

From: P Tewari <ptewari1@sancharnet.in>

To: David Crockett Williams <gear2000@lightspeed.net>

Subject: India update

Date: Sunday, September 28, 2003 8:12 AM

Dear David,

This refers to your message, India update, 9/25/2003.

I would love to participate in teleconference on October 1, 2003,

but for the fact that my telephones are invariably disturbed.

I have already sent my comments.

Thanks for your kind considerations to propose my participation in the conference.

Best wishes,

Paramahansa

\*\*\*\*\*

From: P Tewari [ptewari1@sancharnet.in](mailto:ptewari1@sancharnet.in)

To: David Crockett Williams [gear2000@lightspeed.net](mailto:gear2000@lightspeed.net)

Subject: On the space power generator

Date: Saturday, September 27, 2003 7:40 AM

Dear Mr. Williams,

This is further to my earlier report.

While engaged in construction of large nuclear projects, I had the rare privilege to formulate a new theory of space, matter and energy, namely, Space Vortex Theory (SVT), since mid-seventies of the last century, as a spare time research (hobby). The late Bruce DePalma, having been informed about this theory and my books, sent me some details and test results of his own research on rotating magnets: the "N - effect," as he named it. He sent me one of the test results of Adam Trombly's machine as well. My confirmation of the N - Effect came later through my own experiments. These test results showed extra power generation that was in violation of the law of energy conservation [LCE].

I had been looking for a positive experiment to prove the principles and the findings of the SVT and in this pursuit, I took up for experiments several systems of rotating electromagnets with different configurations / layouts of conductors and magnetic field starting since 1985. The results showed clear violations of Lenz's law -- considered to be the equivalent to LCE in electrodynamics. The late Dr. Stefan Marinov [reported to have committed suicide due to Nature magazine's persistent refusal to publish his valuable papers / comments on relativity etc.] too had reached similar conclusions on the violation of the Lenz's law through his own experiments.

Another conclusion of SVT pertains to the flow of current in a conductor: Between two co-linear elements of electric current, an attractive force should exist as per SVT. A similar conclusion, unlike Ampere's own measurements, was also reached by Dr. Marinov through his analysis. This effect, unacceptable to contemporary theories, plays a crucial role in the functioning of space power generator [SPG] at over-unity efficiency.

The applicability of LCE was initially found in the processes of mechanics and thermodynamics. That it should be applicable to electrodynamics too, and in fact to all the universal phenomena requires support from a basic theory of space and matter, one that should first explain [and also quantitatively derive] the genesis of mass, inertia, charge, gravity, etc.; i.e., should explain the basic nature of energy; should derive the earth's gravity field; and should explain the structure of the electron and its observed behavior of annihilation, etc.

The contemporary physics has to enlarge its scope to include explanations of the above and many more phenomena of astrophysics, but it can not be done, or rather, it is impossible to progress any further having replaced the Cartesian space with the Newtonian space of emptiness.

[The analysis in SVT explains all the above basic phenomena and pinpoints the short comings / limitations of the modern physics.]

Thus, those critical of "overunity" machines, not having an appropriate theory to defend their stand, insist that only a self-running system will prove the authenticity of the new energy technologies. But to bring an over-unity machine to the self-running stage requires finances that individual inventors cannot afford.

The solution lies in organizing a conference in which it is made mandatory for the orthodox adherents of modern physics [quantum physics, relativity, astrophysics] in high government offices, and the editorial staff of so-called famous science journals to attend the conference and discuss their objections face to face with those inventors of new energy technologies who have appropriate theories and practical experiments to explain their inventions.

My experiments convincingly reveal that the space power generator works on a principle of reduction of the generator's reaction on its prime mover that is in violation of the Lenz's law. Though there is no creation of additional energy, yet the reduced reaction of the SPG on the prime mover produces more electrical power with a lesser work done by the prime mover. With this result, LCE requires a fresh definition. With further development of this system, I can predict that with resources made available, SPG units in megawatt range and more than 300% "efficiency" can be made soon a reality.

Best wishes

Paramahansa Tewari

\*\*\*\*\*

From: P Tewari <ptewari1@sancharnet.in>

To: <gear2000@lightspeed.net>

Subject: Thanks

Date: Friday, September 26, 2003 8:37 PM

Dear Mr. Williams,

Many thanks for doing an excellent comprehensive report on my research.

I will send by tomorrow some additional points explaining the scientific reasons as to why the adherents of the contemporary physics are so much opposed to the theories and the experimental results of the new energy technologies.

A group of companies in Turkey has volunteered to build a 90 kW, space power generator. The machine is expected to produce 30 Volts, 3000 Amps, Direct Current, at about 300% "efficiency" in the immediate future.

The rest will follow tomorrow.

Best wishes,

Paramahansa

See more on P. Tewari's work, experiments, Space Vortex Theory, and his articles on the reasoning for the need for spiritual and ethical values to be integrated into modern "amoral," ie, "objective," science, at <http://www.tewari.org> In addition to being an inventor, fundamental new physics theoretician, and a leading electrical engineer of India, Mr.Tewari is also a world class author of articles (some also at above url), regarding the Vedic knowledge of Hinduism, which maintains the unity of all religions as, "facets of the Gem of The One Truth."

More on the work of Adam Trombly and Project Earth whose environmental modeling predicted in 1988 the complete destruction of all oceanic phytoplankton by 2008 due to ozone layer depletion, unless serious countermeasures were widely implemented by 1998 including moving away from fossil fuel combustion of oxygen to these so-called "new energy technologies." <http://www.projectearth.com>

India Today

"An engineer's invention excites interest" by M. Rahman (December 1987)

[2 photos, not shown here, captioned:]

Paramahansa Tewari (top) and the generator: Futuristic Fantasy

In a tiny room in a Bombay suburb, an electrical engineer works on a machine that seems to have been conceived in a Sci-Fi book -- a generator which can ostensibly produce electricity from nothing. But the machine's creator, Paramahansa Tewari, 51, is not an eccentric inventor from one of Sukumar Ray's fantastic tales. He is a senior engineer with the Department of Atomic Energy's Nuclear Power Corporation (NPC).

Tewari created a minor sensation 10 years ago when he propounded the theory that space is filled with a dynamic medium whose swirling motion is the source of all matter and energy. He called it the Space Vortex Theory (SVT) which postulated that at the heart of the electron was a void whose high speed rotation within a vacuum could produce energy from space.

