

Submission for Quality of Life Policy Group:

Robert F. Beck

## Climate Change – we can win and improve quality of life

My title suggests that I am right behind David Cameron's positive approach. I am, 100%. And I am right behind Nick Hurd in saying that this is not the time to lapse into lazy scepticism. My autobiography talks about my passion for sports and especially cricket, and that if 36 runs were required to win off the last over, I would consider only one initial approach, and resignation of defeat is not it!

Apart from aircraft flights, I agree that, theoretically, mankind already has the technology to win the war (yes, I agree war) against climate change, without a huge drop in quality of life, but subject to the timescale indicated by Stern being correct and universal will to apply it.

Unfortunately I have evidence to present that implies much greater urgency (greater even than suggested in the excellent statements of science posted here) and I think that universal will may depend on new technologies that all nations can benefit equally from. That may not sound very positive, but in the most positive vein, what two technologies would not only make a vast difference, but would also vastly improve quality of life for all humanity? The answer is anti-gravity and cold fusion. Pie in the sky? Well I have good news and bad news.

First, here is some of the bad news. The following interview answers by Dr. Storms, a semi-retired, former Los Alamos scientist working in the field of cold fusion, explains why unenlightened governments up to now, and those people with vested interests, have considered some technologies to be “disruptive”. (See also Russell Gittins' comment)

**Would you say that if cold fusion reaches its potential, it would enable homes, vehicles, and businesses to create their own power source on site, for virtually pennies?**

I think cold fusion is one of several ideal energy sources. It's an interesting time because a number of other ideal sources are being proposed. Cold fusion is probably the most thoroughly documented at this point, but all of them have several things in common. They would be very inexpensive, pollution-free, and inexhaustible. Also, the source of energy would be hard for a single company or government to control because the generators can be very easily localized and built on a small scale for any special application.

**How would you rate the significance of cold fusion relative to, let's say, the discovery of electricity?**

These forthcoming technologies are very basic to the way society is organized and the way people live. They are going to change our lifestyle enormously. They're going to change how political power operates and alter the economic structure of the world. So yes, they are going to have a basic fundamental impact. They will allow mankind to live in all parts of the world, many of which are inhospitable now because water is unavailable. These energy sources will allow water to be made available from the oceans by inexpensive desalinization. They will also allow mankind to explore the universe. At the present time, we can't do that because chemical energy is not

sufficiently dense and conventional nuclear energy is too dangerous. These new kinds of energy sources are sufficiently dense and don't have these other problems, so they would allow us to explore the solar system and beyond. Who knows what possibilities would come about?

The entire interview can be found on:

<http://www.newenergytimes.com/Conversations/storms/coldFusionTheBigPicture.htm>

This is recommended reading for those wishing to know more about this subject, and it contains some of the good news in the form of Dr. Storms' openness and confidence. It also contains what may be mixed news in what is already happening in Japan. There, power companies are already getting involved in the research.

Now this is the logical answer, and what our companies should be doing to work towards the ultimate goal of freeing themselves and the rest of us from the vagaries of fossil fuel supply. Ingenuity will find a way of building in some sort of lifespan to fusion power units. As Dr. Storms points out, there is no such thing as completely free energy. Some material is required for fusion that has to be eventually replaced. And I think that some components may get "fired up", requiring periodic replacement. Like light bulbs, supply and demand can be organised

Some say that it will be possible to get "free" energy from space. I agree with this possibility but only because I know that space is not empty, but full of neutrinos and anti-neutrinos, in solar systems anyway, from which positrons and electrons can be made (in my theory). But like crop gathering, you have to expend some energy to gather the end product or to make it happen. Dr. Bruce DePalma claimed that his "N" machine extracted free energy from space, but I think that it depended on the Earth's magnetic field. He died young in what some think may have been suspicious circumstances. My investigations are inconclusive, but now suggest his lifestyle as the probable cause.

But there is another possible sinister implication that may confirm the bad news, whilst corroborating Dr. Storms' views. Another expert in the field, Dr. Eugene Mallove, was beaten to death during an alleged robbery. He was well respected for his knowledge of cold fusion, and had just published an "open letter" outlining the results of and reasons for his last 15 years in the field of "new energy research". Dr. Mallove was convinced it was only a matter of months before the world would actually see a "free energy" device.

It may seem optimistic to wish to believe the views of just two scientists, when most remain sceptical, but I do have more to go on than just that. My report below considers evidence of remarkable phenomena, and my own contact with a Russian working in this field (full details in Appendix 1, not included here), our agreement on various points, my thoughts on his work in the light of this phenomena, and the agreement of several others with Professor Kanarev and I on the nature of electrons, all leads me to what may be an understanding of exactly how cold fusion may be possible.

