

NOTE: This is a copy with some formatting changes. Look below for "I do have an important addition" for the suggestion..

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

**From:** [Phil Stone <mailto:webmaster2005@bibletime.com>](mailto:webmaster2005@bibletime.com)

**To:** [Byron Wine <mailto:byronw1@msn.com>](mailto:byronw1@msn.com)

**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2005 1:23 PM

**Subject:** Re: Addition to your list..

Byron, Yes you can. Since I run my own website I usually give out email addresses based on the use in order to track the subjects, traffic, spam etc. So instead of webmaster2005, let's use [freenergy@bibletime.com <mailto:freenergy@bibletime.com>](mailto:freenergy@bibletime.com) Let me get it set up later this morning... Also, after I emailed you on this subject of how publishing cancels patents. I also realized there is a way to protect from "concrete shoes" which is another problem throughout this space. (Eugene Mallove is another example, they did get him.) Again safety comes through publishing, mostly on the internet, but every stinking detail in some place/way where a team can work the problem. Finding, say, 100 people around the globe working on, say, a freenergy motor is much harder than finding, say, 1 inventor who will not talk, who's secrets die with him. Again, the pattern for all of these problems is solved by publishing early and often, every minute detail. All it needs is someone with passion, but free energy tech, thus not a target, to host a "wiki" website, with a charter that clearly explains the purpose... to make free energy freely available. You up for it? You're nearly there already. Phil On Monday 19 September 2005 06:03, you wrote: > Good morning Phil, >> Do you mind if your email is added to my site? >> Regards, >> Byron >>> ----- Original Message ----- > From: "Phil Stone" <[webmaster2005@bibletime.com <mailto:webmaster2005@bibletime.com>](mailto:webmaster2005@bibletime.com)>>> To: <[byronw1@msn.com <mailto:byronw1@msn.com>](mailto:byronw1@msn.com)>>> Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2005 1:53 PM > Subject: Addition to your list... >>> > I saw your page from a link on rene.com... You've probably got quite a > > bit of traffic all of a sudden... > >> > Anyway, thank you for the list. > >> >

**I do have an important addition.**

> >> > Nearly everyone working in the "free energy" field has had problems with > > the patent office. They seem to think that a rejected patent means they > > cannot produce the object covered by the rejected patent. > >> > SO, they think they cannot produce and sell a 200MPG carborator, or a > > fuel-free motor, or whatever. > >> > This logic is flawed. > >> > Let me explain by example... > >> > IBM publishes "technical bulletins" that are really their failed patent > > applications. Those bulletins provide the proof of prior art and prevent > > litigation of products built on those failed patents. Once published, > > anywhere, but it works nicely for their size to produce a book, the idea > > is no longer patentable by anyone. > >> > The principle is this: publishing process establishes prior-art and thus > > the inventor, by publishing, "opts out" of the patent system completely. > > This protects the inventor from future litigation. No one can use future > > patents to "steal" prior-art. > >> > The free energy folks that have been refused patent protection by the > > patent office are being forced to "opt-out" of the patent system. This may not > > be by choice, but it is a well known path. > >> > These inventors should be immediately

publishing the equivalent, their own "technical bulletins" so they can produce their devices without fear of patent litigation over their own use of their inventions in the future. No patent can then be granted to anyone else over the item because of prior-art. This mis understanding of the patent system from within the free-energy community, is as responsible for these items remaining off the market as failure to be granted a patent. The inventors themselves are doing this to themselves. The fundamental economic theory also shifts without patent protection, but there are still theories in support. (Primary what are called 'first movers advantages.')

You should be clearly mentioning this on your list of problems related to these technologies, since it is as central as the inventions themselves. Phil