . . . . . . . . i+ | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 71.0
2.00 | . . . . . . . . . +i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 72.0
2.17 | . . . . . . . . . ++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 73.0
2.33 | . . . . . . . . . ++++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 74.0
2.50 | . . . . . . . . . ++++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 75.0
2.67 | . . . . . . . . . ++++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 76.0
2.83 | . . . . . . . . . ++++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 77.0
3.00 | . . . . . . . . . ++++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 78.0
3.17 | . . . . . . . . . ++++++i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 79.0
3.33 | -----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+ 90.0
3.50 | . . . . . i CLIP OFF | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 81.0
3.67 | . . . . . i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 82.0
3.83 | . . . . . i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 83.0
4.00 | . . . . . i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 84.0
4.17 | -----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+ 95.0
4.33 | . . . . . i | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | 96.0

```

NEG. CURR

POS. CURR

SPECIAL REPORT
ON A NEW REVOLUTIONARY MOTOR GENERATOR

THE ADAMS THERMO MOTOR GENERATOR - MARK 022/3

New ETHER ENERGY DEVICES are now a reality and the ivory tower protectionism of the Laws of Thermodynamics and Einstein's Relativity has all but collapsed.

Research and development in this new/old vast field is fast gathering momentum worldwide. These new devices include electric motor/generators and solid state units. Present day methods of power generation are destined for the scrap heap.

The scientific establishment has built its imposing edifice of quantum electrodynamics on the basis of secondary results produced from electricity and electromagnetics already in action.

From these actions observed they form a hypothetical picture, theoretical models of which have consequently consistently served as being reliable for MOST electromagnetic devices, but not all, as when these dogmatic laws were conceived today's inventors and scientists had not as yet invented these new revolutionary electromagnetic devices capable of gating ETHER ENERGY, with one exception being Tesla on the close of the last century, who was suppressed.

If the scientific establishment dogma in relation to NEWTON'S LAWS OF THERMODYNAMICS and EINSTEIN'S RELATIVITY were correct, then none of these new energy devices, including UFOs, could have been invented.

Einstein's sacrosanct theories of relativity and the Laws of Thermodynamics are the most remarkable and inexplicable aberrations ever recorded in scientific history. These draconian false teachings have been instrumental on a wholesale scale in impeding the progress of science towards free clean energy in a propitious era which has since had the fossil fuel magnates laughing all the way to the bank.

There is overwhelming evidence that ether/space energy can be concentrated, focused and/or magnified by permanent magnets. I, for one, have proved this in my original motor generator, 4-pole super power magnets, the Adams Thermo Motor/Generator and other inventions and electromagnetic discoveries not yet disclosed. My success in precipitating heat from ether/space energy manifest/ing within the stators of the Mark 022/3 Adams Thermo Electric Motor and successfully harnessing this energy, has proved to be a very significant and exciting event for a world starving for clean economical energy.

The 'ADAMS THERMO MOTOR GENERATOR' is but one of the new energy devices on the horizon with enormous potential. The device is so named as an illustration of it's ability, in addition to it supplying very efficient electrical or mechanical power, to also provide water heating, both at unprecedented economical figures.

Heat is a source of immense energy loss in conventional motors. It was this principal factor in mind that first prompted me to invent a motor that would overcome this energy waste and hence the birth of the original Adams Motor Generator Mark 001 (1968). Ironically, in contrast, over the intervening years, much of my mental research went into the idea of tapping ether energy, in the form of heat, into my original machine. With this task most prominent in my mind, I constantly pondered over the idea of inventing a motor that would, in addition to rendering a very high degree of efficiency, provide etheric energy in the form of heat within the machine which I could then harness by way of heating water.

To achieve this I felt a pressing message to direct most of my efforts into the design of a unique rotor as having, through the years, found little chance, if any, of improving the lot of electric motor stator systems, as has been attempted by many, with most only showing little, if any, improvement in the gaining of higher efficiency.

Two unique engineering factors came to mind quite quickly and were duly implemented into this rotor. The results of the first trial runs were well beyond my expectations; for the size and electrical parameters of the machine, the energy gated from the ether in the form of heat was massive and spontaneous. These results were very exciting.

To construct a machine of this kind requires considerable experience and skill in the design of unconventional new energy devices, in addition to the requirement of experience in the science of thermodynamics, calorimetry and water heating systems. All measures must be exercised to preclude and/or reduce losses as these are many and can be high and include the following:

Conduction, radiation, windage, bearings, magnetics, transistor switching, high windage loss at stator pole faces due to high speeds of 2500 - 4000 rpm of the rotor causing considerable cooling effect - i.e., irretrievable loss of ETHER ENERGY, and thermo insulation losses in stator jackets, holding tank and piping circuitry.

The unique rotor, briefly described, comprises of four neodymium magnets and is driven by only two 180° stators with a large air gap of 1.25mm, has a rotor diameter of 140mm and 19mm in width and the stator faces are small at only 15mm diameter.

The high heat energy referred to, that is gated from ETHER/SPACE, concentrates at the stator windings. The manner in which this heat energy is harnessed from the stator is unique and very efficient; the result is a machine which develops mechanical power for industrial use and provides hot water in addition - a world first in its class. It represents a boon to industry, hospitals, institutions and domestic dwellings alike. For any particular application it can be designed for power supply generation in addition to providing hot water at economy figures undreamed of. The applications are endless and for the consumer

the big bonus is its sheer economy whether you take a small power boat or an ocean-going vessel - fuel costs and weight would be slashed to the bone not to mention the reduced fire risks and as with hospitals, production plants, mills, mining and industry in general, the same benefits would apply.

The machine, because of its unique free water heating advantage, will, of course, be of greater volume than a conventional motor due to the necessary installation criteria of the associated componentry required to harness this primary source of free energy.

The prospect of being now in the position to harness these energies from magnetic forces provides us with a vast new clean source of energy free for the taking.

CALORIMETRIC TEST, TRANSISTOR SWITCH
DISSIPATION, AND ELECTRICAL INPUT
AND ETHER ENERGY OUTPUT

Total Transistor Switch dissipation	- 45 watts.
Total Electrical input	- 33 watts.
Ether Energy output of hot water	- 137 watts.

Now 45 watts of transistor switch is the total dissipation of both the machine and switch, so we are faced with a paradox in that electrical calculation total input power = 33 watts versus 45 watts of the transistor total input (calorimetrically measured). This to me indicates that etheric energy is somehow entering the switching circuit as it gets far hotter than it should for the amount of current it is switching. This possibility should not be ignored as etheric energy moves and collects on both insulators and conductors alike and collectively in a manner totally foreign to the way in which electricity, as we know it, flows in an electrical circuit.

There is mounting evidence showing up in this unique machine that indicates we have much exciting learning ahead in this new field of energy.

For instance, I will cite the following anomaly taken from my day book dated 2.6.96:

Throughout a test run on the above date, as is usual, random checks were taken of the stator jackets' water temperature and it was found throughout the one hour test run that the NORTH POLE had now taken the higher heat potential from the SOUTH POLE - with a difference, however; instead of the usual 2 to 3 degree variation from one day to another between the two poles, on this occasion the NORTH POLE was operating at a temperature of 33 degrees beyond that displayed by the SOUTH POLE. There were no electrical instrumentation variations whatsoever during this period of the test run and, further, there was no sign of variation in machine performance. These anomalous discoveries are not new to me; they simply convince me further that "It is highly probable that, at any or all times in the future, the most any of us will ever know about nature is nothing" (Dr. Robert Adams 1996).

NOTE:

UNLOADED PERFORMANCE TEST - It is to be noted that the outlined test run was carried out free-running, i.e., the machine was operating without mechanical or electrical load applied. On application of loading, however, input power increase is minimal, where ether heat energy increases dramatically in proportion.

A new machine of higher power, greater dimensions and of anticipated improved efficiency is, at present, under construction. The results of its performance will be interesting to see and they also will be published internationally in due course.

RECOMMENDED READING:

MODERN AETHER SCIENCE by Dr. Harold Aspden
PHYSICS WITHOUT EINSTEIN by Dr. Harold Aspden
Saberton Publications, P.O. Box 35, Southampton SO16, 7RB, U.K.

THE COSMIC PULSE OF LIFE by Trevor J. Constable
Borderland Sciences Research Foundation, Gaberville, California,
ISBN 0-945685-07-6 U.S.A.

THERMODYNAMICS AND FREE ENERGY by Peter A. Lindemann
28 Williams Boulevard. Tijeras, New Mexico, 87159, U.S.A.

THERMODYNAMICS AND FREE ENERGY

By Peter A. Lindemann
April 8, 1994

The mainstream scientific community dismisses the idea of "Free Energy" or "Over-Unity" machines because they say that the behavior of such machines violates the "Second Law of Thermodynamics." The purpose of this article is to squarely face this issue from an alternative science point of view. Many engineers and inventors, working in the alternative energy field, still mistakenly believe that the "Laws of Thermodynamics" are universally true. For them, the "free energy" machine can only be a clever scientific slight of hand where the machine becomes "outlaw", breaking some fundamental universe law. For progress to be made in this field, the limitations and errors inherent in the "Laws of Thermodynamics" must be exposed. Only then will people realize that scientific experimentation is the only reliable tool for revealing the behavior of physical reality.

In order to bring this about, it will be helpful to quickly review some of the pivotal historical events which helped shape the modern scientific era with regards to thermodynamics. Before the year 1800, perpetual motion machines were considered possible and heat was not regarded as a form of energy. Both of these long standing assumptions, dating back thousands of years, were effectively toppled by the ideas of Hermann von Helmholtz in 1847 when he *postulated* that since no one had ever been able to build a working perpetual motion machine, that just probably, it was not possible. In order to deny the possibility of perpetual motion and hold the argument together, he had to assume that energy in the system was being conserved. It had long been observed that mechanical devices could not transfer energy perfectly. There was always some friction in the working parts. Friction was not only known to impede the transfer of energy in the machine, but it was known to produce heat. In order to simultaneously explain the work loss and the heat gain, so that **conservation** could be satisfied, Helmholtz postulated that heat was a form of energy consisting of a small, random motion in the molecules of matter. He went on to speculate that the loss of work in the machine as large scale motion was still present as heat in the small scale motion of the molecules in the material the machine was made of. He suggested from this that both the heat and work must be considered energy, and that it was the total that was **conserved**, rather than the heat or work separately.

By 1850, Rudolf Clausius was able to synthesize the work of Helmholtz, James Joule, Sadi Carnot and others to express a generalized statement that has become known as the "First Law of Thermodynamics." It states that "energy can be changed from one form to another, but it is neither created nor destroyed." By the time this thought became universally believed, it had totally transformed the intellectual landscape of mechanics, physics and energy dynamics. This was a clean break from the set of thoughts and assumptions that had come forward from antiquity. A new era in science had begun.

In understanding these historical developments, it is important to realize that besides the new theoretical explanation about the nature of heat, all of the other data that lead to the new theoretical generalizations was derived experimentally. This can be illustrated by an observation made by Sadi Carnot in his extensive work regarding the behavior of heat in machines. He states that "in all cases in which work is produced by the agency of heat, a quantity of heat is consumed that is proportional to the work done; and conversely, by the

expenditure of an equal quantity of work, an equal quantity of heat is produced." This statement by Carnot was based on hundreds of experimental measurements. After such convincing experimentation, it was not unreasonable for Clausius to conclude that heat could be converted into mechanical work. It was, however, a theoretical leap of logic to conclude that energy, in general, could be changed from one form to another.

Before we go on, it is important, for our purposes, to be reminded that this new idea expressed as the "First Law of Thermodynamics" consists of a number of overlapping ideas and assumptions that can be expressed as follows:

- 1) Perpetual motion machines are impossible
- 2) The nature of heat is reduced to the random motions of molecular matter
- 3) Energy can be changed from one form to another without any explanation as to how this conversion is actually accomplished in any specific case
- 4) Energy is not created in or destroyed by its passage through a mechanism
- 5) All forms of energy behave the same way

All of these ideas are fundamentally inherent in "The First Law of Thermodynamics." From an alternative science point of view, the experimental work of Carnot and Joule will stand for all time. It is the *intellectual overlay* of Helmholtz and Clausius, on this experimental work, where the problems are introduced. The theory of **conversion** and the ideas about the nature of heat will be taken up again later in this article, after more ground work has been laid.