And what of anti-gravity? Even more unlikely? Well I have developed my own theory of gravitation and I have evidence to present that not only demonstrates the possible credibility of this (Appendix I of the full report – not included here

and the report as a whole), it appears to verify not only my claim that anti-gravity is possible, but two specific details that I have been suggesting are the most likely key to its realisation.

This is possibly good news, but it goes with bad news I am afraid, in confirmation of the very same negative attitudes mentioned above, and other evidence that suggests that time may be running out even faster than Stern suggests. And I have to report my own disturbing findings on the state of physics and even an alleged pact between the Church and Academia to discourage the discussion of unified field theories.

I have presented and analysed all this evidence in a recent report for my own MP, which I intend to present to the Prime Minister, Archbishop of Canterbury, the Pope, various academics and institutions, and possibly other governments and the UN, subject to guidance. I have already sent it to David Cameron and others in the party, and to Norman Baker, with whom I have had correspondence on the impact of aircraft flights.

It is relatively short, 37 pages, much of which is appendices that I have omitted here. These contain many favourable comments from open-minded dissidents in support of my theory, and correspondence that appears to confirm reluctance on the part of the Government, Archbishop of Canterbury, and a renowned physicist and cleric, to adequately consider my claim that quite simple and inexpensive experiments (initially) may verify my theory.

The Revd. Dr. John Polkinghorne K.B.E., F.R.S., appeared in the BBC documentary about Einstein. He features in a book I have on quantum theory, and actually studied under one of our greatest physicists and early pioneer of quantum theory, Paul Dirac. Now Paul Dirac was able to unify two separate camps in this field by proposing something very similar to what I concluded, with no knowledge of Dirac's specific conclusion at the time. So, because I was also claiming Divine revelation, I expected Dr. Polkinghorne to be very interested in this, and an awful lot more I had to say, especially about experimental evidence that appeared to confirm my view of mass. Why he was not remained a puzzle, unless perhaps there is some truth in the allegation of a pact of silence between the Church and Academia, or perhaps because I am right in suspecting that lead in petrol affected the ability of some to think logically.

My report is entitled:

“Possible Evidence of the Greatest ever Crime Against Humanity?”

Note that since drafting, and since I emailed a copy to Dr. Angela Venters in the Department of Science and Innovation, Lord Sainsbury has resigned. Any connection may be unlikely, but this should be noted in reading my recommendations. I also discovered the information about Dr. Storms and Dr. Mallove after it was finished. Anyone who does not already have the full report can email me via my website: [www.einsteins-revolution.com](http://www.einsteins-revolution.com) where I also hope to post it soon.

## Introduction

The dangers of climate change are now regularly headline news. Report after report confirms and adds to evidence of looming catastrophes on an unprecedented scale. Yesterday (29/10/06) BBC Breakfast mentioned a recent report envisaging disastrous consequences of climate chaos in Africa, one of many areas where it is the actions of the wealthiest nations that will be responsible for untold suffering amongst the poorest and most vulnerable.

But we in the UK are also not immune from possible disaster. The current that drives the Gulf Stream is already showing signs of faltering (30% reduction reported in New Scientist), threatening our very way of life and prosperity. Even the US is arguably already starting to reap the consequences (New Orleans), and other great cities and low lying areas there are threatened by a combination of increased atmospheric energy and probable rises in sea levels, not to mention the economic and political consequences of global catastrophes and instabilities. Ultimately, the whole World and World order is under threat, the consequences of which could bring widespread suffering exceeding all that mankind's arrogance and stupidity managed to inflict upon itself in the last century.

Today (30/10/06) I find that another report, by renowned economist Sir Nicholas Stern, echoes these fears quantitatively (up to £3.68 trillion recession and 200million refugees) and predicts "massive recession" unless money is spent now tackling the problem. I have to say that such figures may represent spurious exactitude, but I have to agree that the scale of the figures has to be considered possible, or even exceedable.

The danger of this report, however, is naïvety about the prospects of achieving solutions without radical new technologies that can benefit all nations. And Stern, not a scientist, offers the highly dangerous opinion that CO2 levels 25% above current levels would be high – but acceptable. Working on this basis is a huge gamble. I doubt if Stern was aware when drafting this report that scientists are now saying that the vast, sub-Arctic forests and bogs may be just one degree centigrade away from disastrous and unstoppable thaw, with decaying vegetation releasing huge volumes of methane, a much worse greenhouse gas than CO2, in a self-reinforcing, accelerating mechanism (ground warming through less reflection). And temperature increase is fastest in these areas, giving us perhaps ten years to avoid disaster by reducing carbon emissions, not stabilising them at a higher level. See New Scientist, 30 Sept. p. 8.

Sir Nicholas Stern and others should note that this New Scientist report ends with the following quote and comment "The Boreal region is like a giant carbon bank account. At current prices in the European carbon emissions trading system, Canada's stored carbon alone would be worth \$3.7 trillion." (Canadian environmental consultant) I wish the report had clarified which dollars, presumably Canadian, but a massive figure anyway, and the report concludes "And if Hansen (NASA) is right that the carbon and methane stored in the boreal regions has the potential to transform the world into "another planet", then the boreal region may be worth a great deal more than that.