Interestingly, it was the Theosophical Society which had first published Tewari's theory by arranging a special lecture in 1977 at Adyar in Madras. The theosophists were excited by Newari's ideas since they were remarkably close to observations about the electron put forward by Annie Basined's associate, the clairvoyant Charles W. Leadbeater, in the book Occult Chemistry.

However, the first indication that Newari's ideas about the structure of space were more than just a mystic vision came earlier this year at a conference in Hanover organized by the German Association of Gravity Field Energy. The Space Power Generator (SPG) invented by Tewari won the first prize of RS 25,000 from among 25 similar machines presented at the conference by scientists from all over the world.

Tewari's generator is actually a simple machine, consisting basically of a magnetized cylinder rotating at high speed with the help of a motor. Power from this device is extracted by connecting a wire between the surface of the cylinder and its axis. According to the engineer-inventor, the SPG produces two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half times more power than it consumes, defying the basic physical law of conservation of energy which says that the output of energy cannot be more than the input.

Tewari says the excess power comes from the inter-atomic space of the rotating cylinder -- it is the movement of the "voids" in the spinning cylinder which creates additional energy out of the space between the machine's axis and the magnet.

Tewari readily admits that his theory sounds incredible taking into account the existing laws and that he would never have developed it had he been trained as a physicist and not an engineer, since it is so divergent from conventional physics. But, he says, it would have been difficult for him to go on with work on the SVT and the generator were it not for encouragement from two U.S. physicists, Dr. John A. Wheeler of the University of Texas, Austin, and Bruce DePalma, formerly a lecturer in physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"But for DePalma, I wouldn't have been able to tie up my theory," says Tewari. "He was working on similar ideas and kept sending his results to me."

Though Tewari, who is slated for transfer to the NPC's Kaiga Project in Karnataka as chief project engineer, has pursued his interest in physics in his spare time, he has received infra structural support from the NPC for putting together his extraordinary new machine. The SPG was built under Tewari's supervision at the Tarapur Atomic Plant.

"Tewari's prototype SPC can be considered a major breakthrough says S.L. Kati, managing director of NPC.. Before leaving for Hanover, Tewari addressed a meeting of scientists and engineers at the Bhaba Atomic Research Centre on his theory. But most physicists remained skeptical about his findings. Undaunted, he is experimenting with a new model of the SPG since his return, which he feels will be an improvement. He eventually hopes to create a prototype for a generator which could deliver 50 kw to 100 kw of electricity.

"The encouragement I received abroad has been a great help, and hopefully within a year, I will be able to build an experimental model which could ultimately prove commercially viable," he says.

Tewari, of course, is not the only engineer hoping to build the ultimate power generation machine -- one which will run perpetually since it will extract energy from space -- as the Hanover conference demonstrated. In fact, DePalma, the first inventor to create such a machine, is presently conducting experiments in California in anticipation of a breakthrough which could lead to commercial production. Their work promises to ultimately create a machine which appears to come straight out of a futuristic fantasy.

----- end

"On your question on the mass energy equation ( $E=mc^2$ ), the same has been derived by the Space Vortex Theory from the vortex structure of the electron" -- Paramahansa Tewari

Dr. Jack Sarfatti has consistently denied over last few years that there could possibly have been a collaboration between John Archibald Wheeler and Paramahansa Tewari who quotes Wheeler in his book about Space Power Generation. The effects predicted by Tewari's Space Vortex Theory. Also Sarfatti has called a "lie" my mention of Wheeler's witnessing DePalma's stationary drop experiment, circa 1970 at MIT in his own office, showing from a height of six feet that a spinning, 18k rpm 1" ball bearing falls faster than a non-spinning control ball bearing.

A small but reproducible and easily visually perceptible difference, empirical proof of the inadequacy or invalidity of (all?) special and general relativity theory interpretations currently ignoring this key DePalma experiment. This experiment, along with his many other later ones in the 70's leading up to the N-Machine prediction in March 1978 and verification of incremental "over-unity" performance in July 1978, demonstrates anomalous gravitational, inertial, and electromagnetic behaviors of physical objects at a "macro" scale. Behaviors still ignored by "mainstream science," which is apparently kept by prejudice or the potential ridicule of theoreticians like Drs. Sarfatti and Park who, "know it is impossible because it violates the physics theories they believe."

And so these simple experiments of DePalma, simple for anyone with lab budgets, have never apparently been properly duplicated by enough qualified physical experimentalists (people who believe what they see is true more than what they think is true) in order to get these results properly published in "mainstream" science journals so that the "community" of science knows that the results are real and "theories" may be adjusted accordingly.

This situation exactly fits Sharon Begley's definition of "pathological science" as per her article authenticating the cold fusion phenomena. A breakdown in the normally open channels of scientific communications. But this one predates the cold fusion pathological ignorance syndrome by approximately 20 years when in 1979, theoretician Wheeler dismissed the spinning vs. non-spinning ball experiment with the spurious comment of, "my eyes may not be sharp enough to tell the difference." Finally after regaining his color, having become ashen from witnessing this result that would invalidate all the theories in which he was invested, Dr. Wheeler's response was, "This is going to change everything, isn't it?" To which DePalma (according to his oft told story to me and others of personal acquaintance from 1979 onwards) replied, "I think so too Doctor. What do you think it means ? How can it be explained ?"

Why has not Dr. Wheeler told Dr. Sarfatti or apparently others about this in over 30 years in spite of his independent co-collaboration with Tewari along with DePalma on theoretical and experimental aspects of Tewari's over-unity space Power Generator featured at international conferences since the mid-late 1980's?

\*\*\*\*\*

The following is Tewari's response to clarification on the nature of his "collaborations" with Dr. Wheeler with his brief opening remark substantiating my claim of Wheeler's observing this key gravity change experiment, followed by his commentary reaction to my recent post about the uncertainty principle paradox in quantum physics, ie, the inability by definition to be certain about uncertainty.

<http://www.depalma.pair.com><http://www.tewari.org><http://www.stardrive.org>

For Wheeler's background see government "black science" websites with clearance, keywords "advanced electromagnetic weapons of mass destruction," and various public praise-ological fluff pieces and "cleared" physics by common search engines. Don't expect to find DePalma and Tewari mentioned together on any sites along with Wheeler's name in the United States

in his control or control of "mainstream American pathological science."

It is interesting to note that although Tewari's space Vortex Theory," coming from perspective of an electrical engineer, and Joseph Newman's "Massergy" theory coming from perspective of a mechanical theory of matter and energy by a self-taught inventor, both theories correctly predicted the "over-unity" electrical energy production from their later built and tested respective different configurations of rotating electromagnetic systems. Both theories postulate in different words and math, yet still similarly describe a fundamental property of matter at subatomic levels as spinning vortices and "rotating massergies" as in electron dynamics.

