

Measurements May Not Give Us Objectivity, Nor Accuracy, plus another Glaring Oversight I have Overlooked. Oops!

As good as [Mathew Crochet](#)'s suggestion appears at first glance, it may not be possible to honor this request of his for two reasons.

The first reason was not brought up by Mathew, but was brought up by [Franco Bruno Cortelleti](#) several years ago. And I thought of it (again, after having forgotten about Franco's observation) upon awakening from a dream this morning which pointed this out, that: Joseph Newman's device was sabotaged when it was tested by the National Bureau of Standards when they shorted out his massive coil for its entire duty cycle – by connecting to this massive coil a small resistor from which they took measurements – rather than leaving it alone to short itself out merely during the latter 20% of its entire duty cycle.

This may make it impossible to take amperage measurements via an analog ammeter held closely to this circuit's coils since this will entangle itself with this circuit's magnetic fields and, thus, modify them with the additional risk of destroying this circuit's delicate balance which might cause the instability of this circuit's periodic collapse of its surges to infinity which may result in this circuit exploding or becoming comatose.

The former possibility is more likely. I've seen this happen many times: I'll add a resistor to one or another of my overunity simulated experiments (or to this one) thinking what a smart boy am I only to be shocked with a sudden explosion of uncontrolled overunity.

They shamelessly admitted to their modifications,¹ in public ...

Concerning the Patent Office, the National Bureau of Standards admits on their website that: The National Bureau of Standards provided the resistive load which was connected in parallel with the coil.² This is an example of current wanting to take the path of least resistance through a parallel load, bypassing the coil (of greater resistance than their test load) to a significant degree by cleverly self-shorting Newman's primary coil and prevent accumulation of HV. Had they performed their test as Newman advises in his book by wrapping a shorter length of secondary coil around the larger primary coil and placing the test load only inline with this secondary and isolated from the primary, then it's entirely possible that the NBS would have produced more accurate results and replicate Newman's. Then, the history of Newman and his motor would have read a bit differently than what transpired. – Vinyasi, 04:34, 2 January 2018 (UTC)³

Their error made it impossible for his coil to double its voltage. Instead, its voltage remained the same as the input voltage which is the foundation of their report to the court since Newman was suing the Bureau and, hence, lost his case.

Yet, Newman never gave them his overunity version; so, he had little reason to complain.

The overunity version he reserved for public demonstrations. The version he gave them for testing

1 [Newman Energy Machine: Approach](#)

2 [Newman Energy Machine: Introduction](#)

3 [User talk:Vinyasi - Wikipedia](#)

was his prior underunity version which he had invented on his own without Byron Brubaker's assistance and advice which was to replace his central rotating permanent magnets with a PVC encasement of helium and wrap this dielectric (and electret?) vessel with an open coil which was not connected to anything. Newman protected his "secret" by not allowing anyone to hand crank his device from a cold start lest they discover that the central objects were not solid permanent magnets after all, but were light-weight canisters of helium!⁴

He, also, never publicly gave Byron any credit claiming, instead, that God had given Newman this invention.

Well, ...

That's partly true and partly false. But, mostly, it's false since only the second version – coming from Byron – is the significant variety since that one is overunity while Newman's variety is not.

The second reason contradicts Mathew's suggestion to make all of the components of replication visible to the observer so as to prevent the addition of any "hidden batteries" and the like.

But, ...

If my speculation is true that the three mutual inductances of the five coils of this circuit will run the risk of their not being in sync with each other if they are not surrounded by a grounded "flux capacitor", then it may become impossible to expose this circuit from all directions since it will be totally enclosed with an exterior conductive plate of this type of capacitor.

Under these circumstances, maybe it is possible to get away with exposing at least one face of a rectangular dielectric/electret block of solid epoxy (or the like) by not covering this one face with a conductive sheet, or film or leaf, of aluminum? (*another speculation*)

For these reasons, the use of a 100-watt light bulb may be the *only* method for testing this circuit along with its replication by many individuals?

Although replication by several individuals is fallacious since it appeals to common sense (Wikipedia's approach more often than not and one of the five major fallacies of logic), nonetheless, we'll have to make do until physics comes onboard with us on this quest. *Don't hold your breath!*

Oops!, ...

Appeal to our belief in physics is another (major) fallacy in that it is an appeal to authority!

Maybe Socrates is right when he said, "The wise man is wise because he knows that he doesn't know anything."

⁴ [Vin Yasi's answer to Has anyone tried to recreate Joseph Newman's perpetual motion machine?](#)