The "Second Law of Thermodynamics" evolved out of further studies of the behavior of heat in closed systems. Remarkably, there is no one statement that is universally recognized as the definitive expression of this so called "Law". Among the more popular statements which reflect the general understanding of the "Second Law of Thermodynamics" include the following: "In a closed system, entropy does not decrease", "The state of order in a closed system does not spontaneously increase without the application of work", "Among all the allowed states of a system with given values of energy, number of particles and constraints, one and only one is a stable equilibrium state", and "It is impossible to construct a device that operates in a cycle and produces no other effect than the production of work and exchange of heat with a single reservoir." For those who can fathom the language, these statements clearly do not all express the same idea. Some have broad ramifications while others are more narrowly defined. All of these statements grew out of the idea, expressed fairly well as the last statement in the series, that a perpetual motion machine could not be made that operated on the principle of a work/heat exchange when this process was limited to a known quantity of heat at the start. After that amount of heat was **converted** to work and the temperature of the reservoir was reduced to the ambient temperature outside, no further work could be expected to be produced. This is not only reasonable, but it is backed up by thousands of experiments. As long as the "Law" is clearly and narrowly defined as a statement that reflects upon the behavior of heat in closed systems, this author has no problem with agreeing completely.

Problems arise, however, with some of the more generalized interpretations of the "Law" such as "the state of order in a closed system does not spontaneously increase without the application of work." In order to understand why this statement is not universally true, it is important to clearly define our terms. We must understand what is meant by the "state of order" in a system, and we must define the boundaries of the "closure" of that system. In the first case, the "state of order" in the system is generally regarded as the temperature.

3

Understanding this, we can rephrase this statement to say, that in a thermally isolated enclosure, the temperature will not increase unless work or energy is added to the system. Here again, by clearly defining our terms, and limiting the discussion to heat and work, we have a universally true statement backed up by mountains of experimental data. If, however, we define the "state of order" as a generalized "quantity of energy", and we further define the "closed system" as the Universe, we are lead to believe that under no circumstance is it possible to create a condition where the concentration of energy will increase spontaneously. This is not true!

While it should be understood that most known chemical processes, standard electrical equipment and heat generally do behave this way, the Etheric Energy Field of the planet does not. The Etheric Energy Field behaves in direct opposition to the more generalized understandings of the "Second Law of Thermodynamics" and this fact is backed up by considerable experimental data. One of the best documented examples of this is the spontaneous temperature rise observed in the "orgone accumulator", invented by Dr. Wilhelm Reich in 1940. Here, a simple enclosure made of alternating layers of organic and inorganic material, allows the ambient density of the Etheric Energy Field to become more concentrated in the local area, *without* the application of work. This new and higher energy concentration is then reflected as a spontaneous rise in temperature. This situation does not break the "Second Law" in the narrow case, because we admit that new energy is entering the system. It does break the "Second Law" in the general case because this energy is entering without the application of external work. Reich's accumulator was designed as an attempt to shield and isolate this energy from its presence in the environment. His data clearly showed, however, that he was not able to isolate the energy effects inside the accumulator because the Etheric Energy Field easily penetrated the walls of the enclosure. He eventually realized that with regard to Etheric Energy Fields, it was impossible to "close the system" in the local sense. This is important to understand because it directly refutes the assumption that the universe consists only of closed systems at all levels of activity.

Here then is a major problem with how the scientific community regards the "Laws of Thermodynamics." When the discussion is limited to the behavior of heat in closed systems, the "Second Law of Thermodynamics" is a well tested and accurate description of what happens under those circumstances. It is when it is incorrectly assumed that all forms of energy behave this way and that enclosure of the system is possible at all levels, that grossly false conclusions can be drawn from what started out as experimentally derived observations. The scientific community-at-large obviates these problems simply by denying the existence of the Etheric Energy Field because it doesn't fit within their intellectual model. Unfortunately for them, the mounting experimental evidence is making this increasingly hard to do.

Certainly, the best evidence to date of the existence of the Etheric Energy Field and its capability of being drawn to high concentrations without the application of work is demonstrated by the Etheric Weather Engineering techniques developed by Trevor James Constable and his Atmos Engineering group. As a member of this group, I have personally seen how simple Etheric Energy projectors, that do no work in the classical sense, can cause the etheric potentials in the atmosphere to rise to such high concentrations that millions of gallons of water will precipitate from the air for hours at a time.

When these Etheric Energy projectors are motorized, they draw a few hundred watts of electric energy. If the rain produced is dropped behind a dam and then released through a hydro-electric turbine, the electrical energy gain in the system can be enormous, on the order of

100,000 to 1. This method of creating "free energy" is a practical reality today. While I know of no community using this method for supplying its energy needs, it is eminently practicable. This example is theoretical in the sense that it has never been done, but it is a good model of other "free energy" systems under development around the world today.

Because the input to motorize the Etheric Energy projectors is electric and the output from the hydro-electric generators is electric, many people might mistaken this for a so-called "over-unity" system. There is nothing "over-unity" about this situation. Each and every component of the machinery used in this system has operational and frictional losses. The energy tapped by the system is the atmospheric ether and all of the energy gain in the system occurs outside of the equipment. The fact that a small electric input yields a huge electric output does not mean the system is operating "over-unity."

The problem with the "over-unity" concept goes back to the "First Law of Thermodynamics" and its inherent idea about the ability to convert one form of energy into another. This assumption includes the idea that these various conversions are accomplished at known and accepted rates of exchange. The idea of *efficiency* of conversion requires that the various rates of exchange are fixed and act as an upper limit for the calculation of a ratio that approaches one (100%) where the numerator of this fraction is the "output" and the denominator is the "input." Since it is generally agreed that every machine experiences so-called losses, the idea that this ratio could be greater than one is, of course, ridiculous. This, coupled with the assumption in the "Second Law" that all energy systems are closed, (meaning that no new energy can enter the system in-between the "input" and the "output") makes the idea of an "over-unity" system even more impossible than a mere perpetual motion machine. The line of logic embodied in the "Laws of Thermodynamics" is flawless. The problem doesn't exist in the logic, but it does illustrate that logic alone is not enough to reveal the truth. The problem exists in certain interpretations of these "Laws." Let's go back and look at the "First Law" again in light of our "over-unity" discussion. "Energy can be changed from one form to another, but it is neither created nor destroyed." This seems simple enough to understand. Underneath the surface, however, there is an assumption that this also means that energy will not spontaneously appear or disappear from the system. This is also a necessary condition if conservation of energy is to be satisfied LOCALLY as well as UNIVERSALLY.

This discussion becomes relevant, for instance, in describing the operation of the rotating magnet generator, the so called N-machine or Space Power Generator (SPG). Most of the important work in this field has been done by Bruce DePalma and Parmahansa Tewari. The following is a brief summary. The rotation of the magnet sets up two force fields that act at right angles to each other. These two force fields are the radially distributed inertial frame of space (centrifugal force) and the intersecting axially distributed magnetic field of the rotating magnet. The area of magnetized, polarized, inertial space appears to open up a region through which new energy can enter the system. When careful measurements are taken of current flows in the generator and in the external circuit, evidence suggests that electric charges are appearing at the periphery of the generator and disappearing at the center of the generator that do not actually *pass through* the generator. This experimental finding may explain why this configuration of electric generator experiences less mechanical drag than standard generator designs for each unit of electrical output produced. While energy is probably not being created or destroyed in the universal context, it is apparently appearing and disappearing from the machine during operation in the local space. This extra energy can be used to produce useful work in external circuits. Tewari has shown that twice as much

hydrogen can be generated from an electrolysis cell run from the output of a SPG than if the cell is run directly. It is impossible to rationalize the behavior of this style of electric generator with the ideas of simple conversion and local conservation as they are postulated in the "First Law of Thermodynamics."

In a standard generator, if all losses are ignored for the moment, conventional theory says if 550 Ft-Lbs of work are applied to the input shaft in one second, 746 Watts will be delivered at the output. If I blindly believe that the generator simply has the mysterious ability to convert the mechanical energy into electrical energy, I don't ask the following questions: what is the mechanism of this conversion?, where does the torque go?, and where does the electrical energy come from? The apparent observation that the generated current produces a motoring effect that opposes the input torque should not be interpreted as a vindication of the conservation rule, but as an admission that this is an inefficient way to generate electricity. The Space Power Generator experiences far less drag per unit of electrical output than a standard generator.

This opens up a much larger discussion about the validity of the conversion idea all together. Are there actual and universal equivalents between the various forms of heat, mechanical work, and electricity? At this point, all we know for sure are the various measurements that have been taken from the devices that demonstrate these energy translations. For instance, in 1845, James Joule found that if he placed a small paddle wheel in a bucket of water, he had to apply 772.5 foot-pounds of mechanical work to spin the paddle wheel to raise the temperature of one pound of water, one degree Fahrenheit. This has led to very careful calculations that now set this "universal conversion" between mechanical work and heat at 778.26 FT-Lbs = 1 BTU. For paddle wheels in water, this is no doubt true. But what happens if paddle wheels are not used? Is there another method that does not use paddle wheels in water to convert mechanical work to heat that does the job better, with less expenditure of work for the same heat gained? The answer is yes. In fact, there are numerous patents on record to accomplish this. One uses rotating parallel disks, not unlike the design of Tesla's turbine, to heat water with less than half the mechanical expenditure.

Once again, we have entered a new scientific era where the exact equivalence between mechanical work as foot-pounds, electrical work as watt-hours, and heat work as BTU's is not known! A wide variety of physical experiments have demonstrated a broad range of differing energy translation effects. The intellectual edifice of Clausius' conversion idea is crumbling, and no one should allow their thinking to be constrained by it any longer. The results of physical experiments have all but disproved it. The "First Law of Thermodynamics" should be seen only as an outmoded, intellectual MODEL that is not supported by all of the experimental data. Likewise, the idea of "over-unity" should be abandoned by those working on "free energy" systems as it is an intellectual contradiction based both on the belief in conversion and the ability to circumvent it. "Over-unity" is an oxymoron that should be removed from the vocabulary of the alternative science community.

This brings me back to the other problem presented earlier, namely, the nature of heat itself. Is, as Hermann von Helmholtz suggests, heat simply the random motion of molecular matter, or is it something completely different, whose presence causes molecular matter to exhibit random motion? This is a very long and involved exploration that has already been handled masterfully by Rudolf Steiner in March of 1920 and published as his Warmth Course. I will summarize some of these ideas briefly.

The ancient's believed that there were four "elements" that all physical reality was composed of. These were Earth, Water, Air and Fire. In modern language, we can restate this as follows. There are four "states" that all matter appears as. These are solid, liquid, gas and heat. From an etheric science point of view, heat is the fourth state of matter and the transition state between matter and ether. Here is why. The only difference between the appearance of ice, water, or steam, for example, is its temperature or internal heat condition. Heat is absolutely fundamental in all considerations regarding matter because a change in heat is the only element required to bring about a change of state from solid to liquid or from liquid to gas. In solid matter, the "atoms" are very close together and they bind each other in a way that allows them to hold their shape without being in a container. Heat can be added to the solid and its temperature will rise, correspondingly, until the melting point is reached. At this point, adding more heat does not raise its temperature, but rather causes the material to change state as the solid melts into a liquid. Once all of the material is liquified, adding more heat once again causes the temperature to rise. In liquid matter, the "atoms" are less close together and they bind each other in a way that allows the liquid to take the shape of whatever open topped container it is put in. As more heat is added to the liquid, the "atoms" move farther apart until the boiling point is reached. At this point, once again, adding more heat does not raise its temperature, but rather causes the material to change state as the liquid boils into a gas. Once all of the material is gaseous, adding more heat once again causes the temperature to rise. In gaseous matter, the "atoms" are so far apart that they will hold no shape at all and can only be contained by a complete enclosure. As more heat is added to the gas, the "atoms" become so dispersed that eventually, all that is left is the heat. The relationships between heat, temperature, matter and state are quite complex and cannot easily be reduced to simple explanations. Steiner's explorations of these relationships go into great detail, forming a seamless line of logic, backed up by a great deal of experimental data. Anyone interested in the nature of heat should study Rudolf Steiner's Warmth Course.