This is just one of various dangers. This must be seen as the third great war for civilisation and we need another Churchill to adequately warn us of the harsh realities and to encourage us to face them sensibly and logically. It is not logical to impose green taxes on aircraft flights whilst actively encouraging increased numbers of them! And we cannot naïvely ignore the likely actions of others such as the USA, India, China etc. The bottom line is that without the rapid development of adequate new technologies, applied on a global scale, we may be sunk.

But what if the technology that could have prevented this situation has been potentially available for half a century, but has deliberately been suppressed for reasons that are no longer valid and represent self-interest that globally is criminally negligent? Such action, if continued in the light of these now apparent consequences, would amount to the greatest ever crime against humanity, and of course, arguably, maybe the greatest ever sin.

This report sets out the evidence that I have recently become aware of and my own particular reasons for considering the possibility of its validity.

## **Background to my involvement**

Since early 2004 I have been constantly increasing my efforts to make physicists, the government, the media, the press and the Church, and the public via my book, aware of my firm belief that God has given me a new understanding of the true meaning of relativity and other knowledge that means that genuine anti-gravity, not just means of achieving lift, has to be possible.

Understandably at first perhaps, I was ignored as a probable crank, though I insisted that as the dangers of climate change became ever more apparent, it had to be logical to at least open a debate about my claims. Regrettably, much time has been wasted in what seems to have been grim determination by almost all to ignore what I was saying, though I can see various reasons for some doubting my credibility. I can, however, now provide authoritative support for the possibility that I am right, in the form of the views of scientists willing to consider ideas contrary those which mainstream physicists appear to be happy to consider as almost “set in stone”; an approach which to my mind is unscientific, and even puzzling bearing in mind the current impasse in physics. The facts are as follows.

In the summer of 2003 I was a retired town planner seeking a quiet and humble existence primarily as a carpenter and tool sharpener, many years after taking some personal interest in relativity whilst doing “A” levels and two years of an engineering degree in the 60’s. I was recovering from a recurrence of the health problems (anxiety & depression) that had led to my retirement from local government in 1984, which were this time triggered by a string of misfortunes that also led me to re-affirm my Christian faith in a decision to trust God no matter what.

In October 2003, I have no doubt, as a consequence of this decision, I had experiences which convinced me that I was being given an understanding of relativity clearly beyond my own ability to reach. The experiences continued for

about two weeks, and exactly one month after the first revelation I completed a 10,000 word paper, which was understandably naïve, following decades of isolation from the scientific community, but which I have refined following further private study and submitted to a conference of primarily scientific dissidents (NPA), but in association with the highly respected American Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Tulsa in April this year. Email correspondence, including favourable comments received is included in Appendix 1.

Note in particular that the person who had read and commented on all 82 papers, and was in the process of a thorough study of both Newton's and Einstein's views, said of my linking of mass and spin that I was "on the right track". Note also that I agreed with Russian Professor Kanarev's views on space, time and matter and that there is no electron orbit, suggesting a mechanism by which they vibrate in place when shared between protons. I learned today from another NPA member that micro-photos taken in recent years appear to confirm this. Others confirmed their support or agreement on other details and most of the participants were concerned about current mainstream interpretation of relativity.

In addition to these favourable comments I was greatly encouraged to find several people with much greater scientific qualification coming to similar conclusions to me, some backed up by maths, on various matters, from the structure of particles to the nature of space and time (including the view of several that  $c$  can be exceeded) and other problems concerned with the meaning and interpretation of relativity. Several others, including Professor Kanarev, argue as I do that electrons are composed of rings; others agree with me that photons are comprised of many smaller particles; and another Russian, now working in the US, Alex Tsybin, agrees with me that gravity can be explained by the action of neutrinos, which move in spirals as I correctly theorised shortly after I completed my first paper late in 2003, purely from my interpretation of relativity.

But from the start, I had been so confident that my own level of knowledge of physics, now being enthusiastically expanded, confirmed the likelihood of the validity and huge significance of my new understanding, that I had immediately embarked on an attempt to elicit comment from those in the scientific community that I thought surely must be interested. With letters to a selected few, completely ignored, apart from the singular and notable exception of the late Professor Sir Hermann Bondi (who agreed that  $c$  should not be considered as a cosmic speed limit) I began to suspect that the physics establishment does not like to communicate with "outsiders", a suspicion that appeared to be confirmed as the number of unanswered letters and emails grew exponentially, and from other material I was reading. Earlier this year I sent 1000 emails in two weeks to staff and graduate students at several top colleges, with just one reply, wondering how I managed to get his email address!

