

# Inside the Philadelphia Experiment



An Interview with Marshall Barnes

# Inside The Philadelphia Experiment

## Marshall Barnes on the Philadelphia Experiment

By Tim Ventura & Marshall Barnes, May 21st, 2005

---

*The Philadelphia Experiment has been one of the most enduring legends of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but after a decade of intense research, Marshall Barnes may have finally solved the puzzle. After a decade of research into the experiment, he offers new insight on just how this experiment may have occurred, as well as the lessons that we can draw from it for a new generation of advanced technology concepts...*

**AAG:** Let's give the readers some background on your expertise: as I understand things, you've been actively researching the Philadelphia Experiment for several years, and you've turned up enough leads on the topic that you're currently writing a tell-all book to try and educate people on what you've found. Can you tell us a bit more about your research & background?

**Barnes:** Several years? Try more than a decade. I began researching the Project Rainbow (otherwise known as the Philadelphia Experiment) in 1991. My first lecture on it was before the St. Louis MUFON UFO Day meeting in a hotel in St. Charles, MO that same year. That's where I first introduced the quantum mechanical connection to the Philadelphia Experiment's teleportation element - macroscopic quantum tunneling. Originally, the first thing I had looked into was the matter of invisibility and teleportation. I used physicists from the IBM Watson Research Center in up-state New York and at the Columbus Community College as sounding boards. I also eventually consulted with Fred Alan Wolf, PhD. In fact, Wolf confirmed the self-consistency of my space-time diagrams which married the original Allende account with the (now known to be completely bogus) Al Bielek account. I was the first and only one to do that, again, trying to make sense and apply physics to this complicated story. What my chart showed is that 'if' both stories were true, it just so happened that because Bielek had invoked time travel then automatically there would be parallel universes involved. So when Bielek was allegedly "Ed Cameron" (which has now been proven to be a lie) he would have been in a parallel universe and so when he was age regressed and sent backward in time, he would have also been in a parallel universe - on our timeline. So as he grew-up to serve in the Navy as Al Bielek, another version of Project Rainbow would have been happening - the one known to be linked with Carlos Allende. Bielek, however, because he doesn't understand how all these spacetime theories would work and has only memorized what Tom Bearden and others talk about, which isn't exactly the same area, didn't get it. He had taught himself one way of addressing the story and kept to it, even adding that stolen photo from the Princeton year book, which led to his being exposed as a fraud and his eventual downfall.

At any rate, all the physics sources that I used confirmed my suspicions that the classic description used in the William Moore/Charles Berlitz book (which was not cited to them) matched what would be viewed as "macroscopic quantum tunneling". I was the first to describe the teleportation portion of the story that way and it was published in an article in the 1993 Spring issue of *Unicus Magazine*. Those individuals and publications that say that the ship "dematerialized and rematerialized" are not only misquoting the original account of the legend, the physics behind such a description are impossible now, let alone in 1943.

For the record, I've been the only one who has actively engaged all elements of this very complicated story - the Navy, the crew, the skeptics the media and even Bielek and others in the lunatic fringe. If you check, you won't find anyone else that has confronted the Navy at all, let alone the way I have - exposing their hand picked point man, John Reilly for lying, and getting

him to admit that nothing that the Navy nor the military would say about the Philadelphia Experiment would be consequential, since if it was real, they wouldn't admit to it. He of course turned right around and proved that they would actually go beyond not admitting to it, but would lie about it. He did so by his lying to me about not knowing anything about Area 51. The government says that it doesn't exist, but of course it does. He said he had never heard about it because he's not a "nuclear test buff". That's funny, since in my discussions with him (which were legally tape recorded) I never mentioned the word "nuclear", yet if you look on a map of Nevada, Area 51 lies in the NE corner of the Nevada Nuclear Test Site. Also, in the late '90s, Area 51 employees tried to sue the government over their exposures to nuclear waste and other exotic materials and Bill Clinton denied them that right to sue. If Reilly had never heard of Area 51, then why on Earth would he have made such a link in the first place, which just simultaneously proves how stupid skeptics are who believe the Navy's denials about this whole affair.

In my CD package, "Inside The Philadelphia Experiment", you can hear the entire conversation with Reilly for yourself. The booklet that comes with it, as well as my new complete book also introduces further evidence against the Public Affairs Office of the Office of Naval Research from back in the late 1990s. You don't see anyone else going head to head against the cover-up this way. I've similarly taken on the media - Sci Fi Channel's "Sightings", A&E's "The Unexplained" and for the first time ever, my book will reveal the behind the scenes dirty dealing that went on with the History Channel's "History's Mysteries", which will explain that totally lop-sided production they did on the Philadelphia Experiment. "Action Report: Inside The Philadelphia Experiment", is the CD documentary addresses that as well with the first ever candid tape recorded conversations with the crew of the Eldrige.