Newman's work is at <http://www.josephnewman.com>

DePalma was familiar with Newman's work also and said he understood how The Newman Energy Machine operated, but as his website says, DePalma's theory is, "that there is no theory,"

ie, "what you see is what you get," or "seeing is believing."

\*\*\*\*\*

From: P Tewari <[ptewari1@sancharnet.in](mailto:ptewari1@sancharnet.in)>

To: David Crockett Williams <[gear2000@lightspeed.net](mailto:gear2000@lightspeed.net)>

Subject: Space vortex theory

Date: Friday, October 03, 2003 11:14 PM

Dear David,

I do remember Bruce DePalma telling me that Dr. Wheeler once witnessed his experiment but did not appreciate it, as you rightly mention in your note.

But DePalma was astonished to read Wheeler's letters to me [1975, 1977, 1985; available at <http://www.tewari.org>]. These letters were in response to my earlier manuscripts/books that I sent to him in the initial stages of development of my hypothesis on the structure of space and matter. He also sent me in 1981 one of his own papers: "Delayed-Choice Experiments and the Bohr-Einstein Dialog," with a remark on the cover of the booklet: "Many thanks for the copy of your book and every good wish for your continuing research!"

In all my letters to Dr. Wheeler until 1985, I was only informing him about the new space vortex hypothesis that I had formulated and there was no mention of the space power generation, because, I was still to fully confirm through my own practical experiments that the output from a rotating system of magnets can exceed the input, as reported by Bruce DePalma.

These results started coming through my own tests only after 1985-1986.

After 1985, I have not been in contact with Dr. Wheeler except for a letter expressing my grateful thanks to him that was sent last year along with my latest book in which the only acknowledgment for him is recorded in the preface of "Universal Principles of Space and Matter -- A Call for Conceptual Re-orientation."

On the history of my theoretical work, the space vortex theory (SVT) and my interaction with Dr. Wheeler, the following is a brief report.

An article "The physical Universe," with basic postulates: Space is a non material superfluid (non viscous, continuous, massless, incompressible) with a limiting flow at speed of light; discontinuity of energy at electron center, was sent to Foundations of Physics in 1974.

Being a brief article, only qualitative in nature at that time, it was not published though some appreciation of the concepts did come from the referee / editor. An Indian physicist, to whom I wrote for help, plagiarized the very basic concepts of this article and published the same postulates (changing the words) along with two other physicists in an important journal. [It was reported in the press by me]. Thereafter, I was cautious and was advised by a senior physicist who appreciated my work to contact Dr. Wheeler for guidance on these very new concepts of electron and its structural relationship with space. [ Prof. Abdus Salam, a Nobel laureate, too advised me later (1981) to keep in touch with Dr. Wheeler. Please see Dr. Wheeler's letters and Prof. Abdus Salam's letter at <http://www.tewari.org>.

In his first letter [1975] he points towards the quantum principles. In his second letter [1977], while agreeing that he once conceived the polyelectron approach but no more considered it profitable, yet he forwarded to Prof. Shild to do an article including the work of Prof. Sternglass and also my own.

Unfortunately, Prof. Shild expired soon after, and the article was never written. In his 1985 letter, Dr. Wheeler credits me with my approach in using a simple geometric theory in a dynamic fluid space and finds similarity with Einstein's general relativity (1917). That is the most encouraging comment on my work from the eminent scientist / philosopher that Dr. Wheeler is. Last year, Toby Grotz sent my latest book "Universal Principles of Space and Matter -- A Call for Conceptual re-orientation" to Dr. Wheeler and talked to him on the phone. He commented that the book will be very useful for science and history.

My work was never published in main stream journals. One reason was that publication of such a radical theory requires lot of skill and labour which I could not provide mainly due to my preoccupation at nuclear projects in senior positions [Chief project Engineer, Project Director/ Executive Director].

In addition to circulation of my earlier books to the interested physicists/ engineers/ scientists, mostly abroad and some in India, the hypothesis [though not fully complete as a theory] was first published in an International Conference Proceedings, Italy, 1982 [Editors: Dr. Stefan Marinov, Prof. J. P. Wesley]. Further, the hypothesis was recorded in international conferences in Germany, USA, Italy, Japan; also in certain science journals in USA, Italy, Japan, etc. Thus, the main stream physicists will not find details on my work in the journals of the physics establishment. Some aspects of the SVT now in a fully developed form are given in the enclosures.

The Cartesian space and matter of ether vortices continued for a century even after Newton's Principia. Despite its replacement by the Newtonian empty space, electron structure as an ether vortex was very much being debated by the close of the 19th century. In fact Larmor even conjectured

emptiness at the center of electron's ether vortex structure as provided in SVT. [This I learnt only lately] But a problem on the stability of ether vortices had arisen. However, special relativity (1905) discarded ether.

The modern physicists, if at all they have ever read my papers or books, will see in my work an attempt to re establish the Cartesian philosophy with which, after relativity theory, they are totally averse. They do not recognize that the SVT supports the Einstein's postulate on the constancy of light speed and also its being the limiting speed. Only time dilation is not supported. Einstein is also supported for his mass energy equation [by deriving this equation from the electron structure] and his strong belief in deterministic approach in contrast with the quantum physics' indeterminacy and the uncertainty principle.

I doubt if the main-stream physicists have ever read my works. Their criticism is on hearsay. Some researchers of physical theories have had prolonged discussions with me on the founding principles of the SVT and appreciated its uniqueness [electron's space vortex structure with a central field-less void, new equations and definitions on mass and charge, derivation of earth's surface gravity, deriving all the universal constants with a single universal constant -- the speed of light, continuous creation of cosmic matter at the center of the sun and the galactic center, etc.]

Theory apart, we are interested in knowing with certainty whether over unity efficiency is ever possible. In this regard, as I wrote to you, by this year end a SPG in tens of kilowatts range should be ready and tested.

The companies who have undertaken this work wish to remain anonymous for the present. If successful commercial operation is achieved, then the modern theories will automatically undergo major revision. But, for the present, when the law of conservation of energy is applied even in quantum processes (neutron decay) and the Lenz's law is considered to be an extension of the energy conservation law as per the conventional physics, space power generation is no better than a hoax for them. For quite some time the opposition from the mainstream physicists will continue; and even if a self running system is made possible, they will call it "an anomaly" rather than retract and be back to the Cartesian space which, as said before, was discredited at the very start of the 20th century [special relativity] and the beginning of the quantum physics based on a misconception of the real nature of the Planck's constant and faulty explanation of the photoelectric effect as concluded in SVT .

