

A NEW PARADIGM

As a young man, inventor Joseph Newman did question "certain things (that) have unequivocally been observed to be so" --- after all, this is one of the principal ways in which new scientific understandings of the universe can occur, by questioning "the accepted explanations" of a given paradigm.

I will pose the following three questions:

- 1) Why is it that one can move a conductor in one hand physically through the magnetic field of Faraday's Generator, and the (electro)magnetic field 'propagates along the conductor' somewhat faster than the original movement of the conductor (held in your hand) through the magnetic field?
- 2) How would you mechanically and fundamentally explain Fleming's Rule?
- 3) How would you mechanically and fundamentally explain Magnetic Attraction and Repulsion?

Question No. 1:

Joseph Newman was raised as a "hard-nosed country boy" (to employ the colloquialism) --- as such, he did *not* believe in getting "something for nothing" sometimes referred to as "perpetual motion." His mind instinctively rebelled against such a notion.

Yet, when he observed that one's motion (slow) of one's hand holding a conductor wire and moving it through a magnetic field (in a particular orientation) produces an electric field (very fast) along the same conductor, this superficially appeared to him to be a case of one obtaining "something (very fast) for nothing (slow)." He refused to believe this could be the case since he did not believe in "perpetual motion." He chose to investigate further.

Through his studies it became obvious that "something" was ALREADY moving (very fast) in that (electro) magnetic field, and this (very fast) "something" was simply being **DEFLECTED** onto the conductor as it moved (slowly) through the magnetic field.

This conclusion answered his first question. If he had the attitude of some conventionally-educated scientists he would just leave it at that and be satisfied.

He opted to question further:

What was the precise nature of this "something"?

Also, this question: does this "something" have a **MECHANICAL** nature?

Well, two of the greatest minds of the last 200 years believed that it DID.

Their names:

Michael Faraday (the mechanical genius)

and

James Clerk Maxwell (the mathematical genius)

I believe I can say that Joseph Newman would prefer to "stand on the shoulders" of these two great men rather than operationally accept the status quo and "loungue on the postulations of some conventionally-educated,

present-day scientists."

[I should add that there are certainly those in the teaching profession who are indeed exceptions to the above -- such teachers who are truly curious, rational, and intellectually honest.]

And what did these two men state?:

Well, Michael Faraday wrote:

"I cannot conceive curved lines of force without the conditions of a PHYSICAL existence in that intermediate space."

--- MICHAEL FARADAY

and

"How few understand the PHYSICAL lines of force! They will not see them, yet all the researches on the subject tend to confirm the views I put forth many years since. Thompson of Glasgow seems almost the only one who acknowledges them. He is perhaps the nearest to understanding what I meant. I am content to wait convinced as I am of the truth of my views."

--- MICHAEL FARADAY

And what does James Clerk Maxwell have to say on this subject:

"In speaking of the Energy of the field, however, I wish to be understood LITERALLY. All energy is the same as MECHANICAL ENERGY, whether it exists in the form of motion or in that of elasticity, or in any other form. The energy in electromagnetic phenomena is MECHANICAL energy."

--- JAMES CLERK MAXWELL

That's a pretty strong, rather unequivocal statement on the part of James Clerk Maxwell.

And just so, no one might later misinterpret his remarks, he added, with EMPHASIS:

"I WISH TO BE UNDERSTOOD LITERALLY"

Literally.

Well, "literally" in my book means **LITERALLY**.

And what is James Clerk Maxwell *literally* saying about the nature of the energy of the field?

--- that ALL --- ALL --- ENERGY is the SAME as MECHANICAL ENERGY..... that all such energy in ELECTROMAGNETIC PHENOMENA is MECHANICAL ENERGY.