While this may make no sense to people trained in mechanistic thought processes, it is much closer to the truth about heat than the ideas of Helmholtz, with which Steiner was completely familiar. Helmholtz's idea that the nature of heat can be fully described by the random motions of molecular matter is far too simplistic. It ignores many of the well known behaviors of heat and matter as well as the existence of the Etheric Energy Field. It should be considered an "interesting" historical attempt to describe heat that is not supported by all of the experimental data.

For those who are not familiar with etheric science, it might be useful to review some of the characteristics of the Etheric Energy Field at this time. The Etheric Energy Field is made up of an extremely fine, mass-free fluid. Its activity can be divided into four main levels. These different aspects of the Ether have been called: the Warmth Ether, the Light Ether, the Tone (or Chemical) Ether, and the Life Ether. The Etheric Energy Field, as a whole, penetrates all matter, flows around and through the planet in well defined ways, exhibits elastic characteristics, and spontaneously moves from low concentrations to high concentrations before discharging. Understanding all of these factors has made engineering the weather a practical reality today. Many other amazing technologies also become possible when the ether is fully understood. Likewise, many aspects of today's science that are still confusing eventually become clear.

One area of the greatest confusion lies in the field of electrical science. The entire study of what has been called "static electricity" is just a confusing encounter with the Light Ether as it

7

behaves under certain circumstances. When fully understood, so-called "static electricity" will be seen to be neither static nor electricity. Normal electricity always flows from high potential to low potential and usually requires metallic conductors to flow along. On the other hand, "static electricity" does not discharge in the same way, and readily moves and collects on both conductors and insulators. Because "static electricity" behaves more like ether than electricity, I am going coin a term for this form of energy when it is present in wires and circuits. I call it "ETHERICITY", to distinguish it from electricity all together.

In some ways, ethericity behaves like electricity and in some ways it behaves differently. This has been the source of confusion. Up until now, most people have thought that there was only one kind of energy moving in electrical style circuits. This can now change. Electric appliances are designed to run on the discharge of electric potential from high to low, as in the draining of a battery to power a load. Properly designed circuits employing ethericity run the appliance on the charging phase, as the energy spontaneously moves from low potential to high. Once the behaviors of ethericity are clearly understood, it will be just as easy to run motors and lights from this source as we now do on electricity. In the 1940's, Dr. Wilhelm Reich demonstrated both lighting and motoring effects running on the Etheric Energy Field that he tapped using his "orgone accumulators" and special circuitry. But many other ways have been discovered to harness ethericity. The patent office has many designs of so-called "electrostatic" motors on file that work quite well. They all run on ethericity, including some powered by circuits set up between the ground and a wire suspended high in the air. Many types of capacitors will spontaneously charge up on days with low relative humidity. This, too, is the classic appearance of ethericity. I have seen how an "electrostatic" generator failed to do anything, one humid morning, until the moment that sunlight fell on the metallic surfaces. It then jumped to life. This was one of the most convincing demonstrations I have ever seen that "static electricity" (ethericity) is related to light (the Light Ether).

Here then are some of the known characteristics of ethericity that engineers and inventors should understand:

- 1) Ethericity can be accumulated from the ground or the air at almost any location
- 2) It can be "reflected" down wires (this is *not* conduction)
- 3) Flows of ethericity can be interrupted by diodes and Mosfet type devices
- 4) Its potential can be raised or lowered in air core transformers
- 5) It can be stored in capacitors
- 6) It will operate neon style lighting, when the potential is high enough
- 7) It can create fields of opposing forces in coils and motor windings

"Free energy" is here in the Etheric Energy Field. Etheric Energy can be accumulated without the expenditure of work, and then released in controlled ways to perform work, in properly engineered systems. Understanding this fact presents engineers and inventors the clearest and most direct path to follow. Systems that precipitate heat directly from the ether have already been demonstrated in Dr. Reich's accumulator. Placing one of these accumulators over a moving body of water increases the precipitation of heat dramatically. This is a rich vane of truth waiting to reveal its secrets to the systematic researcher. Likewise, power circuits that run on ethericity for lighting and motive power are waiting to be perfected.

Researchers in the "free energy" field should not concern themselves with the outmoded ideas presented as the so-called "Laws of Thermodynamics". These "Laws" erroneously envision a mechanical universe that mysteriously burst forth (Big Bang) as a fully wound spring that has

8

been unwinding ever since ("In a closed system, entropy does not decrease"). It is a lifeless, empty vision that ignores the Source of the energy it started with and closes the minds of its adherents to the solutions at hand. Learning how to tap the non-thermodynamic forces in nature is the hope of the future. A modern society needs light, heat, and motive power, all of which can be derived directly from the Etheric Energy Field without consuming limited physical resources owned by monopoly interests.

In this society, theoretical science has been elevated to a very high level of prestige. Under this system of belief, the real needs of humanity have not been well served. It is time that these incorrect theories be discarded and that experimental science once again take the leading role in defining the nature of physical reality. Only then will Etheric Science be free to offer its bounty of solutions to a desperate and waiting world.

Bibliography

- 1) The Cancer Biopathy by Dr. Wilhelm Reich
- 2) Man or Matter by Ernst Lehrs
- 3) The Cosmic Pulse of Life by Trevor James Constable
- 4) Warmth Course by Rudolf Steiner.
- 5) Cosmic Formative Forces by Guenter Wachsmuth
- 6) Loom of the Future by Trevor James Constable

MODERN AETHER SCIENCE
An Insight into Nature's Energy Store

© Harold Aspden 1994

In the December 1993 Space Energy Newsletter (Editor: D. A. Kelly, Space Energy Association P.O. Box 11422, Clearwater, FL 24616, USA) there is a letter from the U.S. Department of Energy which says that new concepts in science do not warrant attention until verified by the peer review process. In saying this, the Director of the Division of Advanced Energy Projects notes that this acceptance process is usually initiated by publication of a detailed description of the concept in a widely circulated scientific journal. He also says that "the responsibility for establishing the scientific feasibility of a new idea lies with its proponent".

This, sadly, is the true situation confronting those of us who think it is due time that we harnessed Nature's technique of using energy creatively rather than destructively and reduced our burn-rate of the world's limited hydrocarbon fuel resources.

It is curious, however, to see that someone in a U.S. government unit entitled the 'Office of Basic Energy Science' puts the emphasis on science rather than technology. Technological progress certainly does not depend upon peer review and prior publication in a widely circulated scientific journal. Also, although we like to see an inventor succeed by his own efforts, it is all too true that the concepts disclosed by an inventor are often turned to good account by others, usually without those mighty peers proffering their preliminary endorsement by even allowing publication of what is written by the original inventor. Academic institutions which publish scientific journals filter scientific and technological ideas to preclude publication of those that could be deemed controversial, especially those claiming a major breakthrough and authored by someone 'unknown' to the peer review group.

What is then so difficult to understand is why a government authority that surely has a responsibility extending beyond the publishing propriety of an academic institution is content to sit in the background waiting for the academic world to give its blessing. This concerns advances in the alternative energy field that will, one day and with hindsight, be seen as matching those of the industrial revolution which gave us the modern machine age at a time when peer review by academic scientists was less obstructive.

In our modern world in which technology is exploited by large corporations, those who sit in power in those corporations, as in the Department of Energy in U.S., turn for advice to academic specialists. Having one's own inspectors see something work and give affirmative advice is not sufficient to convince someone on a remote but governing committee who has built his reputation on a contrary belief.

Without any of us even trying to help in advancing the alternative energy field, surely the facts of record on the Hans Coler file in the archives of government dating from a war-time era should not, even now, be ignored by the U.S. Department of Energy.

The inventor was German. He is no longer with us to discharge the 'responsibility' that Director Polansky insists is necessary. He demonstrated to visiting scientists from U.K. and Norway, using components they themselves provided, that it was possible to generate 'free energy' from a magnetic system. Those scientists reported documented authentication by German authorities and

professors and witnessed construction and operation of a viable system. This technology for energy generation from an unknown source attracted interest in Germany at war, when scientific brains were giving priority to the technology of destruction. Yet, an official report which was surely available also to U.S. authorities, was classified in U.K. as an Official Secret. It recommended positive action because the government scientists who had seen the Coler invention working knew it was important - but it seems that the 'peer review' process by those at the time who had responsibilities such as are now vested in a 'Department of Energy' failed to follow through.

We are left, therefore, as individuals having no proprietary interest in that Hans Coler invention, solely motivated by a spirit of wanting to see progress on the energy front that builds on what Coler demonstrated. We know that Coler's discovery, as well as not-unrelated discoveries of other such pioneers, warrant the fullest attention. Magnetism holds an important secret that Coler somehow shared, but the vast resources of modern science have not been deployed on that task. Coler is history - he is dead - he should, in the spirit of the DOE letter, come back and pioneer his own brainchild - it is his responsibility and certainly not that of the U.S. Department of Energy. That department does not want even to hear about the possibility of tapping energy from a source not listed in their guidelines unless, of course, it has been published in a widely circulated scientific journal and has already found peer approval.

It is now some 35 years since I tried to draw attention to the energy structure of the vacuum medium. I was told to get in tune with Einstein's theory and the fact that scientists no longer accept the aether concept - the aether simply does not exist. Yet my research at Cambridge in England proved otherwise. The way in which a gap in a magnetic core develops a reaction to the passage of a magnetic flux means that there is an aether reaction current. Physicists, however, put mathematical equations before energy and the vacuum medium to them is now nothing more than a set of arbitrary symbols which they struggle with in their futile efforts to develop a link between magnetism and gravitation without bringing that real aether and its energy into the act.

About 25 years ago I tried to interest a leading world expert on gravitation and cosmology in my findings, since I had quite definitely solved the problem of linking gravity and magnetism, but that 'aether' was enough for my case to fall on deaf ears. The one gasp of advice that was proffered was the remark: "Well, yes, there is an 'aether' but you must call it 'space-time' if you want to get anywhere with your ideas".

I wrote MODERN AETHER SCIENCE in 1972. That was long before I heard of 'free energy' or Hans Coler. The book did not sell. It seems one is a scientific atheist if one believes in an aether that contains energy - one is expected to believe in 'nothing' that yet needs to be represented by mathematical symbols.

That was a time when I thought my mission in life was restricted to convincing the world that my theory of gravity and the aether was the true interpretation. I had not at that time woken up to the fact that there was real scope for extracting energy from the vacuum. However, 15 years ago I did see that there was a route through plasma discharges involving electrodynamic actions between electrons and heavy ions. I wrote about that but I still had a living to earn and such research could only be a paper proposal - I may have had the 'responsibility to establish the scientific feasibility' of the 'new idea' in the eyes of Director Polansky of the U.S. Department of Energy, but that 'responsibility' was not part of my IBM job description! So I did not develop the proposal, though I now know that other researchers, who seem not to understand

the physics of their discoveries, have built plasma devices which function as power generators operating 'over-unity' in an energy sense.

So, what is the purpose of this present account? My object is to give a little background concerning my book MODERN AETHER SCIENCE. In my open letter to Don Kelly published in the pages following the Polansky DOE letter I reported on three preliminary experiments on 'free energy'. At the end of my report I offered to those subscribing US \$25 or UK £15 for direct purchase from me of my book MODERN AETHER SCIENCE to supply also the first of a series of ENERGY SCIENCE REPORTS that I have in preparation.

I am now sending this letter to those from whom I have received payment and this is my acknowledgment that MODERN AETHER SCIENCE has been shipped separately by surface mail.

As readers will appreciate, one cannot be expected to understand how an electric motor works or how one can be built if one does not have an introductory lesson on the nature of electricity. One needs to talk about lightning discharges from which we see that there is something that can light up the sky and travel in a flash whilst bringing to bear very substantial energy that builds up unseen and then intrudes thunderously in our mechanistic world. With the aether having been discarded by mathematically-minded scientists there is a need for some indoctrination as to the existence and nature of the form of aether that now has to be revived if we are to think of harvesting its energy. My book MODERN AETHER SCIENCE has this objective but the following commentary will serve as a very brief summary.