There is another adverse impact of modern physical theories on religious and spiritual philosophies that started [18th century] with the transition of the Cartesian philosophy to the Newtonian. Though Descartes and Newton were theists and invoked God for the first motion of the universal space and cosmic matter, in Newtonian empty space how could any reality exist? The very concept of the omnipresent and omnipotent God was killed in Newtonian mechanics based on materialism that posits matter as the final basic reality. [What entity created matter is not known; that "fields" or "energy" created matter is merely giving names, a poor explanation without basic definition to energy. As per SVT, qualitatively speaking: a volume of space (nonmaterial fluid) under acceleration is the most basic form of energy.

Prof. S.J. Prokhovnik, the author of "The Logic of Special Relativity," decades ago, admired me for giving this definition, first time, to energy. Similarly, Electron mass is proportional to the volume of the central void (nothingness) in its space vortex structure, the constant of proportionality is the speed of light relative to the fluid space. And also, electron charge is proportional to the surface of the spherical space enclosing the electron's central void, the constant of proportionality is the speed of light relative to the fluid space. But these definitions make no sense in the contemporary physics because how can there be any fluid reality in an empty (void) space?

And therefore, someone, in the message that you sent the other day, branded my work as a pseudoscience. The present theories cannot explain "mass" and "charge" and why an electron exists eternally (despite interactions with matter) possessing the properties of mass and charge of definite values. What is the genesis of inertia and gravity in the electron structure? The current physics is living with all these obscurities and will continue to live so until spatial reality and spatial interactions are recognized.

To conclude I will say that It is an urgent need to look critically into the modern physical theories and pin point their limitations/ misconceptions to save man from groping in dark with regard to the physical science theories separate from the 20th century's concrete experimental results and notable experimental work in atomic structure , radio activity, electron positron annihilation etc.) starting with the quantum physics in the 20th century and leading to a weird concept of a dying universe of empty space and solid matter and fields, rather than examining the opposite concept hypothesized in my first work "The Substantial Space and Void-nature of Elementary material particles."

Best wishes,

Paramahansa

PS. A senior Biochemist and Theosophy Scientist from USA, having read my first work (1977, 1978?), sent me a copy of "Occult Chemistry," by Annie Besant and Charles W. Leadbeater. In the Appendix of this booklet the following is given: "Let us for the moment name this substance Koilon, since it fills what we are in the habit of calling empty space...Matter is not Koilon, but the absence of Koilon, and at first sight matter and space appear to have changed places, and emptiness has become solidity, solidity has become emptiness..."

Talking of fundamental particle of matter, Leadbeater continues, "Just as bubbles (bubbles rising in water) are not water, but precisely the spots from which water is absent, so these units are not Koilon, but the absence of Koilon...specks of nothingness floating in it so to speak, for the interior of these space bubbles is an absolute void to the highest power of vision that we can turn upon them.

That is the startling, well-nigh incredible fact. Matter is nothingness...

The worlds are built out of these voids, these emptinesses..."

The above was the first concrete idea of existence of a spherical void at the electron center coming from the Theosophy science while I reached the same conclusion searching for the mass, inertia and charge properties of electron. Is it ever possible for particle accelerators to detect voidness at electron center?

\*\*\*\*\*

From: P Tewari <ptewari1@sancharnet.in>

To: David Crockett Williams <gear2000@lightspeed.net> Subject: Uncertainty Principle

Date: Monday, October 06, 2003 5:36 PM

Dear David,

This subject is good for debate and its opportune that you have raised it. I am sending copy of this note to some of those senior scientists who have seen either my latest book or are partly aware of my earlier work.

As to how the uncertainty principle came about is a long story which, now analyzing with the principles and the results of the space vortex theory (SVT), seems to be full of unintentional errors [by some great minds of the time] multiplying into blunders during the development of the quantum physics. It has been analyzed in "Conceptual Error on the Fundamental nature of Light Phenomenon in Classical Electrodynamics led to complexities in Quantum Physics," Journal of New Energy, Vol. 5, No.1, Summer 2000 [also available at [www.tewari.org](http://www.tewari.org) and in "Universal principles of Space and Matter - A call for Conceptual Reorientation." A brief comment is as below.

Photo electric effect: At the time Einstein explained the photo electric effect [1905], he could be aware only with the Thomson's theory of atomic structure - sphere of uniform positive electrification in which the electrons were supposed to be embedded, because the Rutherford's theory, as per which the electrons orbit the nucleus came later [1913]. Therefore, in his photoelectric theory, Einstein did not take into account any kinetic energy that a photoelectron could have had prior to its release from the atom. Interestingly, calculations with the vortex structure model [svt] of a metallic sodium atom show [in the above cited works] that an outer-orbit electron possesses kinetic energy nearly the same as those of the photo electrons released and measured experimentally.

And coincidentally, this kinetic energy is very close to "hf" in Planck's energy equation:  $E = hf$  -- for the frequency that released photo electrons. As is well known, "hf" is the energy accumulated in unit time [calling for a storing mechanism] and yet transferred to a photoelectron instantly as per Einstein !!

So, the error is this: The kinetic energy of the photo electrons measured experimentally was already possessed by these particles while rotating in their orbits with the atoms. Interaction of light does not transfer any energy to the photo electrons. Light only triggers release of the orbiting electrons [explained in SVT].

Therefore, the photon concept itself is an error. Einstein's argument that light is not only released in a quanta of hf (Planck) but also transmitted in a bundle is erroneous.

It is surprising to note that Compton, too, in 1923 did not take note of the kinetic energy that an electron in an atom might possess when, by that time, the orbiting velocity of the electrons must have been well known. By neglecting in his experiment the initial kinetic energy of the electron before encounter with light pulse (X-ray), his own conclusion of particle-like photon is in error. [After all how does one know that the interaction of the X-ray in Compton's experiment is with a free-electron or with the one tied in its atomic orbit]. Further, a deeper insight on the nature of mass [SVT] reveals that light can not possess the property of mass. Hence, assigning mass and momentum to photon which itself does not have a real existence, is a further error.

Now, if photon is a non existent entity, how can there be wave particle duality? How can there be DeBroglie's wave particle equations? And so also wave mechanics based on DeBroglie's findings become questionable.