I had, quite early on, realised the difficulties I would have in publishing papers or embarking on or instigating meaningful debate, so I started working on two books early in 2004. The first of these, *The Special Theory of Reality*, was self-published in ebook form late that year and as a paperback early in 2005. It contained my reasons for believing that genuine anti-gravity must be possible based on my own theory and very strong evidence to suggest that human

levitation was a real, scientifically explainable phenomenon, based on information that I am also convinced I was led to by Divine guidance. Such evidence includes the observations of a former President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, William Crookes.

With very little money for publicity, I have sold only a handful of copies so far, but profit is not my motivation and I have sent many copies to scientists, the press, media, Church, politicians and others, expressing my now ever growing concern that nothing but anti-gravity will be sufficient to prevent the disasters mentioned above.

Following the conference in Tulsa, I became aware of little known evidence, from experiments in the seventies, appearing to confirm my own controversial view of mass (dependent on spin). This prompted me to write (or Email) again to top scientists, the Prime Minister, Lord Sainsbury (science and innovation), Archbishop of Canterbury, the press and media, arguing that there were experiments that could be repeated verifying my view of relativity and thus the possibility of anti-gravity, which appeared to me to be probably a grossly under-funded area of research given its significance to climate change.

I also wrote again to the Rev. Dr. John Polkinghorne, who had appeared on the BBC documentary about Einstein, and was one of the only men of science willing to express any view, albeit a very strange one to me in saying that my statement that mass depended on spin was “incomprehensible to physicists”. This is strange in that gyroscopic action is clearly and most obviously an inertial effect of spin, and of course, the view was subsequently expressed by a truly open-minded physicist, with particular interest in this field, that I was “on the right track” to link mass and spin. I had not persisted with Dr. Polkinghorne because of his age, but now that it was predicted that 400million could die as a consequence of climate change, I felt that he, in his role as a man of God, might be keen to consider the experimental evidence I had found with an open mind. His reply suggested the contrary. (See Appendix 2)

The replies from government departments and from the Archbishop of Canterbury’s office and the latter’s failure to reply regarding my wish to be sure of knowing his personal opinion on a matter that involves the suffering of millions, leaves me pondering two possible options: 1. these people find simple logic difficult or 2. these people have something to hide. These particular letters and replies are included in Appendices 3 & 4. By “these people” I do not necessarily mean the Prime Minister and Archbishop of Canterbury personally, because I cannot be absolutely sure that they have personally read my correspondence. The purpose of this report is to try to ensure that they do become aware of the full significance and possible validity of all that I am saying.

I can see no reason why Lord Sainsbury should not find it entirely reasonable and totally justifiable in the dire circumstance that we now find ourselves, simply to require of the scientific community that they are certain, beyond reasonable doubt, that their understanding of gravity is adequate to rule out the prospect of anti-gravity and that they have given adequate consideration to what I and others are saying and to all relevant experimental evidence. It is ridiculous to suggest that Lord Sainsbury requires personal understanding of the science to do so. And

whether or not my publishing venture is promoted in the process is hugely insignificant compared with the wider economic considerations and the seriousness of the situation, as now confirmed by Sir Nicholas Stern. I continually repeat that my primary objective is not to make profit but to expand understanding, and that I will give as much profit as I can to charity.

I would be astonished if the Archbishop of Canterbury (amongst others, including the Prime Minister) has no interest in seeking opinion regarding the possibility that my view of relativity, and possible insights into creation, can be tested experimentally and thus give credibility to my claim of Divine guidance on a matter of huge significance, in scientific, religious and humanitarian terms.

It is against this background that I now present the evidence that has come into my possession very recently. I cannot guarantee the validity of all this evidence; I have to say that I expect the vast majority of physicists to ridicule most of it, and others to probably deny other aspects. This does not mean that I have lost all respect for mainstream physicists. Far from it; and I have huge respect for the efforts and achievements of many in the past; but I can see that they are locked into error that is a huge stumbling block, causing a recognised current impasse that is leading some to much greater nonsense and wild speculation (parallel universes) than even this evidence may represent. I can only express opinion based on my own particular knowledge and experience, which may well help those with an open mind to determine the likelihood or not of some of the astonishing claims it contains being other than a hoax, misunderstanding or ill-considered opinion or speculation.

I do wish to draw the readers prior attention to the fact that my own particular conclusion about anti-gravity, that I reached in 2004 and is included in my published book, with no knowledge whatsoever of any of the research contained in the interview now mentioned, is that high levels of power are unlikely to be required but rather finding exactly the right (probably high) frequency, e.g. that of the iron nucleus or related to it in some way. It is also important, in assessing the implications regarding profit over progress, to take into account the clarifications I make about Tesla and its significance to the quote involving J. P. Morgan.