Gravitation and magnetism are phenomena for which accepted physics has no explanation, unless one is prepared to believe that a 'minus sign' put before a symbol denoting 'energy potential' gives sufficient account of the actions involved. The 'peer review' of physicists judging the merit of scientific proposals concerning unconventional modes of tapping energy from gravitational and magnetic forces is a constrained process, shackled to a belief that space is a void rather than a real aether medium that is overflowing with energy.

The ripples in that vast sea of energy that pervades space cause that overflow to manifest gravitational and magnetic effects and even the consequent creation of matter, but our 'peers' judge this to be heretical because they say we inhabit a void and because a 'minus sign' suffices to explain how Newton's apple fell to Earth.

The minus sign signifies the release of energy from 'nothing', because when whatever is represented by the minus sign sheds energy we get some positive energy in our real non-aethereal world. Physicists recognise only what they can see and if something appears in the world they can see, apparently from nowhere, so it must be that the condition of what they can see is really negative because, if it changes, something positive in an energy sense emerges. The vast sea of energy that prevades space is therefore written off as a minus symbol and so the whole structure of the aether is ignored as if, because we can see through a glass window, we can pretend that the glass need not exist and ignore the fact that it has a crystal structure.

We need to labour over this point because physicists (and, indeed, others with any sense) are so adamant in saying we cannot get energy from something that does not exist, but physicists go further by persisting in believing that everything is degenerating. They fail to recognize that Nature, on a grander scale, performs a creative role by which it brings its overflow of energy into matter form by creating protons and electrons. People in general would surely

agree with the proposition that if the world exists, it was created and so, unless the laws of physics can change with time, which seems improbable, physics must somehow allow a constructive act by which energy can be transformed from a degenerate to an ordered state.

What one might think or believe, however, is not that important when confronted with the true facts of magnetism. On a small scale Nature responds to the movement of matter to allow some of that aether energy overflow to polarize a magnet. This brings us into the quantum world, the action bearing the name of Planck, and that elusive constant of physics termed the fine-structure constant. However, that takes us deeper into the energy physics at the photon level and our sights are focused upon 'free energy' from the most expedient route, namely magnetism. The ferromagnetic state is polarized by quantum energy interaction and the activity of the aether is at the very heart of the every atom of matter. The quantum states of most atoms are set by a quasi-state of ordering linking to the 'spins' of the aether medium itself, whereas the magnet is rather special in involving a more effective collective ordering, the onset of which releases energy to our material world. To tap the 'free energy' resource from the aether we simply need to strengthen that ordering effect in the ferromagnet.

Reverting, however, to Newton's apple and that 'minus sign', one must not think that if an apple is lifted from the ground one is storing positive energy in the gravitational field, much as one does in the mechanical system in stretching a spring. One can see the spring. It is part of our real material system. The stress energy is measurable from that condition of strain. The lifting of that apple means that we have given energy back to the aether, to something we cannot see. It is the same with magnetism. Here we can put current in a solenoid and feed energy into the inductance of that coil. It may have vacuum as its core and then that energy is stored in that vacuum - in nothing according to the physicist, though he pretends otherwise by referring to a so-called 'field' - but in the aether in reality. How is that energy stored? Does it disperse? If it disperses how is the energy then recovered as the solenoidal current is switched off? Surely the aether 'dynamo' is then at work. It is as if the aether takes in power by reacting as a secondary winding with a load for increase of magnetization but assumes a primary role in feeding back energy when that current is switched off. How can it do that if it does not exist? How does it do it if it does exist, and how can we interfere to our advantage?

This is what the experimental work on free energy is all about, namely harnessing action in an aether that few recognize exists, but which needs to be fully understood if one is to have the optimum success.

My book MODERN AETHER SCIENCE describes that aether and my many scientific papers of public record show the strength of the verifying analysis, but the world will, no doubt, need to see a machine that runs on aether energy before believing what I have written. Even then there will be many who try to find their own alternative theory for such a phenomenon.

However, as I come to report my experimental progress I will presume an understanding of the aether terminology I use, and I shall not be disguising the energy actions by a dressing of impressive mathematical mumbo-jumbo. Hence my strategy in urging acquisition of MODERN AETHER SCIENCE before reading my experimental reports.

Harold Aspden 31 December 1993
Sabberton Research, P.O. Box 35, Southampton SO9 7BU England,
Tel: int+44-703-769-361 Fax: int+44-703-769830

THE OVER-UNITY RELUCTANCE MOTOR EXPERIMENT

One can build an Adams motor and prove that over-unity operation is a reality. However, most academic researchers would deem this to be a waste of time since it is recognized as being a 'crank' pursuit seen as an attempt to create a 'perpetual motion' machine.

My task, experimentally, therefore is to present something far more straightforward that can be assembled and tested in a school physics laboratory or at home using a standard transformer kit costing a few dollars. All one then needs is an instrument to read amps and volts and a variable mains power voltage supply.

I did this experiment to satisfy myself that what I said at the Denver meeting in Colorado holds up. I am glad I did the experiment because it told me something new and important.

I had thought that, in order to access free energy from ferromagnetism, I would need to power the magnetic core above the 'knee' of the B-H curve, where the magnetism builds up by the atomic electron spins being forced into alignment rather than merely flipping through 180° . Here I have to be careful because I have a very thorough grounding in ferromagnetism and I should avoid terminology unfamiliar to your readers.

It must be said, however, that there is no way forward for anyone involved in real research on free energy from ferromagnetism unless that person understands the physics of the subject. The hit and miss ventures of those who build permanent magnet 'free energy' machines and get them to work anomalously only guide others equipped with the right training to take the research forward. I say 'only' because this is a simple situation. Those with the knowledge do not want to believe that 'free energy' is possible. Those without the knowledge cannot prove their case, because they cannot speak the scientific language that applies. However, once on the scent and believing in what is possible, but not knowing why, those 'experts' on magnetism will move rapidly in advancing the technology in the real commercial world.

So, here I aim to point at an introductory lesson or experiment and, to back this up, I commend those attempting this to read about the basic principles of magnetism as explained by an engineer - not a physicist! The best book that I know of for this purpose is one authored by a professor who was one of the examiners of my Ph.D. thesis. His book tells the reader in simple language how magnetism develops as domains reorientate their action and further his book tells the reader about anomalous energy aspects, including the unsolved mystery of extremely high loss anomalies (a factor of 10 greater than theory predicts). I refer to a book sold in students paperback edition by the Van Nostrand Company

(Princeton, New Jersey), published in 1966 and authored by F. Brailsford under the title: 'Physical Principles of Magnetism'.

If the reader belongs to a university and that book can be accessed from the library, then that reader will, I feel, after performing the following experiment, be able to make sense of the 'free energy' opportunities now confronting the world of magnetism. The Brailsford book is not, of course, necessary as a preliminary to the experiment but it can help in onward thinking. Indeed, as an aside, I mention that when I spoke recently about the Floyd Sweet device to one of our mutual collaborators here in U.K. I was gratified to hear that he, too, has a copy of the Brailsford book.

The experiment is simplicity itself, considering the energy issue involved. Take a standard transformer kit and assemble the laminations so that there is what is virtually an air gap in the core. Be prepared to reassemble the core partially with different width gaps. I cut pieces of card of 0.25 mm thickness and performed the experiment in ten repeat assembly stages, using 0 to 9 card thicknesses.

The idea of the experiment is to create an excited core state in which there is a known amount of energy stored in the air gap. If the a.c. frequency is 60 Hz this means that in 1/240th of a second an amount of energy is supplied as inductance energy that can meet the needs of the air gap. Note that I consistently made estimates of energy that were worst-case from our 'free energy' perspective. Therefore, the extra energy supplied that is stored as inductance in the ferromagnetic core itself, rather than the air gap, is ignored. The plan is to compare that energy with the mechanical energy that we could take from the gap if the poles thereby formed were to close together and do work as if in an electromagnet. Textbooks tell us that the energy determined by the flux density in the gap represents that mechanically available energy.

So, we need, for each air gap thickness, to measure the flux that crosses the air gap. We do this by wrapping a search coil around the part of the core that is on the side of the air gap remote from the magnetizing coil and measuring the voltage induced in that search coil. It may be verified, by having a separate search coil on the magnetizing coil side of the gap, that the flux traversing the gap and linking the test search coil is nearly the same but a little less than that on the magnetizing side. So, in our worst-case analysis we may rely on the mechanical energy calculated from the weaker flux measured in the test search coil. That flux must be less than the flux in the gap.

By adjusting the current at successive gap thicknesses to ensure that the voltage sensed by the test search coil is always the same, we then know that the gap energy available as mechanical work increments linearly with gap thickness. For each such measurement we record the current registered as input to the magnetizing coil.

If we now multiply the current by the voltage measured, allowing for the turns ratio as between the magnetizing winding and the test search coil, we can find the volt-amp input, which in the absence of losses is the reactance or inductive power. This allows us to compare the power output potentially available mechanically from such an air gap, if it were in a reluctance motor structure, compared with the reactive power supplied to set up that potential.

It is found that the mechanical power is appreciably greater than the input power, thereby demonstrating that 'free energy' is to be expected.

Now, one does not even need to worry about the calculations to find the reactive power input by multiplying volts and amps and allowing for the coil turns ratio. It suffices to plot the curve of current for different air gap thicknesses. Since the flux crossing the gap has fixed amplitude, as measured by a constant voltage reading, that means linear increase in mechanical power with air gap, so if the current were to increase at a rate that curves upwards with increasing air gap we would see a discrepancy representing a loss but if it curves downwards then that means that there is a 'free energy' source.

The experiment is very positively in showing the downward curve and so gives the 'free energy' answer, but, to my surprise, with the coil arrangement shown in Fig. 2, I found that the 'free energy' becomes available well below the knee of the B-H curve at quite normal flux densities! Even at one fifth of magnetic saturation levels the excess free energy potential can exceed the input power and give a twice-unity factor of performance. It is, therefore, no wonder that at higher flux densities one can aim for a 700% performance, as the Adams motor has shown.

On reflection, the reason, of course, is that magnetism set up by a coil on a magnetic core progresses as flux around the core circuit by virtue of a 'knock-on' effect owing to internal domain flux rotation. This is essential and is usually attributed to a flux leakage reaction, as otherwise magnetism remote from a magnetizing coil could not navigate the bends in the core. That flux rotation, which is dominant above the knee of the B-H curve, for a system with a magnetizing coil coextensive with the length of the core, is brought into effect at low flux densities if the coil only embraces one part of the core.

I regard the experiment just described as a crucial experiment proving the viability of over-unity-performing reluctance drive motors and believe it should become standard in all teaching laboratories concerned with electrical engineering and eventually, as physicists see the aether in its new light, also in all high school physics laboratories.




Fig. 1

Test transformer with 0-9 cardboard layers defining width of pole gap.




Fig. 2

Reluctance test for constant flux amplitude in pole gap as function of gap width in card thicknesses. Straight line shows reluctance energy in pole gap as a current referenced on 76.9 V calibration for 3 card gap width. Curve shows much lower actual current input required.

POWER FROM ROOM HEAT!

by Harold Aspden

The 'Super Space Magnetic Power Discovery' reported by Robert Adams (Nexus, June-July 1995, p. 55) coincides with a discovery I have made concerning magnets. I am using barium ferrite magnets in my own motor research and I am finding excess power. Robert Adams has magnets more than one hundred times stronger, so there is great promise ahead!

My discovery, however, is the link between the retentive properties of a magnet and superconductivity. Magnets are known to keep their magnetic power indefinitely if left undisturbed, the loss of power being less than 1 part in 100,000 per year. Current flow in a closed circuit loop develops a magnetic field. Superconductivity seems also to sustain the perpetual motion of electron currents.