So my background with this legend is as multifaceted as it gets and has required my learning and employing elements, concepts and tactics from physics, research and development engineering, investigative journalism, counter-intelligence, and even psychological operations at times, all in an effort to accomplish one thing and one thing only - the verifiable truth about what happened, regardless of what that truth was or preference from whence it came. The evidence, and I repeat - the evidence which is plentiful, all points at one answer. That answer is that between 1940 and 1943, firms, university departments and elements of the U.S. military and its supporting civilian run agencies, engaged in prosecuting WWII, did in fact conceive and pursue a project that initially involved the idea of repelling incoming projectiles via the application of strong electromagnetic fields but quickly became the use of such fields to accomplish optical invisibility via induced mirages in the air and then radar invisibility. The possibility of teleportation was never considered and if in fact it did happen, it was a mistake. The tests for these effects were code named Project Rainbow and resulted, eventually in failure for the safety of the crews involved. It was mothballed until after the war when it was restarted and eventually successfully applied, in modified form, to the B2. The secrecy and cover-up, which has been sorely mismanaged and nonproductive, was due to intense foreign interest since the war, to the story, and fear that other governments would pursue this technological approach and gain the upper hand. The Soviets did, in fact, pursue it and have developed the practical applications. Simultaneously, there has been a strong connection between these events and the whole UFO controversy and in ways that no one has ever addressed or even considered. My book, *It's Code Name:Rainbow*, details this entire saga with hard evidence, which is the only thing that I have, from which to derive my conclusions. It is an unprecedented account and serves as an unauthorized sequel to the William Moore/Charles Berlitz book since at no time did the Moore/Berlitz account attempt to really substantiate any of its claims. Conversely, my book is almost 50% evidence in its raw form - documents, photographs, personal histories, and the rest is littered with verifiable references, quotes, and links to online sources. Simultaneously, it completely destroys all skeptical arguments against the story and it does so with scientific facts, experimental results and, in a number of cases, even with historical evidence that was acquired from the Navy.

I think that should about do it.

**AAG:** Let's start with the skeptical viewpoint -- tales of "ghost-ships" have been a part of naval folklore for hundreds of years, and it's easy to believe that the Philadelphia Experiment is just a modernized retelling of the classic "Flying Dutchman" tale. So the big first question is this: did this experiment really happen?

**Barnes:** My book proves conclusively that using what passes now for "the skeptical viewpoint" is the biggest mistake anyone can make. Benjamin LeBlanc, Robert Todd Carroll, Mack Shelton, are just a few of the skeptics that I expose for deliberately misleading their readers, but to play along, I can prove my point right now with your 'skeptical' question - "it's easy to believe that the Philadelphia Experiment is just a modernized retelling of the classic "Flying Dutchman" tale". My response is that if you want to know 'did this really happen', then what's tales of "ghost-ships" have to do with it? Those tales exist regardless. My point is that if someone wants to answer the question of if it was a true event or not, the place to start is with the account, which BTW never mentions anything that matches the classic ghost-ship tale. A ghost-ship is a ship that vanishes, meaning that it's been lost, not heard from, and then is discovered at some later date, abandoned with the crew missing as if they suddenly left in a hurry. Or its spotted in the distance and then slips away before anyone can ever board it and is said to be spotted occasionally but never within reach, for eons. There's no connection between such tales and the account of the Philadelphia Experiment. The ship was never lost for a long period, the crew was still onboard and there's no mystery about why there were problems. The line of questioning, as with all skeptical positions taken against this story, is flawed and irrelevant. The proof of that is the phrase that opened your query - "it's easy to believe". I couldn't care less about what's "easy" and I don't give a damn about "belief". There's been nothing easy about this investigation and it hasn't turned out the way that anybody believed it would, that includes me. What matters is the evidence and the methods used to acquire it. If skeptics behaved in the same manner as I have, they would have solved this thing themselves long ago, even exposed Al Bielek, but they didn't. Not one skeptic can claim credit about anything concerning this story. Even Gerold Schelm and Fred Houpt, who contributed toward the Bielek investigation, aren't skeptics because they both believe that the Philadelphia Experiment really happened. So that leaves the skeptics with a big fat zero. Think of those photos from the original Gulf War when the Iraqi Army was trying to flee Kuwait City with all that loot and what not. Remember what was left after the U.S. forces were done with them, that's what's left of every skeptic's arguments against this story after I deconstruct them in my book. I have an entire chapter dedicated to it, early on. Right after the one where I demolish the Navy's positions, sometimes with their own documents to boot.