As physicist Dr. Roger Hastings (who endorsed Joseph Newman's work) wrote regarding Maxwell's emphasis on the MECHANICAL nature of energy:

"This is stated in no uncertain terms in Maxwell's book *A Dynamical Theory of the Electromagnetic Field*. In fact, Maxwell used a dynamical model to derive his famous equations. This fact has all but been lost in current books on electromagnetic theory. The quantity which Maxwell called 'electromagnetic momentum' is now referred to as the 'vector potential.'"

And in a reference to the work of Richard Feynman, physicist Robert Matherne (who also endorsed Joseph Newman's work) wrote:

"While reading my *Commemorative Issue of The Feynman Lectures on Physics by Feynman, Leighton, and Sands*, published by the Addison Wesley Publishing Company, I encountered a passage on relativistic momentum considerations by Richard Feynman that sounded so similar to what Joseph Newman said in his Energy Machine

book, that I wanted to share it. Here's the operant quotation from page 10-9 of Volume I:

'One of the propositions of Newton was that interactions at a distance are instantaneous. It turns out that such is not the case; in situations involving electrical forces, for instance, if an electrical charge at one location is suddenly moved, the effects on another charge, at another place, do not appear instantaneously -- there is a little delay It takes time for the influence to cross the intervening distance, which is done at 186,000 miles a second. In that tiny time the momentum of the particles is not conserved. Of course, after the second charge has felt the effect of the first one and all is quieted down, the momentum equation will check out all right, but during that small interval momentum is not conserved. We represent this by saying that during this interval there is another kind of momentum besides that of the particle, mv , and that is momentum in the electromagnetic field. If we add the field momentum to the momentum of the particle, then momentum is conserved at any moment all the time. The fact that the electromagnetic field can possess momentum and energy **MAKES THAT FIELD VERY REAL, and so, for better understanding, the original idea that there are just the forces between particles has to be modified to the idea that the particles make a field, and a field acts on another particle, and **THE FIELD ITSELF HAS SUCH FAMILIAR PROPERTIES AS ENERGY CONTENT AND MOMENTUM, JUST AS PARTICLES CAN HAVE.**' [Emphasis added.]**

"From the First Edition of *The Energy Machine of Joseph Newman*, page 20, I quote:

'The FACTS above clearly indicate that the magnetic field consists of GYROSCOPIC TYPE MASSERGIES which are the mechanical essence of $E = mc^2$ and represent an orderly flow of kinetic energy.' [Emphasis added.]

"Note the similarity between the Feynman and Newman descriptions of the electromagnetic field: both say the field has energy content and momentum. Feynman, however, pulls his punches by inserting the scientific qualification, '...just as particles can have' while Newman says directly the field consists of 'particles in motion.' **PARTICLES** in motion, by definition, have momentum, and the electromagnetic field, according to Nobel Laureate Feynman, in a stretching of the very definition of momentum, has momentum. Since no one has ever seen either an electric field nor gyroscopic particles (nor will, presumably, they **EVER**, since seeing requires the objects be larger than a wavelength of light, which they definitely are not), both are legitimate ways of talking about a reality that we cannot observe directly. Feynman's way of talking used the concept of field in the accepted scientific say, up until now. Here's a later quote by Feynman from the same page 10-9:

'To take another example --- an electromagnetic field has waves, which we call light; it turns out that light also carries momentum with it, so when light impinges on a object it carries in a certain amount of momentum per second; this is equivalent to a force, because if the illuminated object is picking up a certain amount of momentum per second, its momentum is changing and the situation is exactly the same as if there were a force on it. Light can exert pressure by bombarding an object; this pressure is very small, but with sufficiently delicate apparatus it is measurable.'

"If the momentum of the electromagnetic fields or particles of the sun's rays can be used, as some scientists have proposed, to build a solar sail to power future space ships throughout the solar system, perhaps the momentum of the electromagnetic fields surrounding large coils of wire can be used to provide an efficient source of electrical power throughout the same solar system without the use of fossil or radioactive fuels. This is the promise of Joseph Newman's revolutionary energy machine and its associated theory."