It is well known that a magnet can convert heat into electricity, but the scientific world seems to be totally ignorant of the fact that regeneration of electricity from heat within a magnet is what causes it to sustain its permanent magnetism. Magnets have been used in MHD technology (the 1960s work on magnetohydrodynamics) which generates an electrical current output from the flow of hot ionized gas through a magnetic field in the mutually orthogonal direction. Also, in metal, the heat energy transported by electrons through a magnetic field can convert into a transverse flow of current that derives its power by cooling the metal (known as the Nernst Effect).

In fact, however, a magnet itself is a physical manifestation of room temperature superconductivity, which really is a process involving magnetic induction and electrical regeneration by conversion of heat attributable to current flow through a normal resistance.

Nature's secret governing this phenomenon concerns gravitation and the dynamically-resonant role played by the 'supergraviton' as a mediator in conserving energy in the inertial balance of thermally-activated molecules when impacted by electron current. The supergraviton has a mass close to 102 atomic units and this is the common denominator shared by the group-molecular compositions of warm superconductors and magnets.

Readers who may doubt this should weigh the following evidence. It is beyond belief that my discovery of this curious relationship between the compositions of warm superconductors and magnets can be fortuitous. The excess power in my motor is in some measure extracting heat from the barium ferrite magnets and, as I am collaborating with Robert Adams, it is appropriate to bring this news into the NEXUS readership forum.

This is, incidentally, not technology, but science, yet science which tells us that the 'New Energy' dream of power

generation from environmental heat is already with us, but we have somehow ignored Nature's message. By assuming that the dream can never come true, experts having the research funding have instead befriended the devil who delivers power and pollution from fossil or nuclear fuel.

Typical warm superconductors:

La_2CuO_4 of molecular weight 405 = 4(101.25)

Sr_2CuO_4 of molecular weight 303 = 3(101)

$\text{EuBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_6$ of molecular weight 713 = 7(101.85)

Typical magnets:

$\text{BaFe}_{12}\text{O}_{19}$ of molecular weight 1113 = 11(101.18)

Alnico: molecular weights of atomic groups:

AlNiCo_2 203.53 = 2(101.76)

AlCuFe_2 202.21 = 2(101.10)

Al_2NiFe_7 503.58 = 5(100.72)

Ferromagnetic and room temperature superconductor

Polypropylene oxide: $[\text{CH}_2\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)\text{O}]_n$ 406 = 4(101.5)

Note that anisotropic Alnico-type magnets have an alloy composition by weight that is 8% Al, 13.5% Ni, 24% Co and 3% Cu, this being a 13:10:18:2 atomic mix of Al, Ni, Co and Cu, the rest being iron. Of these, 9 Al atoms occupy the AlNiCo_2 combination and 2 Al atoms form in the AlCuFe_2 combination. The remaining 2 Al atoms form Al_2NiFe_7 .

Readers may find my recently published (May 1995) GB Patent Application No. 2,283,361 enlightening as a way forward towards this new technology. It is entitled 'Refrigeration and Electrical Power Generation' and relates to a solid-state project which complements my motor research.

Should these comments interest an established R&D organization based in Australia I invite contact with a view to developing and exploiting in Australia my earlier and related Australian Patent No. 622,239.

Enquiries in writing should be sent to me c/o Sabberton Publications, P.O. Box 35, Southampton SO16 7RB, England.

(17 July 93)

SWITCHED RELUCTANCE MOTORS

On April 16, 1993, the first day of the New Energy Symposium in Denver on which participants heard about the 'free energy' motor of New Zealander Robert Adams, the Financial Times in U.K. published an article on 'switched reluctance motors'. This article described how a U.K. company Switched Reluctance Drives Limited has become the world leader in that field.

The significance of this as a news item is that there has been a rapid convergence on the transition point at which the electronics needed to control the reluctance motor becomes so cheap that it is predicted that induction motors will soon be replaced on a large scale.

Those of us interested in the 'free energy' theme should see this as opening the door for the new energy technology based on the principles used in the Adams motor. There is a window of opportunity which has been opened by the arrival of the conventional switched reluctance motor at the breakeven point where it can replace the conventional motor on a cost comparison basis. This new kind of motor is one which relies on the magnetic pull across the pole faces to set up the drive torque. It is not one needing force interaction between magnetic field and current in a winding. Accordingly, this is the technology of the Adams motor which allows the extra pull powered by the 'free energy' drawn through the ferromagnetic flux-rotation of the quantum spins to be accessed.

In the light of the report in the Financial Times and the recent media attention to the Adams motor in Australia I have, on my return from the Denver meeting, drawn the Adams motor to the attention of the U.K. power industry magazine 'Electric Review'. As a result their reporter on new technology published an article entitled 'Reluctance motor has 100%-plus efficiency' in 9th July 1993 issue.

The article should arouse U.K. engineering interest in the 'free energy' possibility, since I have shown the design feature by which one can understand the 'free energy' source and so calculate its input. As might be expected the leading U.K. 'switched reluctance expert' consulted on this proposition has been reluctant to concede that one might go above 100% in electrical generating efficiency, but in the light of the next comment one wonders if a crack has now opened in the establishment defences.

by H. ASPDEN Ph.D. BSc. FIEE.

ETMechE, MInstP.C. Eng, C Phys.

Department of Electrical Engineering,

University of Southampton. SO9 5NH, England

SWITCHED RELUCTANCE MOTORS: THE ADAMS MACHINE

Readers of my contribution on pp. 7-8 of the September 1993 issue of New Energy News may like to have some clarification as to why the subject of my U.S. Patent Serial No. 4,975,608 differs from the Adams machine. Essentially, the distinction depends upon whether or not the rotor poles include permanent magnets.

The underlying principle of both machines is the use of the very powerful mutual magnetic attraction of rotor and stator poles in a machine having salient poles on both rotor and stator. If permanent magnets are built into the pole structure of the machine to strengthen the force action so as to pull the poles into register, that means that there must be a way of weakening that action as the poles separate. Alternatively, if the poles are not 'pre-polarized' in this way and the magnetic flux is activated by putting power on an electromagnet, that power must be switched on during the pole approach phase and switched off as the poles recede. The former version features in the Adams machine and the latter features in the machine I propose, though my design does include permanent magnets in a stator circuit to provide magnetic bias in a way that features in early designs of magnetic amplifier. That bias is essential if one is to tap the zero-point energy.

The Adams machine offers a very special advantage. By building a machine which uses permanent magnets to provide the flux bridging the pole gap, which is where the real mechanical work is done, and by controlling the force by weakening and, indeed, actually reversing the flux in the stator poles, Adams achieves a very economic effect. Note that the active region of the stator pole is precisely the region embraced by the stator winding. The power supplied to that winding really only needs to be sufficient to cancel the field action of the permanent magnet that penetrates across the gap to be in that stator region and so the current drawn by the winding need not be excessive because the MMF drawn from the magnet and reaching into the stator is negligible compared with the MMF absorbed in the gap. The stator windings are wrapped just around the pole region that governs the action and so there is no field leakage that needs to be overcome by feeding input power.

Of course, the machine has to be switched and the usual inductance problems arise, but given that that is a routine circuit design problem there seems no reason why the Adams motor cannot be developed rapidly for general use.

When I made my proposals in my patent I thought it best to avoid designs in which a permanent magnet could be part of a flux path subjected to alternating flux variations. My suspicion was that the magnet would eventually demagnetise or be the seat of losses generated by the a.c. Accordingly, my proposal followed the other route and my invention was directed to the current switching problem for minimal loss and optimum commutation.

This concern may prove unwarranted as we see the Adams motor running with a long time span and readers may, in this connection, see support for this and welcome having their attention drawn to the Jones motor, the subject of a 'non-orthodox' proposal presented at the 1988 Symposium on New Energy.

Technology held in Hull, Quebec under the auspices of the Planetary Association for Clean Energy.

The paper of record at pp. 167-182 in the proceedings of that meeting, which, incidentally, appears just ahead of a paper by Don Kelly entitled "Permanent Magnet Motors", discloses a technique for converting a standard automobile alternator, which is a three-phase generator having salient permanent magnet rotor pole pieces, into a rather special form of motor. Jones found that by rewiring the machine and using a switching technique for supplying power in a way which developed pole repulsion as the poles separated he obtained exceptional torque properties and extremely high efficiency as a motor.

Note that that automobile alternator did not have a salient pole stator, such as we see in the Adams machine. The winding was formed in the usual slot distribution. However, if it had had that feature, then I believe that Jones would have implemented the Adams machine directly. As it was, and here I must be careful as I do not want to imply that Gareth Jones was really claiming 'free energy' and 'over-unity' operation, I distinctly recall my own discussions with him about his belief in the aether as a source of energy. The efficiency of that Jones motor was abnormal and Jones knew it! Indeed, after explaining why his machine functions differently from a conventional motor, he wrote in his paper:

"The result of this phenomenon is that, when the field current is increased, the input power decreases because of the increased back EMF, but the output power increases because of the additional force produced between the two fields, and therefore, the efficiency of the Jones motor is proportional to the field current.

This characteristic, as far as is known, is unique to motors operating on this principle, known as the Jones principle, and it was to demonstrate this phenomenon that the motor was originally designed. The efficiency of a motor can be increased by increasing the field current, and this phenomenon can be demonstrated until the back EMF exceeds the applied EMF over a portion of the cycle, and the machine acts as a generator. When this occurs, the speed decreases, reducing the back EMF and the machine reverts to motor action again. This cycle occurs in a very short time interval, and to all intents and purposes, the machine speed is constant."

Bearing in mind that Gareth Jones would hardly be projecting aether theory in explaining the operation of his motor if his experience of its operation was in line with orthodox principles, I really think the Jones machine is worth drawing to attention.

His paper explains how an automobile alternator can be converted to become such a motor and includes the control circuit for the switching operation. The way forward in building a version the Adams machine may, therefore, be to dismantle an automobile alternator following the Jones guidance. This provides the permanent magnet rotor and Jones describes the circuit control. Before rewiring the stator the stator laminations should have slotted portions cut away to form the salient poles and one should then have a viable Adams machine.

I have heard that one of our colleagues in U.K. has built something that verifies that the Adams device works and, from Adams himself, have heard of authentication reported from a responsible U.S. source. Accordingly, the way forward to 'free energy' is now open and our task is clear.

THE IMPENDING ENERGY CRISIS

© Harold Aspden, 1993

We are on the verge of a major breakthrough on the energy front and an impending energy crisis of the kind that few scientists could contemplate.

I am inspired, or rather provoked, into writing this note by a personal communication sent to me in mid November 1993 by Don Kelly, the Editor of the Space Energy Association Newsletter issued from his base: P.O. Box 11422, Clearwater, FL. 34616, USA, a quarterly communication to subscribers which has for some time now provided an international link between a number of 'free energy' enthusiasts.

Don follows the activities of those willing to communicate information about their researches on energy-generating devices which are, by any orthodox scientific standards, seen as encroaching upon the impossible.

For my part, having a formal scientific background, but long ago seeing that physics, in following Einstein and Dirac, had gone off in the wrong direction, I found I had put myself in 'no man's land', somewhere between the world of the 'crank' inventor and the abstract world of the 'scientific' philosopher. That intermediate ground, of course, is the real world, where energy is the governing power, but where people are so busy earning a living that they have no time to think about the noise made by the 'crank' engineer or the elegant mathematical formulations of physicists immersed in thought about 'relativity'.

So, being a realist and also a thinker, I went about earning my living but found time to write books and papers about the real energy world.

One of my books was branded as the 'Physics of Fairyland' by a now-famous professor who at the time was writing about a universe that could go into time reversal mode, albeit long after all our fossil fuel sources have run out. Such a review was intended to suppress any possible interest in my ideas and that will explain why little is known today about my book 'Modern Aether Science'.

Whilst we wait for that critic's own work to be confirmed in some ten or so billion years time, my theory, which promised a route to a source of new energy that was available to us then and now, was cast aside as a 'fairy tale'.

My book was dated 1972. In its introduction, I explained how:

'There was impatience at the difficulties of fathoming and charting that sea of energy permeating space - the aether. And so, many pretended that the aether does not exist and did so by abstract mathematical formulations.'