**AAG:** Investigator Jacques Vallee has been credited with "debunking" the Philadelphia Experiment story several years ago, but his primary source, a fellow named "Edward Dudgeon", has been called a fraud, which seems to have seriously undermined his skeptical analysis. Are you familiar with this story, and if so, what are your thoughts on Vallee's claims?

**Barnes:** Not only am I familiar with the claims, I'm the one that proved Dudgeon was a fraud! Besides, Vallee's so-called "analysis" was no such thing at all. If it were, why, as a scientist, did he completely ignore the Dr. Rinehart account from the Moore/Berlitz book, the one that has all the scientific data in it? Not a single word about that. Not only that, Vallee's published version of the article was "cleaned" by Rear Admiral Houser (ret) to whom Vallee admits handing the article over for having its "accuracy checked". I know the article was cleaned because key testimony that Ed Dudgeon gave on a cable TV show from the History Channel was missing from the print version. That testimony was about how Dudgeon claims he saw Saint Elmo's Fire make a ship invisible just like Allende describes it. In the Anatomy article, it

mentions Saint Elmo's Fire making the ship's glow green but nothing about the attendant invisibility. The clincher is that the TV show was done before the article, which raises the question as to why the invisibility account isn't in the article. That answer is simple - because it flies in the face of the official Navy position posited in the ONR letter which states that experiments in invisibility are only possible in the realm of science fiction. If Saint Elmo's Fire can make a ship invisible then we could figure that out as well, and there goes that good use of a natural phenomena to explain away the story, the way UFO skeptics explain away UFO accounts with swamp gas and the planet Venus. Skeptics are inherently stupid and their stupidity is based in fear - fear of the unknown. As a result, they'll buy anything that makes their knee-jerk objections to anything innovative or interesting sound like they're based in science. It's pathetic, because I've found during my investigation of Project Rainbow that the skeptics have never applied the scientific method itself, let alone address the scientific claims in the Moore/Berlitz book that were contained in the Dr. Rinehart interview. Exactly the opposite - they either ignored it or assisted in its suppression.

Houser, on the other hand, was engaging in an official cover-up and wasn't being "skeptical". He was in counter-intelligence mode. There were Navy regulations in force that he knew of that demanded that he act that way. Vallee implicates him inadvertently by saying that he had Houser check the story for "accuracy". So if there's that detail missing, which Vallee was directly involved with promoting on the program when he asked Dudgeon, "was there anything unusual that happened..." and Dudgeon begins to talk about "the only thing unusual that happened was when the look-out was up on the flying bridge and he saw the St. Elmo's Fire...", then Houser must have had that info removed from the printed version of the account. Vallee says that Houser was given the article to check it, I have to consider that Houser looked at it and said, "Whoa. If we can't make a ship invisible, how's St. Elmo's Fire going to do it? That's a problem. We can't have that in there."

Aside from that, Dudgeon lied about the ship's going out on shakedown together. I can say that because it's the Navy records, oddly enough, that make a liar out of Dudgeon. If you check the launch dates, something that Vallee should have done if, as you say, he was doing any kind of 'analysis', you find that the Engstrom, Dudgeon's ship, was launched when he said, and went on shakedown along with the other two ships but not the Eldridge. It wasn't even finished being built yet. I also talked to a crew mate of Dudgeon's who was on the Engstrom at the time (which can also be heard on Inside The Philadelphia Experiment) and he doesn't agree with Dudgeon's account at all. I also never mentioned to that gentleman, anything about the Philadelphia Experiment, so it's not like he was defending the legend. I was trying to verify the aspects of Dudgeon's story in as far as the events surrounding the Engstrom are concerned.

**AAG:** In 1994 Dr. James Corum wrote a historical analysis of the Philadelphia Experiment that made an honest attempt to show involvement by Vannevar Bush & Albert Einstein. Also, it suggests that Bush was working on the project using ideas developed by Tesla, which sounds like a WW-II "dream team" almost too good to be true. Do you think that these individuals participated in the experiment, and can you tell us if any other notable scientists make cameo appearances in the story?