--- Robert Joseph Matherne, Physicist

But Joseph Newman isn't the only one describing such fields as "matter in motion." James Clerk Maxwell 'beat him to the punch':

Maxwell also wrote:

"The Theory I propose may ... be called a Theory of the Electromagnetic Field because it has to do with the space in the neighborhood of the electric or magnetic bodies, AND IT MAY BE CALLED A DYNAMICAL THEORY,

BECAUSE IT ASSUMES THAT IN THAT SPACE THERE IS MATTER IN MOTION, BY WHICH THE OBSERVED ELECTROMAGNETIC PHENOMENA ARE PRODUCED." --- JAMES CLERK MAXWELL (Emphasis added.)

These are pretty strong statements on Maxwell's part and he did not intend for the scientific establishment which came after him to ignore his words.

Operationally speaking, they have.

For the historical record:

I should state that Joseph Newman's conclusion about the fundamental mechanical nature of (electro)magnetic fields was reached years before he became aware of Maxwell's position on this matter. For Joseph Newman, Maxwell's strong statements served as corroboration from a mathematical genius of the rightness of Joseph Newman's paradigm.

All right.... to continue the discussion....

..... **MATTER IN MOTION**....

Joseph Newman took the concept of "MATTER IN MOTION" and integrated it with his earlier observations regarding Faraday's Generator, i.e., that "something" was **ALREADY** moving (very fast) in that magnetic field, and this (very fast) "something" was simple being **DEFLECTED** onto the conductor as it moved (slowly) through the magnetic field.

Next fundamental question:

What is the operational, mechanical nature/behavior of this "something"?

To say that a magnetic field consists of "matter in motion" is an advance in our fundamental understanding of such a field. But it doesn't tell us much about the real, physical characteristics of this "matter in motion."

Perhaps if one was to fundamentally and deeply understand the mechanical behavior of these "matter(s) in motion," then one might be able to even conceive of a new way of constructing Motors/Generators that would enable one to more efficiently harness the pre-existing, real, kinetic, physical, **MECHANICAL MOTION** of these "somethings."

It was approximately at this point in his studies that Joseph Newman came across **Fleming's Rule**.

Now, what does Fleming's Rule state?

Fleming's Rule states:

"If the fingers of the right hand are placed around a current-carrying wire so that the thumb points in the direction of the conventional current, the fingers will point in the direction of the magnetic field."

Great. That is a convenient "rule." It is a corroborable-by-observation "rule."

Great. Electrical engineers are aware (presumably) of that Rule.

But accepting the limited paradigm of the Rule does not answer the more fundamental question:

What MECHANICALLY --- physically --- causes the Rule to be true?

That is the more fundamental question that occupied Joseph Newman's mind during the 1960s. He sought an honest answer to that more fundamental question as to what is the **MECHANICAL** cause of Fleming's Rule. He

could not find an answer to that question in any of the books that he read on electromagnetics and electrical engineering. Yet he believed it was absolutely essential to answer that question, if he was to progress in a deeper understanding of the fundamental MECHANICAL nature of (electro)magnetic fields [per Faraday's and Maxwell's statements above].

It was about this time in his studies that he began studying the GYROSCOPE. He had heard that the "gyroscope" was a stabilizer, but did not know much more about its nature. As a hobby, he began mechanically working with gyroscopes and children's bicycles (he converted the bicycle of a neighbor's son to a clutch system to better enable it to perform "wheelies") --- so he began to acquire a first-hand understanding of the behavior of GYROSCOPES.

At one point in this process, he *instantly* had an answer to the question that had "boggled his mind" for so long: he *instantly* knew that those "somethings" in that magnetic field surrounding Faraday's Generator individually behaved as **miniature "GYROSCOPES."**

Many related concepts then began to "click" in his mind. It was then that his real insights into the **mechanical** nature of (electro)magnetic fields began to generate a new paradigm concerning such fields.