I went on to write about the evidence of the existence of the aether and its creative powers in absorbing energy into a synchronized microscopic orbital motion of its inherent electricity and then shedding it by gravitational effects, magnetic effects and in matter creation and spin energy.

I pointed to the thunderball as evidence of aether in spin because thunderballs can move through the metal skin of aircraft or through walls in buildings as if they do not exist and yet they can become unstable and then shed energy measured in billions of joules per cubic metre.

Understanding the aether is the only way forward for true science, unless, in the alternative, that understanding is overtaken by the crisis of an energy breakthrough which gives us energy from 'nowhere'. The crisis to be confronted is not just that of an industrial world encountering, in energy, something akin to a gold rush. The phase-out of nuclear, gas and oil power, as 'free energy' transformers and rotating machines take over, can indeed be traumatic, once the rush begins. Then the physicist, having declared the possible as impossible based on physical laws that are at the heart of his or her beliefs, when confronted with this scenario will be overwhelmed by events. A machine that works and defies the laws of physics is not something one can treat as a theory subject to 'peer review'. Physicists will be left standing still by an engineering whirlwind.

So, to come back to Don Kelly and his valiant efforts to inform on 'free energy' progress, I wish to emphasize something that is of the utmost importance. Because too much is said that is vague on the issue of where the 'free energy' might come from. Don, in his communication, now talks about a new energy breakthrough, one which rivals that of Robert Adams, by being a solid-state implementation of a 'free energy' device. He asserts that the energy source is connected with the Casimir Effect and the Van der Waals Effect, trying to keep to terminology in line with the physicist's vocabulary. These are mere words, concepts which lack the quantitative connection and which at best presume that a weak energy anomaly may have a link with observation of what is a strong effect.

Don, I know, wants to share sight of the energy world that surely lies ahead, but the power of the aether to unleash its energy must not be underestimated by suggesting connection with such weak effects. The aether energy is not of a trivial nature. It warrants bold description connected with the positive coupling between charge motion in the vacuum medium and electrons in orbit in a ferromagnet or charge in the vacuum itself that is involved in setting up the vacuum spin. Ferromagnetism is used in our electric power generators and is suited to levels of energy that power our prime movers. The phenomena named after Casimir and Van der Waals bear no relationship to such energy requirements.

It is ferromagnetism that powers the Adams motor and vacuum spin that powers the thunderball and, on a larger scale, accounts for the rotation of the Earth and the Sun! We have reason to expect to tap aether energy through both of these routes, each in both solid-state and dynamic technology.

I have joined forces with Robert Adams because he has opened the door on the demonstrable motor that runs on aether power. We can now imagine ships being propelled by an energy source generated by cooling the space through which the Earth moves at cosmic speed. I am, however, attentive to the energy breakthrough which Don mentions as that of Dr. Wingate Lambertson, for which a 378 per cent efficiency is reported, and which is said to be a solid-state 'cermet' device, the design and construction of which are yet to be disclosed. I suspect that the latter will involve the vacuum spin or rather the 'aether spin' property that I suggest above, one induced by setting up a radial electric field in a conductor, much as applies in the so-called 'N' machines introduced to us by Bruce de Palma.

In short, I declare that the 'free energy' world has two and only two ways of tapping into that aether coupling to gain power from the 'vacuum', one is via the radial electric field route which induces vacuum spin and the other is via the orbital coupling between the vacuum and atomic electrons in a ferromagnet.

Robert Adams has unleashed the evidence of the latter process and, no doubt, Wingate Lambertson may be about to introduce us to the former process.

This is the real beginning of something that began long ago, even with the work of Tesla in USA and later Hans Coler in Germany, but somewhere we were led astray by philosophers who embraced Einstein's doctrines.

Now we are about to be part of a new energy world that brings crisis directly into the mind world of the physicist and the crisis of change to something better for those more directly concerned with energy generation.

For those of us who are obliged to watch events but want to learn, or those having scientific training who are inclined to disbelieve, I can but suggest reading, what my critic termed a 'fairytale', my book 'Modern Aether Science'. It is not about the Big Bang concept of creation, but it will tell you how the stars and planets were created from aether energy. It is not about four-space in a void, but about a plenum full of energy and electricity, it being philosopher Bertrand Russell who noted that motion in a plenum is possible, especially rotational motion and especially if it has always existed. It is not a theory based on the work of famous thinkers such as Albert Einstein or Louis de Broglie, but one that owes more to the forgotten genius of their contemporaries. The book will tell you about Alexandre Veronnet, a French Astronomer who is of record as being presented by the Prix Lalande by the French Academie des Sciences on the same occasion in 1929 when de Broglie received the Poincare Medal honouring his work on wave mechanics. Veronnet's writings about an aether populated by 'etherons' moving in orbit, in synchronism and with the Planck quantum of angular motion, have, sadly, not survived in the contest of competition with the mathematical abstractions of modern quantum theory. Indeed, knowing nothing of Veronnet's work, I had to reinvent such a model of the aether, in the early 1950s from my own research into the nature of ferromagnetism. However, Veronnet, has my respect for the prior discovery. It is Veronnet's 'etherons', the charges I term 'lattice particles', that provide the action feeding the 'over-unity' energy input to the Adams motor. Anyone who really seeks to understand the physics of creation and the energy properties of the vacuum medium will find a developing respect for Alexandre Veronnet as they see Albert Einstein receding from the picture.

The book explains the true nature of inertia as a natural response of electrical charge in conserving energy and the true nature of the electrodynamic action between charge sharing that universal synchronous aether motion that accounts for gravitation. The latter unification eluded Einstein, because he turned his back on three-space aether theory and opted for an imaginary four-space in which gravitation is attributed to distortion of what cannot be imagined.

If the reader does not want to believe in an aether that can be the seat of energy in spin, let the reader try to explain how the phenomenon we refer to as the 'thunderball' can float in air and move in the opposite direction to the wind, besides moving intact through walls of buildings or the metal skin of an aircraft. If that is unbelievable, the reader can seek reassurance from the experimental observation of such effects in artificially created 'plasma fireballs' as described by Japanese researchers in Nature, 350, pp. 139-141 (1991).

If the reader wishes to take a more positive view on vacuum spin as involving substantial energy storage and is inclined to want to know how it can be calculated then he or she will find my theory justifying an energy density of between 2 and 5 billion joules per cubic metre presented in the paper at pp. 179-184 of the book 'Electrostatics 1983', U.K. Institute of Physics Conference Series No. 66. Alternatively, my 1980 book 'Physics Unified' can be consulted. Copies of both 'Modern Aether Science' and 'Physics Unified' are still available from Sabberton Publications, P.O. Box 35, Southampton SO9 7BU, England.

At this time, with the technology needed to harness this aether energy having now to evolve rapidly from the base we hear about from Don Kelly, one can but surmise how the rival vacuum spin and ferromagnetic routes will compete in the race for industrial exploitation.

I have put my effort into the ferromagnetic route and, with Robert Adams having shown us a motor that others have reproduced, and with the high performance potential now known to be possible, I am very optimistic that this will be the leading technique. My reason is that, though it does involve building a rotating machine, it will involve design principles with which electrical engineers are familiar. Given magnetic core configuration, core composition, levels of magnetic excitation and an understanding of underlying principles, the development of machine applications should be straightforward.

To begin to understand those principles one only needs to assemble and reassemble a transformer having an air gap of progressively increasing thickness. Use a primary winding on a limb removed from the air gap and a search coil or secondary winding closely adjacent the air gap where it can measure magnetic flux traversing the gap. For each test with successive thicknesses of air gap, put just enough voltage on the primary winding to obtain the same magnetic flux across the gap. This means that the reluctance energy or inductance energy fed in over a quarter cycle at the power frequency used will increment linearly with gap thickness.

The test is then to plot measured primary current against that gap thickness. If the current measured curves upwards with increasing gap thickness one is feeding more energy into the machine than is being stored in that air gap. If the current versus gap relationship is a straight line then one has perfect energy balance and the energy in the gap, which is a measure of the mechanical work potential available from pole closure, will exactly equal the inductance energy fed in. If the current curves down and falls below the straight line, then one is witnessing a 'free energy' condition, because there is a mysterious energy input from some external source.

Do the experiment. It is as easy as assembling a transformer using a standard kit available for a few dollars. A 100 volt-amp transformer with prewound primary and an unwound secondary suffices. It will be found that the curve turns downwards at levels of applied voltage and so flux density less than half those applicable for normal operation as a transformer. Hence it is no wonder that once permanent magnets are brought to bear in a reluctance motor that mechanical power surplus to the 100% power input can be extracted as poles are excited and deexcited in a special switching sequence.

I conclude by thanking Don Kelly for provoking this enthusiastic commentary on the aether as a source of 'free energy' and by thanking Robert Adams for the stirring way in which he has, with the help of NEXUS, announced his motor innovation.

28 July 1993

On the Nature of Electrical Induction

by Bruce dePalma

"It is the conceptualizations which are important."

- A. S. Eddington
Fundamental Theory, 1944

The phenomena of electrical induction which are fundamental to electrical science have long since passed into everyday experience. Recently the nature of this fundamental principle has been re-examined in the light of experiments with electrical machines, which, in their operation violate the conservation laws of charge and energy.

In my early schooling (M. I. T. class of 1958) I was struck by the attention paid to magnetism, magnetic circuits, electrical machinery and magnetic properties of materials. No attention was given to magnetism as a source of understanding of the machines and apparatus which employed it. This attitude was forced on a student because the consensus was: all that needed to be known about magnetism was known because electrical machines obeyed the conservation laws. I.e. one way of generating electricity was as good as another since all machine efficiencies could be "improved" or designed up to the point of a maximum efficiency of 100%.

To point out that electrical efficiency measurements are based on the "mechanical equivalent of heat", 746 watts/horsepower, measured with a calorimeter and paddles by James Watt (inventor of the steam engine) in the late 18th century; a number suspect both in its relevance and accuracy, and sensitivity to experimental vagaries, was heresy.

The concern of this paper is not with all the experiments which have demonstrated anomalous "over unity" energy production, but with the operation of machines which clearly demonstrate violation of energy and charge conservation laws through continuous production of electrical power in excess of the electrical power used to drive and/or energize the machine.

The experimental performance of over-unity machines, the N-machine and Space Power Generators are substantially covered in the literature and are not repeated here. References (1 - 7)

The basic question is: do electrons flow in a conducting circuit impelled by magnetic forces, or, are the electrons created in situ by the magnetic forces, collected by the conducting wire, and then impelled to flow in the appropriate direction by the well known force interaction of electrons and magnetism?

Einstein treated electromagnetic induction as simply a relationship between two members, i.e. the magnet and the wire. He would ask, "what is the point?"

The purpose of the experiment is a simple demonstration of one of the effects of the od field of a rotating object. The demonstration may easily be repeated using any one of a variety of rotating objects, motor flywheels, old gyrocompasses, etc. The rotating mass of the flywheels used in these experiments is $29 \frac{1}{2}$ pounds. The rotational speed of 7600 r.p.m. is easily accessible. The effect is roughly proportional to the radius and mass of the rotating object and to the square of the rotational speed.

Finer measurements can be made using an external electrically powered tuning fork oscillator and an electronic frequency counter. In this case the inertial anisotropy of the od field of a rotating object can be much more quickly and precisely measured. Field strength lines can be plotted along contours of constant frequency shift for the two orientation conditions of fork vibration direction parallel to, and perpendicular to, the axis of rotation of the test object.

Conclusions and Observations: The proper conclusions and evaluations of the above experiment will affect present conceptions of Cosmology. Before this can happen, simple tests must be performed to show the existence of a new phenomenon. It is hoped the apparatus for the performance of these tests is widely enough available to lead to quick verification.

Bruce dePalma

1) Eric Laithwaite, John S. Wolfe, Edward Delves, Bruce dePalma

Appendix: Axial moment of inertia measurements of constrained gyroscopes, pendulum experiments demonstrating anisotropic inertia of a rotating body. (available from Bruce dePalma)

May 20, 1996

To: Paul Williams
WBAI UFO Desk
From: Michio Kaku

Dear Paul,

Sorry that I wasn't able to get back to you before your interview, but the stationary store was closed. So I just picked up your fax today. So my comments may be too late for your interview.