Planck's Constant, derived in SVT, is intrinsic angular momentum of electron:  $(4/5 \text{ electron mass}) \times (\text{velocity of light}) \times (\text{electron radius})$ , where the electron radius is the radius of the central void in electron's vortex structure. Using Planck's constant in the uncertainty principle is not relevant.

I am aware that the highly complex principles of the quantum physics cannot be critically examined in a short note like this. But if the above referred works are seen, the errors at the very foundation of the quantum theory become more than evident. In any case the uncertainty principle is not the principle to last, like the mass-energy equation, light-speed as the universal constant, and the light-speed as the limiting speed in the universe.

Introduction of empty space in place of ether also introduced voidness around the nucleus, thereby removing the vortex concept of the atom [late 19th century.] This led to very many complexities in the development of the atom structure.

Best wishes,

Paramahansa

PS For brevity, I have not mentioned here Bohr's atom and the space vortex structure of atoms; production of light by oscillating atoms . These are dealt with in detail in the above referred works with the conclusion that the contribution of the orbital electrons in the production of light is insignificant. And also, the orbital electrons do not lose energy to fall closer to the nucleus because the electron 's space vortex and the space vortex enclosing the nucleus constantly interact to keep them a fixed distance apart. On your question on the mass energy equation, the same has been derived in SVT from the vortex structure of electron. <http://www.tewari.org>

From: P Tewari <ptewari1@sancharnet.in>

To: Mark Gubrud <mgubrud@squid.umd.edu>

Subject: Fw: Your comments on 'Pathological science'

Date: Tuesday, November 18, 2003 11:57 PM

----- Original Message -----

From: P Tewari

To: Mark Gubrud

Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2003 10:41 AM

Subject: Your comments on 'Pathological science'

Dear Dr. Gubrud,

In your reply to David Crockett William (16th November), on the explanations of researchers to various free energy experiments, you observe "delusional notions based on half-misunderstood science." True, there could be some in this category, but , let me assure you, there are many exceptions.

Before I proceed further, please permit me to introduce myself. I retired (1997) from the post of Executive Director ( nuclear projects ) in India, having constructed and commissioned large nuclear projects almost throughout my professional career. Side by side with my engineering profession, I framed a hypothesis ( as a spare-time research hobby) on the structure of electron (1974) to explain the genesis of "mass", "charge", "inertia", and energy fields ( electrostatic, magnetic, electromagnetic, gravitational) arising from the electron structure. This hypothesis, having provided several proofs, is now referred as Space Vortex Theory (SVT). The latest work is : "Universal Principles of Space and Matter--A Call for Conceptual Re-orientation"

As per SVT , an electron has a discontinuity of energy -distribution at its center and, in fact ,its mass is directly proportional to the field-less, energy-less, spherical volume of "nothingness" (void) at its center (of the order of  $4 \times 10^{-11}$  cm in radius). With the maximum speed of circulation of fluid space © in the vortex , the vortex structure is dynamically stable.["space" is postulated as a nonmaterial ( massless, density-less, incompressible, zero-viscosity) fluid].

The genesis of electron- mass and charge are quantitatively derived, explaining for all the time as to why matter possesses mass, charge and inertia.

So also, the origin of energy fields including gravity field is quantitatively derived ; all universal constants are derived with a single universal constant. The basic form of energy is defined as, "massless space in acceleration."

The surface gravity of the earth is derived from space circulation around it. [This sounds weird, but Dr. Wheeler's comments on my initial work was, "Isn't this another way of stating the content of Einstein's 1917 and still standard geometric theory of gravity, according to which the geometry of space is a dynamic entity, changing from instant to instant according to an utterly simple and beautiful law"...]

With the principles of SVT , the concepts of the contemporary physics (CP), go topsy-turvy. For instance, photon can not possess mass or momentum, nor any angular momentum.

In fact light, basically, consists of spherical wave pulses, least like photons. So also there is no reality to "electromagnetic mass". It's the misconception on the very nature of mass that has led to assigning mass to mass-less entities.

Electron is a particle, least like a wave. Photon is a wave- pulse, least like a particle. Einstein did not account for the kinetic energy of photo electrons that they already possessed before their release in photoelectric effect. This led to an erroneous concept of photon that founded quantum physics.



If you are interested, I can send you my latest work. Then you can see for yourself the errors that exist at the very foundation of CP. The errors are so grave, that the mystery of mass, inertia, charge, and light can never be solved by CP.

Violation of the Lenz's law is shown theoretically possible in SVT. And, I have built electromagnetic machines that exceed 100% efficiency . But, under the existing physics, it is not possible to see as to how in a machine the output can exceed the input. It can not in thermodynamics; but can violate the Lenz's law in an electromagnet machine by reducing reaction on the prime mover. The fault lies in equating the energy conservation law with the Lenz's law --a mistake done in the 19th century.

In SVT two basic equations on electron- mass and electron-charge are derived showing the interrelationship between matter with space. If there is no matter, yet all the energy of the universe stays in dynamic space. But , if there is no reality of space, matter can not be created. Such a conclusion can be drawn only by a theory that reveals the very process of creation of electron (with all its properties of mass, charge, inertia, fields) and matter at large. I am not aware if any such theory exists. I wish some one takes note of these ideas rather than ignoring facts.

Best wishes,

Paramahansa

-----

From: P Tewari <ptewari1@sancharnet.in>

To: David Crockett Williams <gear2000@lightspeed.net>

Subject: Tetron Theory

Date: Saturday, October 25, 2003 3:58 PM

Dear David,

In your Tetron Theory [TNUFT] you conclude, "how everything is related according to the very nature of light". Your conclusion is perfectly correct, though I reach it under a somewhat different system of logic through space vortex theory (SVT).

The true nature of light, which you also inquire into as the very basic concept in INFUT, has not yet been grasped by the modern theories wave-quanta nature). The pre-relativity concept of light as a "wave motion in fluid ether" is nearer to the truth. In the Newtonian empty space (without a fluid ether), corpuscular nature of light was the only possibility, because how can there be a wave without a real fluid medium!

But, since in the relativity theory (1905), the medium of space is a void extension, here again like Newton's corpuscles of light, Einstein too had no other go but to imagine particle -like photon. The errors in the explanation of the photo electric effect were brought out in my previous note. Thus, the very concept of photon possessing mass, momentum, spin, kinetic energy etc., is erroneous, making all those theories that rest on these concepts far from truth.