As he explains in detail in Chapter Two of his book: [

Note: I will endeavor to describe only in words what is graphically and with words depicted step-by-step in the book.]

1-A) If one has North and South ends of magnets facing one another with a gap between them (as in Faraday's Generator), if one moves a conductor DOWN at a right angle to the magnetic field, the CURRENT FLOW MOVES LEFT. (Figure 11-A)

1-B) If one applies a downward force to the axis of a spinning gyroscope, it will pivot at a right angle to the force (in this case of Figure 11-A1) it will PIVOT LEFT. Now imagine that this gyroscope has a forward motion at the speed of light as well as spins at the speed of light.

2-A) If one has North and South ends of magnets facing one another with a gap between them (as in Faraday's Generator), if one moves a conductor UP at a right angle to the magnetic field, the CURRENT FLOW MOVES RIGHT. (Figure 11-B)

2-B) If one applies an upward force to the axis of a spinning gyroscope, it will pivot at a right angle to the force (in this case of Figure 11-B1) it will PIVOT RIGHT and opposite to the case of 1-B above. Now imagine that this gyroscope has a forward motion at the speed of light as well as spins at the speed of light.

3-A) Now flip the above-described magnets over 180 degrees: If one has a South and North magnet facing one another with a gap between them (as in Faraday's Generator), if one moves a conductor DOWN at a right angle to the magnetic field, the CURRENT FLOW MOVES RIGHT and opposite to that of case 1-A even though the force direction is the same. (Figure 11-C)

3-B) Now flip the above-described gyroscope over 180 degrees: If one applies a downward force to the axis of a spinning gyroscope, it will pivot at a right angle to the force (in this case of Figure 11-C1) it will PIVOT RIGHT and opposite to the case of 1-B above even though the force direction is the same. Now imagine that this gyroscope has a forward motion at the speed of light as well as spins at the speed of light.

4-A) With the magnets in the same position as 3-A, if one has a South and North magnet facing one another with a gap between them (as in Faraday's Generator), if one moves a conductor UP at a right angle to the magnetic field, the CURRENT FLOW MOVES LEFT and opposite to that of case 2-A even though the force direction is the same. (Figure 11-D)

4-B) With the gyroscope in the same position as 3-B, if one applies an upward force to the axis of a spinning gyroscope, it will pivot at a right angle to the force (in this case of Figure 11-D1) it will PIVOT LEFT and opposite to the case of 2-B above even though the force direction is the same. Now imagine that this gyroscope has a forward motion at the speed of light as well as spins at the speed of light.

5-A) With the magnets in the same position as 3-A, move the conductor vigorously "up" and "down" through the magnetic field, MAINTAINING THE CONDUCTOR FORCE PARALLEL TO THE MAGNETIC LINES OF FORCE AND *NO* CURRENT FLOW IN THE CONDUCTOR WILL RESULT.

5-B) Apply a vigorous "up" and "down" force parallel to the axis of the spinning gyroscope. Regardless of how energetically the force is applied, as long as the force remains parallel, the gyroscope will not pivot even though it has a forward motion at the speed of light.

THE ANALOGY OF THE ABOVE TWO EXAMPLES IS SCIENTIFICALLY EXACT!

Once Joseph Newman began to understand that the "mechanically moving somethings" in a magnetic field each possessed a GYROSCOPIC SPIN, then many other insights began to fall into place.

It was at this time that Joseph Newman also began to understand and mechanically explain:

- 1) Why, in a mechanical sense, does a magnet attract and repel other magnets?
- 2) Why, in a mechanical sense, do electric charges attract and repel?
- 3) What is the energy in a magnetic field and what is its source?
- 4) Did the energy used in creating a permanent magnet have any bearing upon the strength or energy contained within a magnetic field emitted from the permanent magnet once it was made?