A few comments:

Mr. Adams is proud of the fact that his motor violates almost every known law of modern physics, including those of Einstein and the laws of thermodynamics, i.e. the last 200 years of physics. Reading his paper, I think his theory also violates the quantum theory and the electrodynamics of Maxwell and Faraday. In fact, it's hard to find a law of physics that is not violated by his theory.

Since I am always open-minded about things, that in itself is not a reason to totally discard his theory. However, we must therefore look at his claims that much more carefully!!

The centerpiece of his theory, as I understand it, is a revival of the discredited ether theory. Apparently, he wants to extract energy from the ether by using rotating magnets, thereby violating the first law of thermodynamics (the conservation of mass and energy). This is an ancient idea, going back centuries but was most popular in the 1800s, but was disproved by the Michaelson-Morley experiment and Einstein's relativity theory. Ether, which was supposed to be a magical substance which pervaded the universe, has never been measured in our laboratories.

So I would say that his theories are not original and are mostly likely wrong, i.e. either he is next Einstein and Newton rolled up into one, or he is a crackpot.

However, the proof is in the pudding. He has to show a blueprint of this machines, show that they in fact generate energy from nothing, and show with a few equations how his theory works. Lacking a blueprint, a mathematical theory, and, say, video tapes of his motors generating energy from nothing, I cannot say for with 100% certainty that he is wrong. (Only 99.99%)

I hope I don't appear to be a party pooper? However, often times these inventors want to solicit money from investors, so I have a moral obligation to say exactly what I think about issues that, at some point, may hurt people.

Hope this helps,
Michio Kaku

ROBERT ADAMS DEVELOPMENTS

NEW ENERGY SCIENTISTS

DR. ROBERT ADAMS F.N.Z.E.I.
M.S. & M.N. (UK) Dr. Sc. FOUNDER
MEMBER AND CHAIRMAN 1988 - 1970
OF I.E.E.E. (USA) N.Z. SECTION.

DR. HAROLD ASPDEN PHD. B.Sc.
F.I.E.E. F.I.Mech.E. M.Lnse P.C. (ENG)
C.PHYS. FORMERLY L.B.M.'s EUROPEAN
PATENTS DIRECTOR FOR 19 YEARS

134A KING STREET
WHAKATANE
NEW ZEALAND
TEL/FAX 07-308-0657

BRUCE LAIRD LL.M. (HONS)

25 May 1996 (NZ)

Mr. Paul Williams,
Pruducer UFO Desk,
WBAI 99.5 FM Pacifica Radio,
New York 10018,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

FAX (212) 564-5359

Dear Paul,

Thank you for your fax of 20/5/96 (USA date) which arrived here 5am on 22nd (NZ date) and thank you for your kind comments. It was a pleasure to speak with you and the interview was a good idea. Both Bruce and I felt comfortable with it.

I have read Dr. Kaku's comments. They are practically word for word commentary of the sort of thing all we New Energy people get thrown at us from time to time and, of course, such zealous condemnation of the New Science fraternity is to be expected; indeed, without it we would all be in pretty dire straits because we must depend to a certain extent upon such scepticism from the other side of the tennis court - otherwise there would be no game. A player without an opponent is not a player - at all! This business of 'new energy' is not a game; it is a very serious and urgent matter. But the way in which it is being treated by some is indicative that the matter is nought but simply a game and so the analogy must be drawn. Flippancy on this issue cannot be tolerated - serious scepticism, if one can be so bold as to put the two words in context, on the other hand, is vital to the survival of the issue. The old must be discarded for the new, just as in life some must die for others to live, and with this issue the one instrument by which this exchange can be achieved is the paradox of scepticism - serious scepticism. So we of the new nexus thrive upon it. It prods us along and encourages us to continue our work with renewed vigour and energy to pursue our goals with heartfelt enthusiasm and tireless joy. God bless the Michio Kakus' of this world for we would feel quite lost without them. It is not good enough to find blind acceptance of our theories and works alone - we need our share of parochial rivalry, as long as it is earnestly dished out, for this is the tool by which we may grasp the opportunity to enlighten the public domain to the truth of the advance into the New Science.

Now to deal with Dr. Kaku's comments in a less rhetoric manner.

First, it is indeed condescending of him to give me a point zero one percent probability of my 'theory' being correct. How truly magnanimous!

To quote him - "Ether, which was supposed to be a magical substance which pervaded the Universe, has never been measured in our laboratories" - unquote. Well! "Magical"? What on earth is the man babbling about here? What books is he reading for mercy's sake. Then, in the same sentence, he agrees to it's (ether's) existence by saying "it" has never been measured in our laboratories. Now perhaps this, at this point, is exactly the whole point that he is, and obviously always has been, missing. This is perhaps exactly where he and his Nuclear Old Bays Association should have jumped the nuclear bandwagon and hopped on a new train. Why, it simply must be asked, have the nuclear fraternity NOT "measured in our laboratories" the phenomenon of the very real existence of ether. Why? And so who, I might ask of him, are the 'crackpots' here? I don't mind him calling me a 'crackpot'; the term is a favourite of mine too. But one should be careful, and he is talking about being 'careful' here, whom one addresses as a crackpot. Nothing wrong with the term or it's inference per se. Just that one should be fairly sure the guy is what one infers, first.

It appears to me that Dr. Kaku could well be in need of some enlightenment on the subject of ether energy. I am referring to ether energy that can be concentrated, focused and/or magnified by permanent magnets and other devices. For his information, the identity of ether energy was not only theorised upon, but actually proven to exist and be harnessed by correctly engineered devices constructed in the 18th century by Dr. Nikola Tesla, Henry Moray and Dr. Wilhelm Reich to name but a few, but all of whom suffered defeat at the hands of the cartels of the day who had wealth of a more sinister nature to contemplate with gleeful anticipation. Their defeat was easily accomplished given the fact that the general mental climate of the populace of the 1800's was primitive in the extreme in comparison to the 'Beyond 2000' thinkers of today who far more readily grasp the significance of these pioneers' concepts.

Tesla, Moray, Reich, Schauberger - all, together with numerous others since, have, albeit with similar oppression, nevertheless proven that ether energy exists and exists in astronomically vast and endless extent and, more significantly, have proven ether energy's capacity to be harnessed in a number of ways. The fact that there are devices capable of gating this energy from the ether is no longer a point of contention.

At an early age of nine years I commenced my venture into the mysteries of electromagnetics, radiowave propagation and universal energy production. One of my first projects was to build myself a crystal set in order to tap into the universal

energy field and listen in to those modified waves being broadcast from the early radio stations. The fact that these primitive assemblies of wires coils and crystals hooked to makeshift aerial systems worked at all mystified me. Where was the energy coming from? If thousands, or theoretically an infinite number of crystal sets and radios were tapping energy from the broadcasting station why was this supposed energy loss not detectable at the station? It was from this point on that I became involved, in my adolescent and young adult years, in the radio and broadcasting fields and gradually became a disciple of what is termed ether energy.

Although ether energy has been in existence since before creation as we conceive it, and although the 1800's, as we perceive the era, is one of old and bygone concepts, the irony of it all is that ether energy was recognised in that era, but also that today it is considered a 'new' science, a 'new' concept. Ether energy is not new. The only new thing about it is that it is being recognised and accepted now in a way it has never before been recognised and accepted.

This leads me to speculate just where has Dr. Kaku been the last twenty years in particular, that he should exhibit such gross ignorance of the phenomenal advances in this field of New Energy during this period.

I have several suggestions that might help Dr. Kaku avoid embarrassing himself further; just a few items of recommended reading, i.e., two very enlightening works authored by my eminent colleague, Dr. Harold Aspden of the United Kingdom who, incidentally, is 45 years out of Cambridge and a past Patent Director for IBM for 19 years, among other things, entitled "Physics Without Einstein" and "Modern Ether Science". Dr. Kaku might like to avail himself of Dr. Aspden's latest papers in relation to his more recent works regarding his electric motors exhibiting 'excess energy' also.

It could also be of some assistance for Dr. Kaku to study Peter Lindemann's paper, published in the United States in 1994, entitled "Thermodynamics and Free Energy". There are many other references which can bring Dr. Kaku up to date should he, of course, be disposed in the first place to even dare be seen availing himself of, him being a nuclear man and all.

Having said that, however, it is gratifying to note of recent, particularly since Chernobyl, a clear indication that a drift towards the new energy fields is definitely in progress. A good number of the nuclear boys are hitching a ride along - they know they have to. They know the nuclear world is NOT the world of the future. Some of them are finding this a difficult transition but most of them I would think know that to stick one's head in the sand over this issue can be a hazardous and inappropriate gamble in view of a world tumbling headlong towards 2000, and when we have already traversed across into the medium of space travel over thirty years hence. The meltdown has well commenced. Nuclear has gone with it. Hydro and fossil fuelled economies are to follow. It is inevitable.

Now, as for Dr. Kaku's statement that "he has to show a blueprint of this machine" - it is obvious he has never heard of me or my work over the past thirty years. He, and anyone else with a ready tongue, must be advised that I have released COPIOUS QUANTITIES of my developmental and research data in relation to my ORIGINAL Motor Generator invention and my various other electromagnetic discoveries made and worked upon over the past three decades.

In relation to my latest motor invention, the Mark "024" Thermo Motor which is subject to Patent application, if Dr. Kaku thinks I am going to divulge proprietary information on this into the public domain at this stage, then he is either naive or RIGHT off his trolley! (Note: I justify the inference by the pre-condition here). He can, however, if he so feels inclined, rest assured that this new machine does perform as claimed and close colleagues have witnessed its performance, and to relieve any further anxiety he may have on the matter, arrangements have already been made, for my own purposes, to video a complete test procedure of this machine in the presence of reliable witnesses in due course.


In finalising Paul, I am inclined to view Dr. Kaku's final statement of 'moral obligation' regarding inventors soliciting money from investors quite absurd and unprofessional. Of course we require funding and investment. How else does he suppose the machinations of any industry to function or of any idea to bear fruit. Clearly he has a problem with this concept. Besides - is he in the habit of applying sweeping statement to people he doesn't even know? A hell of an attitude if you ask me. I have used up all of my entire life's savings on my projects and a goodly sum from my dear wife as well. Close friends have given me years and years of their loyalty and their professional and moral support, all for nothing I might add. None of them had to and even I could have used up my earnings in a more comfortable way. During all these years I, like everyone else, have had to earn a living as well. Nobody has ever paid me for these endeavours to get clean energy, economical energy, to this world. Which brings me to a salient point - "Who pays Dr. Kaku?". Is he wealthy - because if he is I am most assuredly not. I am on the bones of my posterior and have been for many years. I am well accustomed to it.

Oh, and by the way Paul, if you happen to be chatting to him one fine day, please just advise him that I did not approach your Station - that it was the other way around.

Should you happen by any more Dr. Kakus of this world Paul, it might be a good idea to file them in Bin 13. They really are a total waste of time and this is a commodity I have precious little left of. I'm far too busy with constructive matters.

I look forward to hearing from you again soon.

Regards,



Dr. Robert Adams.

Peter A. Lindemann
28 Williams Blvd.
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059 USA
Phone and Fax: 1-505-281-7554

June 4, 1996

Dr. Robert Adams
134A King Street
Whakatane
New Zealand

Phone & Fax: 011-647-308-0657

Dear Dr. Adams,

Thank you for your Fax today. I am honored that my writings have been an inspiration to you. Because of heat's direct relationship to the "Warmth Ether", it is the easiest form of energy to precipitate under "anomalous" conditions. Congratulations on your astounding success at proving this fact, again.