## **The Evidence**

The main evidence, to which I will refer is a video interview to be found on the following website:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=3808996975040613718&hl=en>

This will be compared and analysed with information contained on the website of American Tim Ventura, who brings together much information in this field:

[www.americanantigravity.com](http://www.americanantigravity.com)

I shall also refer briefly to an alleged historic pact between the Church and science regarding unified field theories, as set out on the following website:

[www.einsteinconspiracy.co.uk](http://www.einsteinconspiracy.co.uk)

The video interview to be found on the first website is quite long, over 52minutes, but I urge all interested in this report to watch the whole interview for two reasons. Firstly, this helps to judge the sincerity and credibility of the interviewee, and secondly, this is necessary to understand the full implications and the relevance of my comments here.

The interview is conducted by members of an organisation called Project Camelot, who explain themselves on their website as follows:

PROJECT CAMELOT's purpose is to provide a vehicle for researchers and 'whistleblowers' to get their stories out.

Many who are challenging current paradigms have concerns about being attacked personally or in other ways prevented from doing their work.

Our purpose is to help.

The interviewee, Ralph Ring, is a Korean war veteran who, with no real qualification or experience, apart from his own interest in magnetism and natural laws, discovered what seemed to be a natural ability to come up with solutions to problems posed in a research facility in Southern California called Advanced Kinetics, soon after he found work there as a laboratory technician in the 50's.

Frustrated with Advanced Kinetic's preoccupation with maintaining continued funding rather than actually finding solutions, the shredding of his paper outlining his own experimental findings (analysed below), and even a visit from three "men in black", Ring resigned.

He then became involved with a group calling themselves "understanding" set up by one Daniel Fry, that included Otis T. Carr, a man who knew the renowned great innovator Nicola Tesla, who I can confirm had made huge contributions in the field of electrical generation and transmission following his move to New York in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and very nearly beat Marconi to the invention of radio. I will discuss his ideas on high power wireless electricity transmission later.

Carr, using knowledge passed on by Tesla, that few could understand, had apparently been working on levitating discs in Oklahoma but was becoming concerned regarding scrutiny and even his own safety. So the Understanding group moved him to a safe house, a cabin in California, where he and Ring apparently had fruitful discussions.

Tesla and Carr were clearly men of inspiration with the knowledge to make sense of the cutting edge technologies they were involved in. Ring, on the other hand demonstrates more of an intuitive kind of insight, without the benefit of adequate study to make complete sense of it. We thus find, as the interview continues, that Ring becomes a little hesitant in his explanations (sound waves? electricity?) and is ultimately astonished and bewildered when Carr is found premises adequate to continue his work and eventually demonstrates mind blowing effects to Ring, including apparently a ten mile trip in a levitating craft, with strange effects on perception of memory and time.

Two weeks after this trip, apparently, there was a raid by government agents, who shut down the operation, confiscated material, and banned Ring from further contact with Carr. This may have transpired because flights of the craft produced by Carr had been spotted, or because Carr had a meeting with a representative of General Motors, hoping to get backing for an enterprise with huge potential benefits to mankind, but instead elicited the quote mentioned by Ring, referring to levitating craft: “put ‘em up and we’ll shoot ‘em down”.

The account of the mysterious flight, or transportation of some kind, is the point where many may suspect that Ring was either the subject of a hoax (unlikely considering the action that followed) or complicit in one now, or perhaps that his memory is now deceiving him. The only way that I can throw light on this, apart from the relatively small value observation that this man comes across to me as probably genuine and does not mention a book that he might profit from, is by analysing some of the details in the light of my own particular knowledge and experience.

I will start with experiments, official and private, while he was working for Advanced Kinetics. Firstly, Ring’s experiment with his own cathode ray tube may be difficult to explain by standard physics. In theory the electrons should deviate most at low power and thus low speed, which is why the experiment that Ring was introduced to used high power to propel the electrons at high speed to give minimum deviation. In my theory both the magnetic field and the moving electron are spirals and rings of anti-neutrinos (maybe also including neutrinos), and the electron, unless given high momentum, and depending on the orientation of my hypothesised outer ring, may progress not in a straight line but a spiral (helix) by virtue of the inertial effects of its spins (external and internal). This appears to be exactly what Ring describes. The tiny particles comprising the slow-moving electron may thus be picking their way round the spirals of similar tiny particles comprising the field with thus less interaction, that cannot be avoided at greater speeds.

The levitation of a ping-pong ball utilising, apparently, ultrasound in a 15 inch woofer speaker (normally low frequency) may be explainable by waves (air particles) as Ring supposed. But this would surely not have caused Dr. Weinheart to shred Ring’s paper and result in a visit from three “men in black”. Weinheart would have just smiled and said “Nice try Ralph, but what you have demonstrated is explainable by existing physics and does not represent a breakthrough in understanding that we are looking for”.

One can keep a ping-pong ball in the air by blowing from underneath at appropriate speed, so that the momentum of air particles destroyed by the ball

exactly balances the force of gravity. So it is not inconceivable that a much lesser volume of particles (ultrasound waves) at much higher speed could have the same result, but why only at 28,000 cycles rather than as a progressive effect?