**Barnes:** Tesla doesn't seem to have had any direct connection to the project because he was too sickly. He is completely absent from any records that I found. Vannevar certainly could've had some of Tesla's ideas on the rotating magnetic field used, and nothing from the Moore/Berlitz account rules that out, but this idea of Tesla running the operation as Al Bielek has posited, is, like all of the other material that Bielek has originated, pure fantasy of the most unsubstantiated sort. Tesla only seems to have tried to contribute his idea on the death ray to the Allies by all of the historical accounts that I've seen. Whether he was involved directly or not adds nothing to the story, and in fact I believe it has been used to throw people off of the real

trail. After all, Tesla is sexy for the fringe science crowd. You mention Tesla and you automatically have tons of people nodding their heads, "oh yeah, I can see him involved. That's right. He was a genius. Super genius. And the government got all his records after he died. Probably faked his death and took him away to serve in some underground lab. And he used to get those messages from Mars, too." and then it's off to the races. You've got no records left to check, and enough unbridled speculation to give the skeptics a field day and plenty of ammunition. Meanwhile, the Dr. Rinehart account gets ignored. Or covered-up like Sightings and The Unexplained did.

As far as Vannevar being involved, I'm sure he probably knew about it and it had his and Rear Admiral Bowen's OK for it to proceed. I think that Vannevar was too busy with the Manhattan Project being developed to have had any direct involvement, though. But I'm sure he knew about it because he would have heard about it from von Neumann. The way things are looking I'd say that Ross Gunn, William Parsons, T. Townsend Brown, John von Neumann, Albert Einstein, Francis Bitter and a few others were the ones doing the work most often with Bowen probably in charge for the Navy. In the end, I'd say it was Einstein, von Neumann, Brown and Bitter involved, with Witmer having done analysis for radar invisibility.

As for other scientists, in my book I name names, give dates, and show records as to who would have been involved and why. That includes the true identity of Dr. Franklin Reno/Dr. Rinehart.

**AAG:** For me, the "odd man out" in the Philadelphia Experiment story has always been Thomas Townsend Brown. It's probably because he's more recognizable for his work with the Biefeld-Brown Effect, which leads me to ask me if he was really involved, and if so, what his role might have been?

**Barnes:** That's so incredibly easy. The records, the records from his own files at the website about him (which are no longer there) as well as those in archives, show that for every major step that the project underwent, Thomas Townsend Brown was being assigned to work in that area. That's one of the glaring facts that Nick Pope completely misses in his book, *The Hunt For Zero Point*, which deals with the Philadelphia Experiment on a number of occasions. Then 6 months after the project goes all wrong, Brown has a major nervous breakdown. One so bad that a "team of Naval doctors" have to see to his recovery. Then, after that, instead of being reassigned, while the country is still in the middle of a war for the survival of the free world, he's given a discharge! Other guys are being shot and blown-up and being patched-up and sent back out on the battlefield and Brown's never seen combat in his life - yet he's given a discharge after a nervous breakdown? I know of guys in Iraq, right now, who have been wounded, patched-up, sent home to be rehabilitated and they're back there now. So this is really extraordinary for this to have been done with Brown. You might not remember the incident, but in the movie *Patton* this guy is having an emotional breakdown in front of General Patton, due to combat fatigue or shell shock, and Patton slaps him and tells him to pull it together and that he's not going to stand for any cowards in his command. True event too. So, I'm expected to believe that after this "nervous breakdown" was over, that Brown doesn't just get a desk job but he's given a discharge altogether? 'C'mon. Give me a break!

What caused the breakdown? Certainly not that weak excuse that's in the Moore/Berlitz book - 'aw, he wasn't getting any of his pet projects done. Poor baby!' No. Brown was a smart, young, happy-go-lucky guy that was into science since he was a kid and had been assigned to research areas state-side and beyond. So whatever made him have that nervous breakdown had to be pretty traumatic - like seeing men killed and maimed from an experiment that he had a personal hand in. That makes sense. Brown in no way is the "odd man out". His record screams that he

was inside the loop. In fact, it implies that it was the main thing that he did from 1940 on. He was certainly involved and he also never denied it.

**AAG:** You've mentioned finding new evidence that Moore & Berlitz didn't publish. Was this a coverup for something?

**Barnes:** It was what they admit to in the book - leaving things out to protect "the status quo". I checked and everyone that I discovered connected to this project, or would've been or had some knowledge of it, that wasn't in the Moore/Berlitz book, was still alive when they were publishing it, including the real Dr. Rinehart, though they claim otherwise in his case. Unfortunately, they're all dead now. All except for one who only knew of the real Dr. Rinehart but I have no proof that this man was involved with the project himself. I do, however, reveal who he is because of the confirmation that I received that he did in fact remember the name of the man that I tag as "Rinehart".