As Joseph Newman writes in Chapter Two of his book,

"In the early part of 1965, I eagerly researched the known facts concerning the creation of a permanent magnet. Because I instinctively knew that if the strength of a magnetic field was solely relative to the energy input, then I would know I was incorrect. But if the strength of the magnetic field was INDEPENDENT of the energy input, then I would be even more assured that I was correct.

"Upon examining the known facts concerning permanent magnets, I again knew that I WAS correct."

It took Joseph Newman over 15 years to develop and refine his Theory and Technical Process. It was not until these many years passed did he even construct his first crude, hand-built prototype to demonstrate the operability of his Technical Process. Ironically, Joseph Newman *knew* that his invention would work and demonstrate the nature of his Technical Process. The prototype(s) were needed to convince the rest of the world. I should add, that Joseph Newman considers his Theory to be far more important than the application.

This attitude on his part is analogous to Einstein and his Theory of Relativity.

For a number of years earlier in the 20th century there was no "proof" of Einstein's Theory -- it was just a challenging (and sometimes upsetting to others) idea in Einstein's head.

It was not until the Ecliptic Expedition of 1919 (Chaired by Arthur Eddington) that Einstein's Theory was corroborated. During 1919, a journalist on hand who was following the Expedition cornered Einstein and asked him, "*Dr. Einstein, your entire Theory hangs on the balance of this Expedition. Aren't you a bit concerned as to its outcome?*"

Characteristically, Einstein replied, "*Oh no. I'm not worried. I know my Theory is correct. The Expedition is only needed to convince the rest of the world.*"

My introduction to Joseph Newman's work nearly 20 years ago was through an understanding of his revolutionary explanation for Magnetic Attraction and Repulsion. It was at that point that I became convinced of the validity of his Theory.

In essence, a **MAGNETIC FIELD** mechanically consists of "negative" and "positive" gyroscopic

particles having opposite spins and simultaneously traveling in OPPOSITE directions, e.g., the concentric "shells of force" surrounding a bar magnet.

An **ELECTRIC CURRENT** mechanically consists of "negative" and "positive" gyroscopic particles having opposite spins and traveling in the SAME direction down a conductor wire --- as does light traveling in space through a medium.

"In speaking of the Energy of the field, however, I wish to be understood literally. All energy is the same as mechanical energy, whether it exists in the form of motion or in that of elasticity, or in any other form. The energy in electromagnetic phenomena is mechanical energy."

--- JAMES CLERK MAXWELL

To view these documents, click on the title:

- * [The Origins of the Patent Battle](#) *
- * [A New Paradigm](#) *
- * [An Interesting Demonstration](#) *
- * [A Cooling Effect](#) *
- * [Corroborative Information from The Journal of Applied Physics](#) *
- * [Endorsement of Joseph Newman's Work by Distinguished Expert](#) *
- * [Affidavits & Evaluation](#) *
- * [Joseph Newman's Statement to Universities](#) *
- * [Declaration by Dr. Roger Hastings, PhD](#) *
- * [Statement by Joseph Newman](#) *
- * [Four Letters from a Mathematical Physicist](#) *
- * [Heat & The Three Laws of Thermodynamics](#) *
- * [Joseph Newman's Theory --- by Dr. Roger Hastings, PhD](#) *
- * [Letter from Col. Thomas Bearden](#) *
- * [A Preliminary Quantification of Newman's Effect](#) *
- * [Design Considerations for Rotating Magnet Newman Motors](#) *
- * [Measurement and Analysis of Joseph Newman's Energy Generator](#) *
- * [Commentary Regarding Einstein's Equation of \$E = mc^2\$](#) *
- * [The Magnetic Current and Single Magnetic Charges](#) *
- * [Existence of "Less-Than-Whole" Electronic Charges"](#) *
- * [Light and Quantum Mechanics: Additional Verification](#) *
- * [Falling Gyroscope Experiment: Additional Verification](#) *

To return to the main webpage, click on the title:

[The Energy Machine of Joseph Newman](#)

E-mail: josephnewman@earthlink.net