Now on the wave nature of light, the question arises: "wave of what". It is now simpler to answer this question taking the example of the light-pulse produced in the process of annihilation of electron/positron [discovered in 1935?]. [ There is an article "Conceptual Errors on the Nature of Light.....," at [www.tewari.org](http://www.tewari.org), that discusses at length the modern misconception on the nature of light]. It is concluded in SVT that consequent to the annihilation of an electron and a positron, a spherical shell of light, in which the radial width of the shell, equal to the electron's radius (radius of the central void in electron's space vortex), is the wave length, is produced and transmitted at speed  $c$  relative to the fluid medium of space.

As the shell of light is transmitted out , the gravitational and electric potentials in the fields of the annihilated particles collapse to zero within the shell. Light is produced at a point in space due to time varying potentials at that point caused due to motion/vibration/ acceleration of electrons/atoms.

Light is not energy emitted from the centers of the annihilated electron and positron.; it is an effect produced due to dying potentials of the annihilated particles. This is the true nature of light as per SVT. When this nature of light is taken for analysis, then an observer moving towards a light source ( that sends successive pulses of annihilation light continuously) finds that its frequency (nos. of pulses received by him in unit time) is increased while the wavelength is proportionately decreased ; and if he recedes from the source, the very opposite happens.

Thus, the product: frequency  $\times$  wavelength, remains the same, that is, the same speed  $c$ , as postulated in Einstein's special relativity theory. But when the photon nature of light is taken into account, it becomes incomprehensible to conceive as to how different observers in relative motion can measure the same value of  $c$  unless one resorts to time dilation/ length contraction.

So, it's the misconception on the true nature of light that has caused the confusion. Light is not a phenomenon as fundamental as matter. With creation of electron [when the speed of rotation of the fluid space reaches  $c$  and its flow breaks down] gravity and electrostatic fields are first created. With motion, vibration, acceleration, annihilation of electron, the gravity and electrostatic fields change into electromagnetic field--that is, light. Had there been no creation of matter and its motion/oscillation, there would have been no light.

The speed of light  $c$ , that is,  $3/10^{10}$  cm/s, is associated with the most basic property in the universe of space and matter. In fact, the only absolute property that the superfund space has is its limiting angular rotation, which is  $c$  / electron radius, beyond which, its flow breaks down into matter.

As stated above, when the speed of rotation in a space vortex reaches  $c$ , the flow of the superfund space breaks down into electrons and positrons, thus creating mass, charge, gravity and electrostatic fields. Therefore, more basic than the transmission of potential effects, that the phenomenon of light is, is the maximum flow of space, which too is at the speed of light.

Thus, " $c$ " has two functions: (1) transmission of potential -effects relative to space at velocity  $c$ , and (2) limiting flow of space at velocity  $c$ .

It has been possible in SVT to derive all the known fields and predict new field (nuclear field) from a single constant  $c$  and the radius of the central void in electron's space vortex. All the universal constants too have been derived with the above basic constants. And this supports your theory that, "everything is related according to the very nature of light."

You mention  $c^2$ . In fact as per SVT,  $c^2$  is the maximum possible electric field in the universe and it is a vector quantity.  $c$  is also the maximum possible magnetic field in the universe and this too is a vector quantity;  $(c^2 / \text{electron's radius}) \cdot s^2$  is the universal time;  $(c^2 / \text{electron radius}) \cdot s^2$ , is the universal radius.

Also,  $c^2 / \text{electron radius}$ , is the maximum possible acceleration field (inward vector) in the vortex structure of electron. In all the above expressions,  $c$  appears as the limiting (maximum) flow of space, which, as pointed earlier, is the speed of light relative to space as well.

I think when it comes to truly basic concepts, like mass, charge, transmission of light, mathematical conventions of scalar and vector can be appropriately taken care of if so required. For instance, in SVT, mass is a product of volume and velocity of light, which should be a vector quantity. But, this problem stands resolved when mass is defined as the volume integral of velocity and becomes a scalar. Similarly, the product of electron surface and velocity of light is electric charge and should be a vector; but defining it as surface integral of velocity makes it scalar.

I think such mathematical conventions such as scalar and vector, though meaningful for computation, should not override analysis for truly basic physical concepts.

The question of velocity of light relative to observers arose because of relativity theory's empty space (Empty space does not explain creation of fields and matter; neither it can explain the very existence of light). In substantial space, " $c$ " is the limit of flow of space as well as transmission of potentials. And the very nature of light is such that observers in relative motion will measure the same value  $c$ . Hence,  $c$  is "non-additive" (as you mention in TNUFT).

Prior to creation of matter, the universal space is a conscious entity, which as I said in my earlier letter, is CHID-AAKAASH of the Vedas, FORMLESS ALLAH of Islam and SPIRIT of Christianity. An individual soul possibly, an independent spinning vortex (at speed less than  $c$ ) in the universal ocean of space] is not yet created. Consequent to the creation of the universal matter, individual souls with material enclosures are born as the living beings. Man is their higher evolution. Since he is in complete continuity with the universal consciousness, it is possible that through mass prayers to the Overself, natural happenings can be controlled.

The individual consciousness is derived from the universal consciousness, and part of the universal consciousness transforms into cosmic energy and matter. Man, a combination of the universal consciousness and universal matter is thus of Divine origin. Through his individual consciousness, which spreads out throughout the universe due to continuity of space, he is in a position to influence the consciousness of other living beings (at least higher forms of life like birds, animals, man) to some extent. His intense desire to make an event to take place, may materialize it through the help of other conscious beings.

But most of these processes take place with spiritual forces, as demonstrated by some saints, sages, the Prophets and Incarnations. [Shri Sathya Sai Baba is demonstrating such phenomena, that transcend physical sciences, for all to witness right since his birth(1926)]. But, for an individual to directly influence the experimental results from inert experimental set ups is something that can not be fathomed through physical sciences but, perhaps, feasible through spiritual forces.

Your prediction on fuel-less technology, partly if not wholly, and neutralization of radioactive waste will certainly come true.

Since your theory inquires into the true nature of light, which is the only absolute property that the universe possesses in the vast primordial volume of the substantial space, basically, it has truth in it.

Best wishes, Paramahansa

From: Adam Trombly [mailto:iasa@rof.net]

Sent: Friday, June 02, 2006 12:32 AM

To: 'David Crockett Williams'

Subject: RE: New Age Energy Technologies to replace nuclear and fossil fuel power, Santa Barbara Weekly on Bruce DePalma and The N-Machine.