**AAG:** Charles Berlitz had written extensively about the subject of the Bermuda Triangle before getting involved with William Moore's Philadelphia Experiment story. Admittedly, these are all stories related to maritime-folklore, but I'd wondered if Berlitz influence & reputation might not have clouded Moore's focus a bit. Any thoughts on Berlitz' role in this story?

**Barnes:** From what I've been told, Berlitz was behind the deleting of the sensitive material. As for his Bermuda Triangle influence, it had nothing to do with it. The connection between the Triangle and Project Rainbow is simply pedestrian. They both have similar phenomena associated with them but those who have postulated that Rainbow was designed to take advantage of the geographical location of the Bermuda Triangle are like many others who have made various claims about the project - wrong. For the experiment to only work in a specific geographical region would have had no military usefulness at all and that's what this whole affair was about - defeating the Nazi and Imperial fleets, most of which weren't operating anywhere near the Bermuda Triangle. Primarily the only Nazi vessels, other than subs, were all operating in the North Sea and the European areas of the Murmansk Run.

Likewise, any skeptical arguments trying to tie the two stories together in an attempt to cancel out the Philadelphia Experiment are erroneous, like 100% of the skeptical arguments against the story. In this case, as usual, it's wrong because it ignores the basic facts of the story and relies strictly on 100% circumstantial evidence, and rather weak evidence at that. Here's an example that I'm sure even skeptics might be able to understand - The Wright Brothers fly at Kitty Hawk and a skeptic, who is told of the story but hasn't seen the photos yet, says, "Bolderdash! Orville Wright himself said not long ago that man's ability to fly is over 1,000 year's out of our reach. Some fanciful newspaper reporter is just taking that myth about Icarus and giving it an up-to-date dressin'-up by putting the Wright Brothers into it with some new fangled flying machine!"

OK, so now let's play with history a little and say that their first flight goes horribly wrong and there's a crash and the plane is destroyed. Now we have a few eyewitnesses - who the skeptic can character assassinate or dismiss, as is their normal practice, the photos can be claimed to be fake and the whole thing can be written off as an urban myth unless someone attempts to try it again. But then let's say there's some kind of political pressure to keep people from trying to fly because it's just too dangerous and now you have a similar situation as with the story of Project Rainbow. The flight of the Wright Brothers would have been the truth, but it could also have been squashed if things had gone differently, and if the kind of skepticism were applied, the way it is today. The witnesses are discredited and it's left to someone else to eventually discover flight, even though it had actually already been done.

As far as Moore is concerned, I can prove that at least Moore was on the same trail that I went down, because I found the evidence that supports it. That evidence is in my book and so is the proof that it was deleted from their book. Many people aren't aware of this but Berlitz had an intelligence background and probably there was some pressure applied for him to not take the story too far. Both Berlitz' intelligence connection and the information concerning his deleting pertinent facts, was discovered by Fred Houpt from Toronto Canada. I have confirmation of that information now, as well as another item of importance that Fred brought to my attention in 1999.

**AAG:** On the topic of physics, Corum suggested that the experiment might have accidentally tapped into a Torsion Effect, but his own 1994 replication was based on something more mundane: impedance-matching between a block of iron and the surrounding air. What are your thoughts about the physics involved with this experiment?

**Barnes:** I think Corum was right and it matches the whole idea of attempting a number of experiments. It completely matches the testimony from Dr. Rinehart. I think that some of Einstein's Unified Field Theory may have been involved but not in the way that people suggest - none of this accelerating atoms and other such nonsense. I have discovered that impedance matching was one of the research areas that was under consideration but a method that would be effective against all available frequencies was being sought after.

**AAG:** I've always thought that the Hutchison-Effect at least sets a precedent for considering some aspects of the Philadelphia Experiment effects themselves-- such as maybe Allende's claims about "the becoming invisible" and "men melting into decks". However, Allende also additionally claimed that men were catching on fire, walking through walls into nothingness, and getting stuck in a "deep freeze" that he sounds from his claim like being stuck in-between two dimensions. Allende later confessed to making up the stories for these last 3 effects, but continued to maintain that the first set of effects were quite real. What's your opinion on the effects that really occurred in this experiment?