It has to be remembered that the cone of the speaker generates the sound (or ultra-sound) waves in the air, but this is achieved by the frequency of the electric current in the coil attached to the cone. As I have mentioned, I had previously concluded that levitation, including that of the human body, for which there is considerable evidence as a genuine phenomenon, must depend upon something very specific rather than high levels of power. And I am sure that this must operate at sub-atomic level, probably at a very specific frequency of atomic and sub-atomic vibration. This maybe why Weinheart knew that Ring was onto something significant, a solution that may make further experimentation (and funding) in this field unnecessary. Note Weinheart's words: "we get paid handsomely for looking for answers – not finding them."

But it may also have been that Weinheart was taken aback that someone with as little knowledge (apparently) as Ring, had discovered something significant or already known and highly classified, which necessitated the visit by the three men in black suits to find out how much Ring actually knew and from what source; and if he was likely to understand fully what he had actually discovered. Was he a spy? If not, might he inadvertently disclose the key frequency? No doubt Ring's background was investigated and it was decided that he had very little understanding of the effect he had discovered. Perhaps he was watched for a while to rule out espionage.

We then come to the aluminium plate that was apparently jellified, so that Ring was able to push his hand in and out of it. Again Ring's lack of knowledge is evident in thinking first of sound as the answer rather than electricity, though he seemed undecided as to which. The strength of materials is determined by the role played by electrons, so one must suspect a more likely high voltage effect that maybe removes structural electrons. Is this feasible? It appears so if you are familiar with the Hutchison effect as referred to by Tim Ventura in his long article entitled "The Ultimate Hutchison Effect" to be found on the second website given above. I have also read articles theorising this removal of electrons.

Ventura's website is an excellent source of information regarding anti-gravity research from which it is clear that there are experimental results from several researchers that are difficult to explain in terms of established theory. Canadian John Hutchison is by far the most impressive in this field, but no one has been able to replicate his results, and it appears that Hutchison is not able to explain them except as sporadic and thus somewhat unpredictable effects of his salvaged high voltage apparatus, including a Tesla coil (for the production of both high voltages and high frequencies). It is important to note, however, that Hutchison has been banned from further experimentation, by the Canadian Government, apparently following effects that put him in danger.

Well photographed and documented results include exactly the same jellification of aluminium produced by Carr that Ring apparently interacted with half a century before. But his most impressive results show the levitation of many

objects of many types of materials. Tim Ventura refers to serious attempts that have been made to replicate Hutchison's results without success.

Several months before seeing Ring's interview, I had suggested to Tim Ventura that his next step should be to consider the evidence that I had found indicating human levitation to be a real, scientifically explainable phenomena, and that the reason why others could not replicate Hutchison's amazing effects might be that Hutchison himself was affecting them by his own presence and interaction. This is why I did not immediately scoff at what no doubt many would think "science fiction nonsense", including myself three years ago, because Ring's almost unbelievable account of how ultra-marine was selected fitted with both a very particular frequency and human interaction.

Those few familiar with my book and first paper, including my M.P., will realise that the way Carr explained time to Ring is essentially what I have been saying since October 2003, and we both use the same words: "time does not exist". I do not, however, agree that everything that exists is the product of our own imaginations, just that what is called "paranormal", including telepathy, psychokinesis etc. is most probably explainable by the encoding of information at lower levels than have yet been discovered, in the spirals of neutrinos spinning at many frequencies, which I also think explains string theory and the very nature of quantum mechanics. I have a possible explanation for the time and memory effect experienced by Ring but this may take up too much space here and detract from following the important basic facts.

Apparently the reason given by the government agents (FBI according to Ring, and maybe CIA) for shutting down Carr's operation was "attempting to overthrow the monetary system". Presumably because General Motors and the government feared that technology becoming suddenly available, that existing manufacturers did not understand and which in particular did not depend heavily on gasoline (petrol), would de-stabilise the capitalist economy (stock market, tax revenue etc.)

So we are left to ponder the possibility that the development of the technology that could have had a huge effect in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution (including possibly lead in petrol as the reason for some very unsound reasoning), was deliberately suppressed in the USA from the 50's on, perhaps so that research could be focussed purely on possible military applications. You will find almost daily TV programmes (Discovery mainly) dealing with the latter scenario and as related with other conspiracy theories.

As to the possibility that far more efficient, wireless energy transmission was also suppressed because there was no way of metering it, it appears that Tesla's ideas in this respect were found to be unworkable after he died in 1943, and though we may suspect that vested interests found a way of influencing this conclusion, it has to be borne in mind that my source claims that millions of dollars were subsequently spent on the possible military/ defence applications of his ideas for a defensive "death ray", based on the same basic principles, including maybe some aspects of Reagan's SDI in the 80's, with no success (so far). It is also my own opinion that even if it were theoretically possible, maintaining a constant and adequate nationwide (or even relatively local) supply could prove extremely hazardous, both directly to human health and as the result

of accidental or deliberate extraction of too much power. But I have to say that I could be wrong on this; Tesla clearly had much greater expertise than I in this field.