David,

Tewari gives Depalma credit (Depalma should be given credit as a popularizer) but would just love to pretend that his first three papers regarding this technology were not about facsimiles of Joe's and my machine, and I feel it is time to say something. I was thrilled when I first heard of Tewari's experimental confirmation of our claims in 1986. But as soon as he tried to publish his second paper with Les Adams' publication "Magnets" he failed to cite our work until I demanded it.

I still have his letter of acquiescence to the publisher Les Adams.

I went on to co-invent six further generations of devices that demonstrated the actual principles. In 1989 a former colleague and I physically demonstrated a solid state ZP device in both New York and Washington D.C. Our presentation at Dag Hammarskjöld Auditorium received a 20 minute standing ovation but the press about the demonstration and speech that followed was totally suppressed.

We physically demonstrated over 50 times greater output than input but you will not find any acknowledgment of that on any of the so called Free Energy websites which presume authority.

In 2000 we demonstrated a subset of the same device in San Francisco. Hal Puthoff initially said, "Where do you think the extra electrical energy comes from? I'm a ZP man myself! Wow what is so cool about this Adam is there are more and Amps and more Volts coming out of this thing! That is really significant!" The other witnesses agreed. Then Hal left the room and returned with a Rube Goldberg box which was made in his lab in Texas but for which he had no information. He could not even tell us what actual measurement it did or the relevant algorithm. He just hooked it up and reversed himself saying, "Well you are not quite there yet." The other measurements that had confirmed the actual performance had been done on a beautiful Sony/Tektronix Scope which had been newly calibrated and was certified as such.

Yet this man who had promised that his backers would provide one billion dollars in initial funding for a demonstrable technology in front of several witnesses at the State of the World Forum in New York a few weeks before threw out one very real chance for the future of humanity based on a measurement done by an unknown machine with an unknown algorithm, which he could not explain at all!

We have to get hip to which individuals are the real obstructers of these technologies !

Puthoff later wrote me an email in which he asked me not to "think of me as the enemy." I don't. I still remember the youthful and excited look he had on his face when he saw the device work and confirmed the measurements on the real scope. I saw something good in Hal at that moment. I do not know what the powers that obstruct have on this man that could cause him to betray his own soul but it must be a humdinger ! I will just remember the beautiful look on his face and pray that one day he rediscovers his integrity. In the mean time we have no time for all of this garbage. We have shown for over two decades now that ZP works! There were some who came before us like Ed Gray who warned me before he died not to let his Navy handler (and mine) ruin my life's work the way his had been ruined. He was a really good man who ended up designing weapons you still have not seen in Janes, but which I saw in 1983.

There are so many stories. I loved Bruce for defending Joe and my work against the likes of Tom Vallone. Who is this guy? That is the question I asked Hans Neiper in 1980 at the First International Tachyon Field Energy Conference in Germany. He could not really tell me. But Vallone was quick to criticize me for spending too much money instead of doing really mediocre work!

By 1989 the ZP field had been so infiltrated by people from corporations like Lockheed, Ford Aerospace, spooks, bad copiers and mediocre pretenders that seized control of the conferences and undermined the field. What have any of them ever really done?

I could tell many, many stories but somehow we all need to pray that someone or some group is finally successful in acquiring the kind of support that is really need to commercialize ZP and help pull this species out of its current nose dive into the abyss.

Adam Douglass Trombly

\*\*\*\*\*

Santa Barbara, California - Proponents of DePalma's machine, believe the US government, to protect the energy industry, has suppressed widespread application of "N" type technologies.

"The same ethic of materialism that stopped Tesla's 'free energy' technologies in the early years of the 20th century, is today visibly responsible for wars, hunger, poverty, homelessness, pollution, and the prostitution of the American scientific community resulting in the completely insane endangerment of our planet threatened with the potential of complete destruction of all life by nuclear Holocaust."

"...it would have been difficult for [Tewari] to go on with work on the SVT and the generator were it not for encouragement from two U.S. physicists, Dr. John A. Wheeler of the University of Texas, Austin, and Bruce DePalma, formerly a lecturer in physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. "But for DePalma, I wouldn't have been able to tie up my theory," says Tewari. "He was working on similar ideas and kept sending his results to me."

By reviewing the following articles you can see that support for this project is thwarted by so-called experts in physics who are quoted stupidly in public news articles discrediting something they have not studied and are afraid of because it seems to violate their "known laws of physics." To those versed a bit in physics or electromagnetism it is clear that Dr. Hone's scientific response below is totally bogus because he is talking about the "induction effect" that he calls below the "Faraday effect" whereby a wire moving through a magnetic field has an electrical current induced in it by that motion, or so the "theory" behind that particular "law of physics" says.

This is this principle, electromagnetic induction, responsible for all the electricity generation by generators commonly used for a hundred years around the world and the same principle responsible for the operation, in reverse, of all commonly used electric motors, a coil of wire on an armature rotating inside an array of magnets producing a current in the wire to generate electricity and conversely by putting electricity into the coil it spins within those magnets as a motor. That Dr. Hone below acknowledges this and still says that this principle is not valid or scalable up to larger machines for more power is simply factually wrong. That he equates this principle of induction to the operation of the n-Machine which is based on a deeper understanding of a different effect found by Michael Faraday in 1831 that he called the homopolar or unipolar effect, and its corresponding unipolar or homopolar generator and motor effects, is also factually incorrect, since this latter effect has no wire/conductor moving relative to a magnet to "induce" current in the wire, but rather is a spinning disc magnet with attached metal conductor rotating together with no relative motion between the magnet and that conducting disc from which electricity is extracted flowing from the center to the edge of that rotating magnet/disc assembly.

Faraday also discovered that if the disc is rotated with the magnet stopped, there is a current flowing in the disc, this seemingly like induction. But if the magnet is rotated and the disc is stopped there is no current flowing in the disc, which violates the principle of induction and led Faraday to conclude that the magnetic lines of force of a magnet are not a property of the magnet but induced in the space the magnet occupies by its magnetic field, ie, because this non-reciprocal effect indicate the magnetic lines of force do not move with the magnet rotating.

This accounts for some of the confusion about this particular electromagnetic effect, which Faraday called the homopolar effect and DePalma re-discovered and proved independently 147 years later calling it the n-Effect, but with the additional insight of "tapping the free energy field of space itself."