**Barnes:** I know what's possible. I know that Allende seems to have come upon a ship that was suffering from the after-effects of an experiment. The Hutchison Effect certainly verifies some of what could have happened in addition to the radiation burn injuries that are listed in the classified report that Naval personnel have told me privately that they've seen. Other than that, I've never tried to make Allende out to be a major witness because it's clear that he was lying about seeing the ship go invisible. He got those details from scuttlebutt from those who were involved, just like Robert Beckwith clearly overheard scuttlebutt about an early version of the testing for it at the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory at Fort Trumbell and then embellished it with his own nonsense. In my book, I put it all together seamlessly, from the Allende account to the Rinehart interview to how it all began, was developed, who else was involved, seems to have been involved and could have been involved, why, how, where, and then the aftermath and beyond.

**AAG:** Since I've drawn a comparison to the Hutchison-Effect, I should note that Hutchison claims a number of effects not reported in the Philadelphia Experiment, such as levitation. I'm wondering if you've heard evidence for additional effects that may have been unknown to Allende?

**Barnes:** No, I haven't.

**AAG:** Speaking more pragmatically, Corum diligently noted that high-intensity magnetic fields may cause Purkinje patterns, which are a type of optical-stimulation that may cause hallucinations. Could that explain any of the anecdotal evidence relating to this experiment?

**Barnes:** Yes, the hallucinations that the crew saw about the aliens, if that part of the story is even true. It certainly would've contributed to their overall psychological disorientation. However, those hallucinations are a rather small fraction of the account. They don't explain away anything else about the optical invisibility or even if teleportation was involved. The fact remains that optical invisibility, as it was described by anecdotal accounts, matches what Dr. Rinehart claims they were attempting and I've been able to prove the scientific basis for that - simultaneously disproving the Office of Naval Research letter that says that such experiments are only possible in the realm of science fiction. When a person has such an unusual story and then you have scientific and credible evidence to support it, a professional doesn't go trying to explain it away with assumptions about hallucinations unless they're an idiot or a skeptic, which in many cases are one and the same thing, from my professional experience.

**AAG:** Carlos Allende mentioned a physicist on the project named "Dr. Franklin Reno" (aka "Dr. Rinehart") that author William Moore later tracked down. This individual provided some detailed descriptions of performing calculations to "bend light around a ship", but little is known about the actual character. What are your thoughts on this Dr. Rinehart?

**Barnes:** I found him by looking for him the way that Moore would've have done it. Gerold Schelm helped by developing a sort of "suspects list". I immediately saw the man, that I already suspected as being Rinehart, on that list and proceeded my investigation from there. Everything matched-up. Amazingly so. The readers of my book will be shocked by the highly detailed account that I present which contributes to the story in ways that no one has ever suspected, but support it completely with well documented evidence. The idea that Dr. Rinehart was the NRL's Lou Gebhard as described in the hoax paper 50 Years After Einstein: The Failure of the Unified Field at [http://www.aetherometry.com/unified\\_field/uft\\_convergence.html](http://www.aetherometry.com/unified_field/uft_convergence.html) is laugh. The entire idea of John von Neuman being the real Dr. Rinehart is a complete crock that Al Bielek made-up, just like he's made up every single detail that he's brought to the story. One rare item that I know that most don't is that at some of his lectures, Bielek would show a photo of Von Neumann and then show a photo of the old radio guy that is described in the Montauk Books as being von Neumann - still alive. He tried to point out certain physical characteristics as proof that it was von Neumann. I saw this presentation in 1996. I could tell they weren't the same man. Not even close. You can compare the photos yourself at [http://bielek.com/ab\\_albielek.htm](http://bielek.com/ab_albielek.htm), the first two about midway down the page. Von Neumann was a Hungarian Jew and the man in the photo next to him doesn't have any of the same features of von Neumann. Von Neumann doesn't have classic Jewish features either but they aren't the fine, chisled features of the man he's being compared to. Now here's the trick - scroll up to the top of the page and you'll see Einstein, Tesla, Von Neumann and Alexander Duncan Cameron in that order. Compare Von Neumann to Alexander Cameron. They look nothing alike. Now compare the Cameron photo to the one of the aged "Von Neumann". Same ears, same long thin nose, the deep set eyes. Now go five pictures down from where you started originally to where it says "1969 - Alexander with son Duncan II in Sarasota Florida." on the left side. Blow that pic up and compare the man on the left to the one of the aged "Von Neumann". It sure looks like the same guy and that guy is Alexander Duncan Cameron. So you have a case of Bielek passing off phoney evidence once again.