But the important point that I wish to make is that we must not see Tesla as discredited as a result of this. By any standards he was clearly a brilliant, able and highly productive innovator and inventor, who made a huge contribution to the technological advances that sustain our current way of life. It is probably true to say that he outshone Edison and Marconi and may well have suffered injustice as a result, robbing him of the distinction of inventor of the radio. We must consider the possibility that the knowledge he passed on to Carr could be the key that can save humanity from untold suffering and set mankind on a new course.

My next evidence, I present with some hesitation and reluctance. The idea repulses me and I hope it is not true. But if it is true, it is so contrary to my philosophies on both science and religion that I must see it refuted or exposed.

On the third website, someone with considerable knowledge of the history of the development of unified field theories, Roger Anderton, says:

“There has been a great number of scientists working on UFT, and academia responds by ostracizing them whenever possible. All of the scientific issues raised by this theoretical development touch upon issues such as the paranormal and ETs that Academia wishes to be in a state of denial about.

I have now been in contact with various people that have been working on these theoretical ideas either directly or indirectly, and was amazed to be informed that Scientific Academia had made a deal a long time ago with the Religious Priesthood that “they” have agreed censorship between them. This agreed censorship seems to be another reason why UFT is not allowed to be talked about too much; because it would impinge on religious beliefs.”

If this is true, it is one more reason, in addition to those set out in Chapter 5 of my book, why my own experience is not ostracism (which I would have preferred and could have responded to) but a generally universal, extreme and determined avoidance of any comment. There have, as I have stated, been one or two very slight exceptions, but apart from other dissidents (see Appendix 1) and very brief comment from the then very elderly and now late Sir Hermann Bondi, no indication of any desire to consider what I am saying with an open mind.

I passionately believe that the historic problems between science and the Church stem from a lack of open-minded humility (read on in Roger Anderton’s website for facts), mainly on the part of the Church in the past, but with the pendulum now tending to swing more in the other direction, perhaps encouraged by the Church, with scientists fearful for their funding if they refute the certainty of big bang theory (see [www.cosmologystatement.org](http://www.cosmologystatement.org)). Expressions such as “standard model” as applied to particle physics and cosmology do not engender a truly open-minded approach. The wider “Church”, especially in the USA, still has problems in that some wish to suppress science in favour of their own interpretation of the “literal truth” of the Bible.

I have reason to sincerely believe that God wishes me to convey to the World that mankind's future depends on its ability to find the value of open-minded humility. The lack of the ability to say "maybe we are getting it wrong" is the cause of all our great problems, from terrorism and wars to pollution.

No science and no religion should ever insist that they cannot be wrong. Humility is the hallmark of true faith and the essence of good science, and it must be our guide if we explore the universe. Certain knowledge is, I think, revealed on a need to know basis. Attempts to define God and his creation may have seemed necessary when the populace was relatively unformed. But now may be the time that it is necessary for all to open their minds to the possibility that we are ready to be given greater and clearer understanding. But we are not ready to receive it unless we demonstrate the open-minded humility to admit our own fallibility. If the insistence that certain ideas are beyond discussion is preventing understanding that could lead to new technology with the potential to avoid great suffering, I say that simple logic demands that it is time for a rethink.

I shall, therefore, be sending copies of this report, inter alia, to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope, asking if they are aware if any such pact ever existed, and if so, if they are willing to dissociate themselves from it in the interests of discovering both the knowledge that could save mankind from untold suffering, and the truth of my claim that God has given me knowledge that could lead to a true unified field theory, with all forces, matter and energy being explainable by the same mechanism (spirals and rings of fast-spinning neutrinos and anti-neutrinos or possibly even smaller as yet undiscovered particles).

I shall be asking again, in the light of the evidence contained in this report, if they have any interest in calling for the experiments of the late Bruce DePalma, (who I understand died young in suspicious circumstances) that appear to verify my view of inertial mass, to be repeated and improved so as to indicate the validity of my claim of Divine revelation of the true meaning of relativity and the nature of gravity.

The experiments I mention (trajectories of spinning balls) and also those referred to by Dr. DePalma regarding the collision of spinning balls, carried out by others, need to be repeated in such a way that the effects of air resistance and friction are clearly ruled out (it is not clear to me if DePalma did this), and so as to examine my claim that anything that spins, naturally follows a curved path in the absence of all other forces (in apparent contradiction, or perhaps clarification, of Newton's first law of motion). Such experiments are best done in space, but should perhaps be preceded by relatively simple and inexpensive terrestrial ones that indicate if I may be right or wrong by confirming the results stated by DePalma.