Your report on your new motor's "efficiency" I find theoretically amusing. Since the device is a motor, the "input" of 0.08 kwh is correct. However, the device as you describe it has outputs of mechanical torque and heat. "Output" ratings, therefore, should not be in kwh's (because no electricity is coming out), but rather in foot-pounds and BTU's. After all, we really don't know what the "conversion rates" are, do we? We either believe in "conversion" or not. It is intellectually inconsistent to simultaneously break "The First Law of Thermodynamics" and then rely on its basic assumptions to describe our results. In these matters of developing a new paradigm, it can take quite a while to correct all of the errors in one's thinking. Please do not take this as criticism, for it is not meant to be. I realize that we have all come a very long way from our original indoctrination. De-programming is a long and involved process. I am only trying to help you see how your "logic" has not kept pace with your "understanding."

As for interesting reading, I recommend the following:

- 1) Loom of the Future by Trevor J. Constable
- 2) Man or Matter by Ernst Lehrs
- 3) The Etheric Formative Forces In Cosmos, Earth and Man by Guenther Wachsmuth
- 4) Symbolic Representation of Alternating Electric Waves by Eric P. Dollard
- 5) Symbolic Representation of the Generalized Electric Wave by Eric P. Dollard

All of these titles are available from BSRF.

Peter A. Lindemann

28 Williams Blvd.
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059 USA
Phone and Fax: 1-505-281-7554

June 6, 1996

Dr. Robert Adams
134A King Street
Whakatane
New Zealand

Phone & Fax: 011-647-308-0657

Dear Dr. Adams,

Thank you again for your Fax today. I am really pleased to be in a dialog with you on these subjects. You say "...You mention "conversion" Peter, but are we indeed involved in conversion? The energy gated in my new motor is in the form of heat and is harnessed via water in the same state, i.e. heat."

My reference to "conversion" was relating to your statement that the output of your device was 120 kwh. If your device gates (rhythmically opens and shuts a door through which warmth ether enters the machine) energy in the form of heat, as you say, then no "conversion" is involved in this process. Its just that heat is usually not measured in kwh's, so I assumed that the actual heat measurements were "converted" to their "equivalent" kwh "rating". In fact, kwh's doesn't tell me anything about heat output. Kwh's of heat is an abstraction.

What is involved, however, is a COUPLING of the warmth ether to the MASS, otherwise, the temperature of the mass would not rise, no matter how much warmth ether passed through it. Under normal circumstances, warmth ether passes through mass with almost NO INTERACTION. Understanding how to control the precipitation of warmth ether into matter is VERY IMPORTANT and is the beginning of a new EON of human history. whereby the savage is no longer huddled by the fire. If in fact you can now do this, no amount of congratulations is excessive!

Your device does not simply break "The First Law of Thermodynamics", it dis-proves it! The experimental dispatching of "The First Law of Thermodynamics" is the cornerstone of the new paradigm wherein the Etheric Energy Field is the primary, underpinning of the physical world. I have long known that "The First Law of Thermodynamics" was not true, but I have never seen a physical device whose functional behavior utterly defied it.

It is my personal belief that we do not need a new method of rating these machines. A simple measurement of how much energy (electrical, mechanical, or whatever) is needed to establish the etheric coupling and maintain the controlled flow of ether into mass (as temperature rise or fall, kinetic movement, electrical potential, or whatever) is all that is required.

I would like to see the raw data collected on your new motor as electrical input in kwh's, and outputs as foot-pounds of mechanical work and BTU's of heat. No rating will be needed, the data will say it all!

Sincerely,

Peter A. Lindemann
Peter A. Lindemann

P.S. I EAGERLY AWAIT YOUR PACKAGE.

THE AUTHOR'S LABORATORY 1976



The Author in his laboratory 1976. From left 1) The original complete Motor Generator; 2) A larger version; 3) A Motor Generator with twin set of output windings. All were built between 1970-1976. Motors only were originally built during 1969-1973.

Peter A. Lindemann

28 Williams Blvd.
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059 USA
Phone and Fax: 1-505-281-7554

June 14, 1996

Mr. Paul Williams
Producer, UFO Desk
WBAI 99.5 FM Pacifica Radio
New York, NY 10018

Dear Mr. Williams,

I received a package of material from Dr. Robert Adams yesterday, including some of his correspondence with you and Dr. Michio Kaku. In one of your return letters to Dr. Adams, you expressed an interest in obtaining a copy of an article I wrote entitled *Thermodynamics and Free Energy*.

To quickly fulfill your request, I have enclosed a copy of the article. In addition, I have enclosed another article on Tesla's "self-acting" engine, which I wrote last year.


I am sending these to you for your own edification. Like Dr. Adams, I am NOT in the business of trying to convince skeptics of anything. The experimental evidence is abundant and unambiguous. Anyone wishing to review it and duplicate it experimentally may do so at their own expense of time and money, and draw their own conclusions. Anyone willing to express an opinion on these matters without first seeing the experiments is not a scientist.

The fact is, the "First Law of Thermodynamics" was never proved. There is no experimental evidence that *proves* that one form of energy can be changed (converted) into another form. In its historical context, it was only put forth as an hypothesis. It was never proved, and now it has been disproved.

These are weighty matters at the heart of physical reality. Science moves forward along a well defined path. It begins in the Philosopher's imagination. It moves on to the Experimenter's work bench, and ends with the Mathematician's equations. The equations are only an intellectual MODEL derived from what has already been discovered. It is also important to note that the MODEL of one discovery CANNOT be used to measure the import of a DIFFERENT discovery.

Anyway, enjoy the reading and pass them along if you wish.

Sincerely,



Peter A. Lindemann

Magnetic Battery



by Bert Werjefelt
PolyTech (USA) Corp
PO Box 5011
Kaneohe, HI 96744

*Patent Pending

Introduction and Background

The following discussion and disclosure concerns the possibility of utilizing magnetic materials/magnetic fields as a new primary source for electricity. And, whether or not existing theories of electricity, magnetism, thermodynamic conservation laws and the existing body of (scientifically bona fide) experimental evidence can be proven to support this discovery.

At first glance, the resounding answer to this question is an emphatic *NO*... because, to many of those versed in this area of science, it immediately waves red flags of perpetual motion - a flagrant violation of the thermodynamic conservation laws.

Supporting the position that it is *not* possible to extract energy from magnetic material/magnetic fields, the following excerpt of the relevant conservation law from one of the current and popular encyclopedias¹ summarizes the perception and thinking that has prevailed since the infancy of electric and magnetic science, in the middle of the last century²⁻⁷:

Magnetic Potential. *In mechanics it is often more convenient to work in terms of energy, a scalar quantity having magnitude but no direction like magnetic charge, than in terms of force (a vector quantity): And the same is true in magnetism. When a magnetic pole is moved, work must be done against any force acting on it if it is moved in the direction opposite to the force, and, conversely, work will be done (or can be extracted) by the magnetic pole when it moves in the force direction.*

Thus, no work is done in moving a magnetic pole around a closed path in a magnetic field. It follows that the work done in moving a pole q'_m from a point A to a point B is independent of the route followed. Otherwise q'_m would be returned to A by another route on which more work is extracted than was expended in the initial move-

ment to A. The net effect would be that work could be extracted by movement around the complete path without any other change in the system giving the possibility of a perpetual motion machine that is contrary to the laws of mechanics...

With few exceptions,⁸⁻¹² this rather categorical statement has, in the opinion of the writer, served as a formidable deterrent to substantive and credible review of the statement. Nevertheless, one of the primary objectives of this discussion is to prove (or disprove), within currently accepted academic and scientific boundaries, the validity of the existing theoretical formulation and/or the possibility of extracting useful energy from magnetic materials/magnetic fields.

Bear in mind, that the simple, seemingly axiomatic statement, "...when a magnetic pole is moved, work must be done against any force acting on it if it is moved in the direction opposite of the force..." is in a way, one of the most important statements of physical laws in terms of effects on our social and economic order in society. Why? All of the petroleum, nuclear power and other fuels, used in the world today to produce electricity, are used for *moving magnetic poles in magnetic fields*, in other words, to power electric generators or charge batteries.

Can anything in the existing formulation of the theory be questioned as incorrect or incomplete?

What are the facts? What are the facts that may have been omitted? Why is the statement conspicuously silent on the di-polar (or bipolar) nature of magnets? (Note that you never have 2, but a minimum of 4 poles interacting. Two may dominate, but the other two cannot be ignored!) Why is the statement conspicuously silent on the two fundamentally different forces - attraction and repulsion - that are inherent to magnets? Why is the statement also conspicuously silent on the important fact that electromagnetic field theory (like gravitational field theory) is not reconcilable with conservation laws (which exclude perpetual motion). Why does the statement mention "the laws of mechanics"? - Are these laws even applicable in this case?¹ Should the statement have been revised and updated at some point? Should the statement have included exceptions (at the time, or later)? Were some fundamental facts overlooked from the beginning, when the statement was formulated, etc, etc, etc.

PHYSICS WITHOUT EINSTEIN

By HAROLD ASPDEN

The grand edifice of Einstein's theory appears to be crumbling and may well collapse as modern scientific technology exposes it to new tests. Without Einstein's doctrines theoretical physics could be left in a parlous state. Professional physicists have been such firm believers in Einstein's philosophy that they have no alternative ready to meet the impending challenge. Perhaps this is why the amateur physicists, the professionals of other fields who are not obliged by convention to advocate Relativistic principles, have been at the forefront in efforts to find a substitute for the unreal four-dimensional space of Einstein's universe. This book is the product of such endeavour.

To the author physics has always been the prime interest. In 1945 it earned his entry to Manchester University at the age of 17, but practical considerations diverted his attention to electrical engineering. After graduating with first class honours, a two year period was spent on engineering training in industry. Meanwhile, by a thesis on electrical measurements the author won a Whitworth Scholarship, later followed by a Research Scholarship from the Institution of Electrical Engineers, which sustained three years of Ph.D. research on magnetism at Trinity College, Cambridge. Then, though writing several papers on magnetism between 1949 and 1956, the author pursued a career in industry and is now the European Director of Patents of a large international company. Physics has remained a hobby founded upon a persistent conviction that several aspects of electromagnetic and ferromagnetic theory are inadequately developed. In spite of recognized weaknesses the accepted theories provide a formidable barrier to new ideas, but these ideas can be consolidated and can gather strength with the passage of time. This book is the product of a struggle lasting fourteen years. It has led to a form of physics which does not require Relativity. Hence, it is a 'Physics Without Einstein'.

SABBERTON PUBLICATIONS
PO Box 35, Southampton, England

PHYSICS WITHOUT EINSTEIN

HAROLD ASPDEN

PHYSICS without Einstein

*A confrontation with the anomalies
of electromagnetism which reveals a
unified explanation for the physical
phenomena of the universe*

by

HAROLD ASPDEN

DR ROBERT ADAMS EXPOSES THE FALSE TEACHINGS OF THE LAWS OF THERMODYNAMICS, EINSTEIN'S RELATIVITY, LENZ'S LAW AND MORE.....

Establishment teachings in relation to the above were deliberately designed to preclude man from crossing the border and delving into the realm of the ether, and thereby depriving man of a free clean energy.

The establishment knew that to include the ether in their teachings would result in opening up the gates to clean free energy. In their attempt to avoid this situation they decided to make it known that the ether does not exist, and discarded it, result of which the Laws of Thermodynamics, Einstein's Relativity and Lenz's Laws become sacrosanct.

Robert Adams with his many years of experience and research into the problems of energy production pollution, lays the path for the oncoming solution to this insidious problem. "Free Clean Energy without Newton's Thermodynamics", and Einstein's Relativity.

With a long and varied career in the field of technology, inventions and science, Robert Adams presents an insight into the continued use of the outmoded so called "Laws of Thermodynamics" and Einstein's Relativity. Modern society needs clean, affordable energy; nature has provided it, and it is there for the taking and so too, in tapping space energy, it serves to free our planet from further wanton destruction.

It is with the inventions and discoveries of people like Robert Adams that the planet's destruction can be halted.

For those of you following the theme of clean free energy, this "Addendum to the Adams Motor Manual" is a must, it is packed with undeniable evidence of the presence of ether and it's awesome powers.