Oh, wait. Here's something interesting - that little comparison thing I had you do with the Von Neumann and Alexander Cameron pics from the row of pics with Einstein and Tesla? Well, you can't do that from the latest version of the web site that I gave you because they have text

running across their faces. I was looking at a print out of an earlier version. You have to go to [http://web.archive.org/web/20020802082021/http://www.bielek.com/ab\\_albielek.htm](http://web.archive.org/web/20020802082021/http://www.bielek.com/ab_albielek.htm) to do it. Hmm. Is this a coincidence or evidence of a literal 'cover-up'? Who knows? I doubt it, but I am amused by it, however.

**AAG:** I touched briefly on Torsion-Fields earlier, but I'd like to get your opinions on the applications for this technology. What, if anything, can we learn from the Philadelphia Experiment in terms of new technologies?

**Barnes:** I can only respond in terms of my own research as a R&D engineer. Invisibility mirages are certainly possible, and I'm not talking about those silly camera/wrap-around screen systems either. Of course radar invisibility and at least a direction for teleportation research. From my own lab I've been working at times on electromagnetic fields that induce similar effects as what James Woodard has been talking about at <http://chaos.fullerton.edu/~jimw/general/massfluc/index.htm>. My fields are not created the same way as he describes, however, probably why mine worked and his haven't so far. They have been known to induce propellantless acceleration that is also invisible to radar and we have a video tape showing that. In fact, there's an entire DVD and TV special in the works surrounding this development. There were also a number of unofficial tests involved with police officers using radar guns. The tests had to be unofficial because the idea that such a device could exist and be installed on a car, enabling it to speed without detection, just totally freaked out law enforcement and they didn't want to be officially connected to any tests that proved it was viable, for obvious reasons. So I had to use some of my police connections, off the record.

Aside from the radar invisibility the connection between my device and Project Rainbow seems to be found in the idea of Einstein's Unified Field Theory. The UFT has been greatly misunderstood because it has been compared to a GUT or Grand Unified Theory. It was not intended that way at all. Einstein's UFT was an attempt to unify gravity, electricity and magnetism and not gravity, electricity, magnetism, strong and weak nuclear forces, which has been the way it is portrayed quite often in the mainstream science community. To keep this from becoming a science lecture, let me just use practical applications as an example - my device, the STDTs, seems to cause a vehicle, that is already in motion, to move faster without the consumption of additional fuel, which is the cause for its being in motion. The STDTs does this via the application of a specially modulated electromagnetic field generated near the front of the vehicle. All tests show that what seems to be happening is that space is being contracted near the front of the vehicle and expanded out the rear. That would explain why there is no additional fuel consumption required for the increased velocity. It also explains why there is no increase in the speed indicated by the speedometer yet all inside and outside clocks indicate that the elapsed time says that the vehicle was going faster. So we have an electromagnetic cause for something that is usually attributed to gravity - warping space. Likewise, bending light is also something that is attributed to gravity, as has been insinuated by people discussing the Philadelphia Experiment, but clearly, in both cases, were talking about a tremendous amount of gravity having to be involved and yet that is not the case.

Like many things associated with Einstein, there are flaws which then appear to be only half wrong. For example - the EPR paradox. Einstein said that quantum mechanics was wrong because if it were right then entangled particles could be separated by the expanse of the universe and a measurement on one would still result in the other responding in the exact same instant and that would be a violation of the relativity. Well, it turned out that that's exactly what happens, and so Einstein was wrong but he was still right because by all accounts it seems that this signalling at a distance is really saying that the entanglement process is never broken, no matter how far "apart" the particles seem to be separated. So it's not really a violation of relativity.

Similarly, if special electromagnetic fields induce what appears to be gravitic effects, it doesn't mean that it's actually gravity the way that we know it. There is no complete theory of gravity that explains everything, so there's still much that scientists have to learn. But what the Hutchinson Effect shows, and what seems to be happening with my STDTs, is that there are other windows to the forces that seem connected to Einstein's UFT. Only further research will reveal how far these forces may be explored and what the results can be. But in my book I reveal for the first time anywhere, how this idea applies directly to Project Rainbow and how it is supported by information that was leaked to Carlos Allende by Dr. Rinehart and revealed in letters to Robert Goerman, who in turn, completely missed their significance.

**AAG:** Most people believe that the Philadelphia Experiment was a one-time thing, and that the results were disastrous enough that it was never attempted again. However, there's been a persistent rumor that the Navy might have revisited this experiment in 1947, and other rumors suggest that parts of this research were underway even into the 1950's. Do you think there's any truth to this?