But either way the question remains: why, so far, has no one been able to accept the simple logic, that if simple, relatively inexpensive experiments can be repeated, that could conceivably lead to technology that can change the entire future of the human race and prevent untold suffering, whilst maintaining and improving current lifestyles, they simply have to be carried out no matter how small the perceived chance of success, especially when the only alternative appears to be action that will simply spread the misery more evenly and almost certainly unsuccessfully?

The situation has drastically changed since General Motors (allegedly) said of levitating craft “put ‘em up and we’ll shoot ‘em down”. Now, the only sane way to maintain the hopes and aspirations of those seeking life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, so that others can just “live”, is to give them jobs putting up quiet, non-polluting, energy-efficient craft that no sane person should ever wish to shoot down! Regrettably the insanity of war and terrorism will continue, so the “insane” will still “shoot ‘em down”, but perhaps some will have learned enough of the value of an open mind to sow the seeds of a peaceful (multi-faith) future and take us beyond this planet with a better attitude than epitomised the exploration of this one. And future 9/11s will not be as devastating because there will be no need to carry huge quantities of explosive fuel.

## **Conclusions**

The evidence presented in this report, including my own experiences, all suggests for various possible reasons, that technology and the theory behind its development, that could have very substantially reduced the effects now recognised as primary contributors to disastrous climate change, may have been seriously and deliberately inhibited over the last 50 years.

Those who may have been aware of this in recent years would, in the light of what we know now, be collectively guilty of the greatest ever crime against humanity and possibly the greatest ever sin, if this is true and they do not take appropriate action now.

Economic considerations are now significantly different to those applying in the last century. There is now greater risk to stability, the capitalist system and to all humanity from ignoring this possible radical new technology than from suppressing it.

I have strong reasons to suspect that I have been given knowledge that could assist in the understanding and development of such technology now, but time is rapidly running out. Experiments that may verify my claims are possible (unlike much of recent modern physics). In addition to those mentioned above it should be noted in the copies of correspondence that follow that I have suggested experiments to the National Physical Laboratory that might verify my explanation of the constancy of  $c$  and my view that it is exceedable, with obvious implications regarding the exploration of the Universe.

It is, therefore, logical that these experiments be carried out with utmost urgency (less so perhaps with the speed of light, though this may equally verify my source) and that all possible encouragement and assistance be given to all researchers in this field, whether theoretical or experimental. I also have reason to suspect that such research may link up with work in the field of new energy sources. Professor Kanarev is working in this field and is struggling with financial difficulty, despite claims of success in his experiments and ground breaking theoretical ideas for which there is evidence of possible verification. It is an absolute nonsense that Kanarev, and probably others do not receive all possible support.

## **Recommendations:**

1. The Canadian government and others must reflect on whether the danger of John Hutchison's experiments to himself and possible to others is:
  - (a) the only reason they were stopped; and
  - (b) now a justifiable risk that those willing to take should be permitted in light of the huge potential benefits to all humanity. (subject to the provision of government funded safe premises and facilities)
2. All governments should be asked, via the United Nations, if they will now collectively agree to openly share knowledge of all research and development in the field of anti-gravity technology.
3. The United Nations should consider a resolution requiring all participating nations to give high priority to the funding and encouragement of research in the fields of anti-gravity and new energy sources and related theories, including analysis of all sources of relevant information as opposed to only peer-reviewed papers.
4. Questions should be asked in the House of Commons to ensure that the Prime Minister, the Government and the whole House is clearly aware of the evidence contained in this report. The Prime Minister should be asked if he considers that it is appropriate that Lord Sainsbury should limit his contact with scientists to matters limited by the extent of his own scientific expertise. This should be followed by asking the Prime Minister if it is appropriate for the Government to satisfy itself that the scientific community is not missing a vital aspect of knowledge or information that might be of crucial significance to the world-wide battle with climate change. The Prime Minister should be asked if he will now request Lord Sainsbury to reconsider my suggested draft letter to physicists.
5. All concerned, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Pope, the scientific community, the press and the media, must ask the following questions:
  - “What if Beck is right in his claim of Divine revelation?”
  - “How do we discern this matter?”

The answer to the first is that this means that there may be an answer to climate change that may not only mean maintaining and vastly improving current lifestyles; intelligent application of this technology need not threaten the capitalist system, as apparently feared in 50's America, but would kick-start the global economy, bringing growth and huge benefits, in contrast to the dire forecasts of the Stern report and in accordance with its most sensible suggestions.

And I am able to offer a clear and obvious answer to the second question:

ask those who are able to carry out the relatively simple and inexpensive initial experiments I can suggest, improving on those mentioned and conducted by the late Dr. Bruce DePalma, to do so (preferably in various universities in different countries). If I am wrong, how much is lost? If I am right, how much stands to be gained? Surely Sir Nicholas Stern would agree.