This rotating magnetic assembly duplicated by Tewari of India, Shiuji Inomata of Japan, and by Adam Trombly, of Colorado's Aspen Institute for Advanced Studies (founded by Trombly and Buckminster Fuller, in the 1980's)

This "homopolar" effect was not known in the scientific community or taught in any of the schools before 1980 and the 1979 DePalma n-Machine tests quantitatively proved not only that this works but also, unique to DePalma and not conceived by Faraday, that rotation produces more current than it takes to operate a motor to spin the assembly. DePalma's earlier experiments on gravitation and rotation and inertia anomalies indicated to him that this "homopolar" effect he had only learned about in 1981 was due to the rotating assembly "extracting electricity from the energy field that exists in space itself, the space in which matter resides."

This idea that there is an enormous energy field in "space" or what now physicists since the 80's and 90's have been calling the "quantum vacuum flux" or "zero point energy" with various

attempts to theoretically understand and mathematically describe these ideas, are what DePalma's experiments, including the last one, the n-Machine, prove exists as what he called the "free energy of space" and what Tewari says his Space Vortex Theory explains. This proven by the performance of his overall overunity Space Power Generator version of DePalma's n-Machine.

Those first tests in Summer of 1979 of that n-Machine made by the Sunburst Community, which they called the S-Machine, did not show "overall overunity" performance (more total output power than the power to drive the generator with a motor) like Tewari's later models in India have shown, but the 1979 tests, reproduced in 1986 by Dr. Kincheloe of Stanford independently, showed an equally unexplainable by conventional "laws of physics" incremental overunity effect where at a given generator speed an increase of drive motor current produced from five to twenty times that amount in output current increase, but due to engineering that machine has not shown, yet, at its rotation speed design limits, to produce "overall overunity" performance. This is the context to know in reading the below to understand how significant a blow to this movement was this mistaken and negative report in the newspaper by a "physics expert."

After this article came out I went and personally spoke with Dr. Hone, also there was another article written about this time frame from the UCSB newspaper, and he just said he was misquoted, but he did not make any effort to correct his slander that DePalma's work was a hoax. In normal circles DePalma would have won a big lawsuit against Hone and UCSB for libel, but in this arena of forefront science this has been the way it has

gone because the public in general is not at all confident or competent in its understanding of fundamentals of science such as this and feel compelled to rely on the view of "the experts" who as below are often just plain wrong by intent or ignorance. They claim they are misquoted, but take no responsibility for getting the real truth out there once they figure out they made a mistake, if it was a mistake and not by intent to discredit some of the most important work in science in the 20th Century.

The Sunburst Community founder Norman Paulsen still has that 1979 test machine in Santa Barbara area under auspices of Solar Logos Foundation, Sunburst Church of Self-Realization.

<http://www.solarlogosfoundation.org>.

See also the work of Thomas Bearden on the solid state MEG oscillating electromagnetic system, Magnetic Energy Generator:  
<http://www.cheniere.org>

Bruce DePalma's earlier experiments, showing anomalous inertial and gravitational effects of rotating and rotating-and-precessing systems convinced him '72-'78 of not only the existence of, but the properties of what he termed an "energy field that exists in space itself, the space in which matter resides." The results with which analysis and contemplation led to his literal "Eureka moment" jumping out of the bathtub to write a drawing in March 1977 which he circulated predicting if the flywheel were magnetized, energy could be extracted from this energy field as electricity flowing from center to edge of the rotating magnetized flywheel. At that time the knowledge of Faraday's homopolar/unipolar motor/generator effect observations as per his diary entries Christmas time 1831 was not known by DePalma or taught at all in schools.

In 1978 someone in Santa Barbara familiar with DePalma's previous work in electronic engineering audio circuit designs published in hi-fi electronics magazines, prompted a sound man for the Grateful Dead music band to read that paper predicting the n-Machine as an "overunity homopolar generator" (term not used or known then circulated about 1980 by DePalma, about two years after his prediction).

A community in Santa Barbara brought DePalma and Ed Delvers there to test this work of theirs and Bruce's prediction, which they did first with a device glued together and spun in a hand-drill. Qualitative proof was demonstrated on a VTVM meter with needle probes at the axle and the edge of steel disc cemented to a ring magnet from a loudspeaker. In Summer 1979 they tested a large rotating electromagnetic system and got between 5:1 and 20:1 incremental over-unity effects over range of parameter variations (speed of rotation and strength of rotating electromagnet) as per witness by DOE team et al. <http://www.depalma.pair.com>

There was a memorial remembrance gathering in Tehachapi for Ed Delvers a few weeks after his sudden passing from an apparent acute asthma attack, so I would sure like to share this as a testimony to Ed's little known contributions as Bruce's protege and one of his most brilliant students at MIT, asking original and penetrating questions about physics principles. DePalma was greatly influenced and aided on his path by working with Ed to test the spinning vs non-spinning ball bearing drop, after they could not find in the literature if it had ever been done before. Were it not for "Ed's mind" in its student-teacher dynamic with DePalma, this whole line of enquiry may never have started. Neither may have these keystone, Galileo-like, fundamental, principle discovery experiments have been pursued either.

The spinning vs. non-spinning ball bearing drop experiment as ultimately witnessed by Dr. John A Wheeler in his own office, after a photo of the experiment was published in the Sunday newspaper with an article bemoaning his refusal to go see the experiment, seems to be some kind of "secret" history as evidenced by years of refutation by Dr.Sarfatti and others of these documented experiments. Dr.Wheeler certainly seems to be in support of P.Tewari and in complete denial of the contributions made by Bruce E. DePalma.

Compiled from the personal archives of Bruce E. DePalma with permission.

#### Appendix

##### 1. Correspondence between Bruce Depalma and Dr. Schrieffer University of California

Santa Barbara, Institute of Theoretical Physics.

##### 2. Adam Trombly's 1988 Climate Change and Alternative Physics lecture transcribed.

##### 3. 1988 N- 1 Report and Standford Emeritus Professor Kinchloe's review.

##### 4. Paramahansa Tewari "Beyond Matter."

##### 5. Sparky Sweet "Nothing is Something."

##### 6. Dr. Fred Wood "Maxwell-Heavyside equations revisited."

Please visit these most interesting sites :

[BruceDePalma.com](http://BruceDePalma.com)

[Depalma.pair.com](http://Depalma.pair.com)

[Projectearth.com](http://Projectearth.com)

[Tewari.org](http://Tewari.org)

[Rexresearch.com](http://Rexresearch.com)

[Infinite-energy.com](http://Infinite-energy.com)

[Padrak.com/ine](http://Padrak.com/ine)

[Nexusmagazine.com](http://Nexusmagazine.com)

[Cheniere.org](http://Cheniere.org)

[Peswiki.com](http://Peswiki.com)