**Barnes:** The 1947 date, I believe, is from Allende which is when he says that he heard that the ship teleported. He later changed that, in a letter to Robert Goerman, I believe, and said that it happened in 1944. As an aside, I believe that that's probably where Beckwith got his dates for his version of the story, that it happened in 1944 and not 1943. My research shows that the events that Beckwith bases other details of his story on actually took place earlier than 1943 and were part of the first large scale testing of Project Rainbow. It also could be that Beckwith just changed the dates or doesn't have a very good memory.

In any case, what I know is that there were tests before the one using the Eldridge and that there seems to have been other ships that were used for testing as well, in 1943 and earlier. The Timmerman may have been tested in the 1950s and used the cover of trying out special engines to explain the wacked-out fields that witnesses saw. However, it seems that the real research after that went towards aircraft based on T. Townsend Brown's work. Why make-up all this hooey about Biefeld-Brown not working when it does, unless you don't want anyone playing around with it because it can lead you to more stable radar and optical cloaking? There's alot more to this whole Brown thing that even Nick Cook knew and he missed quite a bit. Odd too, because he started out with the same Brown material that I did and had the Russian plasma sheath information as well. I was able to get my leads that me to where I got what I learned about the Russian plasma sheath tech from his Jane's Defense Weekly article, in fact. In double checking my records, it appears that he's the one at Jane's Defense Weekly that put me in contact with the Russians that confirmed the story. This of course led me to more evidence about why there has been such an overwhelming effort to keep this experiment so covered-up. If Nick had been really looking, he could have found the same thing. I guess he took a wrong turn somewhere...

Also, my book settles once and for all, the whole matter of Professor Biefeld being real or not and who he really was. Vallee had said as much as the man never existed, trying to call T. Townsend Brown's credibility into question. Oops! Vallee was very, very sloppy. Actually, he was just doing his job at the time, unfortunately for him. He was put up to it, from all accounts that I heard. Aviary business, you know. I used to really like him when I was younger. I saw him as the Jacques Cousteau of UFOs in a way. Then I later learned how dirty this business really is and picked the side of the idealist. I don't have anything personal against him, it's just that that little disinfo piece of his had a lot of people fooled, right when I just discovered that refracted light causes invisibility mirages when properly manipulated, just like Dr. Rinehart said. So there was no way I was going to sit by, especially after I investigated the Dudgeon account and then saw them both on Mysterious Forces Beyond, and let that stand as this so-called "good piece of

research" as Mike Corbin of ParaNet called it. No one checked it, that's why they were fooled. There was no evidence presented to look at, just taking their word for everything. When I found the info verifying Dr. Biefeld, I knew that Vallee's piece wasn't even a good piece of disinfo. Sloppy, sloppy work. But like I said, it's been said that he was put up to it. I even tone it all down in the book. I don't want to beat-up on the man. I want to beat-up on skeptics and the media. But I do want people to know that the Dudgeon account is completely baseless. They can speculate on the motives themselves. It's the facts that matter, and the facts are that Dudgeon's account is full of holes that are historically inaccurate and are discredited even by U.S. Naval records. Like I said. Sloppy.

**AAG:** I'd also heard another rumor suggesting that the Philadelphia Experiment may have even had some relationship to UFO's -- as amazing as it sounds, this rumor claimed that this technology may have served as a beacon for ET, and might have even triggered the UFO-craze of the 1950's. Have you heard anything about this, or is it just more mythology?

**Barnes:** The UFO connection is tenuous and adds no credibility nor takes any away from the story except to say that Bielek introduces the idea that aliens were behind the experiment in the first place so that a 40 year "wide" hole could be opened in spacetime to allow easier access to our planet. That, of course, is a patent lie. It doesn't even make any sense. Otherwise, I have no evidence of UFO involvement. Stanton Friedman is the one credited with saying that perhaps the event became an interdimensional beacon due to its creation of "electromagnetic oversplash". Maybe so. That's not my area and it would be hard to prove beyond just sheer speculation.

**AAG:** Let's finish with your book -- can you provide us with any details or contact info, and possibly some insight on when the book is coming out & where the public can get it?

**Barnes:** The book will be available June 22nd. The CD will be out around the same time. It will be announced nearly everywhere as well as where they can get it.

---

Marshall Barnes is an independent researcher with decades of experience studying high-energy physics & anomalous technologies.