

Dr. Robert Koppany
Email: bkoppany@ix.netcom.com

Dr. Philip Campbell
Editor-in-Chief of Nature

Dr. Campbell,

Please excuse us contacting you first instead of going directly through the editorial submittal process. Your website states, "Since 1869 Nature has published some of the world's most important physics and astrophysics research." We feel we have such an unpublished research article we would like Nature to consider. The title is "Weighing magnetized and unmagnetized ferromagnetic elements – Initial findings."

ABSTRACT: "We weighed iron and nickel toroids of 20kg each and measured the magnetic flux of a gap in the toroids before and after degaussing in a furnace oven. The weight of the nickel toroid changed before and after magnetizing with amounts depending on the orientation of the toroid in the oven. When the nickel toroid was magnetized, it gained weight and when it was unmagnetized, it lost weight."

It is a straightforward article of weighing magnetized and unmagnetized ferromagnets. No fancy equipment was used, just an oven and scale. But, our conclusions certainly fit in your statement of "selecting and communicating the most important and valuable scientific information to the broadest possible audience."

As a physicist, I am sure the ramifications of this experiment are quite apparent to you and equally profound; the discovery of a distinction between inertial and gravitational masses suggests that magnetism is gravity – which puts gravity into a Spin-1 classification from Spin-2 – which allows us to fully solve Einstein's Unified Field Theory – which puts closure to the inability of LIGO (in operation for more than a decade) to discover gravitational waves (as they are magnetic waves) – which suggests a conversion factor exists between electron volts and magnetic susceptibility.

A copy of the article pdf file is attached for your review. As you will see, it doesn't say anything we feel is inflammatory or deserving the kicks in the teeth we've gotten from the three physics journals we've submitted it to. These various physics journals not only rejected the article but responded with outright animosity along with a gut-wrenching hostility from the editors who reviewed it. We were breathing easier when we saw your website's statement that "Editors choose referees for their independence and ability to evaluate the technical aspects of the paper fully and fairly", which would help our article finally reach the scientific world and stop the bloody beatings we've been receiving.

On your website's peer-review policy you list four points you were looking for as a criteria for publication: 1) *Provides strong evidence for conclusion* - We have listed our data points, but many people would not be happy even if we provided countless thousands of data points. 2) *Novel* - that pertains to this submittal. 3) *Of extreme importance to scientists in the specific field* - that pertains to this submittal. 4) *Ideally, interesting to researchers in other related disciplines* - this also pertains to this submittal.

For the people writing the review - there are questions that are asked on the Nature webpage:

1) *Who will be interested in reading the paper, and why?* This article would be of interest to any engineer, physicist, chemist, and possibly biologist.

2) *What are the main claims of the paper and how significant are they?* The significance of the paper has been mentioned earlier.

3) *Is the paper likely to be one of the five most significant papers published in the discipline this year?* You are at a better place to judge that than we are, but we think it's pretty darn important.

4) *Are the claims novel?* We think they are.

5) *Are the claims convincing?* If not, what further evidence is needed? We may be too close to the article, but we think it is fine the way it is. We want the various investigators to substantiate our results, which is the only way

further evidence can be supplied.

6) *Are there other experiments or work that would strengthen the paper further?* There are different ways to modify the experiment, but experiments of this type have not been performed until now using large ferromagnets and so couldn't strengthen the paper further.

7) *How much would further work improve it, and how difficult would this be?* Would it take a long time? We are convinced that the majority of the physics world will not accept our results no matter how many data points we have or how we modified the experiment. Acceptance can be achieved ONLY by other independent investigators repeating the experiment. That is why we listed the title as "Initial findings."

8) *Are the claims appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature?* As far as we can tell, no one has ever tried looking for changes in weight when demagnetizing "large" ferromagnets. Most people in the past (1880s to early 1900s) used "small" ferromagnetic masses and discovered no difference in their statistical analysis, finding no change in weight on their scales to within one part in 10^3 or 10^4 .

9) *If the manuscript is unacceptable, is the study sufficiently promising to encourage the authors to resubmit?* We cannot see how we can ever modify the article to please the community besides rephrasing of the text.

10) *If the manuscript is unacceptable but promising, what specific work is needed to make it acceptable?* We theorize the only additional work that can make the manuscript acceptable would be support by the results of future independent experimenters.

Your peer-review policy website page states "Authors of papers that blow against the prevailing winds bear a far greater burden of proof than normally expected in publishing their challenge to the current paradigm. Veering too far in one direction or the other leads to complaints either that peer review isn't stringent enough, or that it is stifling the freshest research." That is a good point.

In looking on your webpage on Physics Portal, I was impressed by the caliber of your past articles; a DNA paper by Watson and Crick, Roentgen's X-rays, photon spin, isotopes, mass spectrographs, quasars, Zeeman effect, nuclear fission, de Broglie's particle/wave duality, MRI, laser, and even an article by Einstein himself on General Relativity. Many of those papers were controversial. Some, as Einstein's theory of Relativity, had venomous hostility toward it from the scientific community when it was first presented in the past.

But, someone had to have the strength of character to publish Einstein's paper, along with the other significant but controversial papers of the centuries, in the hope that it would strengthen physics and not stifle the truth. Someone with a strong character, who could stand on their own two feet and not bend in the wind. Someone who did not flinch at steering their ship straight into a storm of biblical proportion if he or she thought that would help them in the best way they knew how to get themselves and the cargo/passengers entrusted to them to a safe port. Someone who knew that physics was strong enough to weather such a storm, with something greater and better arising from any wreckage.

We need such a brave advocate, and hopefully it is you. That is the reason for this Email - to get a champion to assure this paper gets published and shown to the world at large. We are convinced that without intervention, this paper will banish into the recycle bin of limited reviewers with small perspectives and quick knee-jerk nerve reflexes. If these results prove reproducible, it will rewrite physics. If there is even the slightest chance that it is true, isn't that an important and significant enough article that Nature wants for its readers - one that would also enhance the reputation and prestige of the journal?

I should note here to provide some confidence in you about this article that this isn't the first time a paper by me has appeared in a scientific journal. I was a co-author on an article published in Science in 1981 while I was working at Jet Propulsion Laboratory on Titan's atmosphere from the Voyager 1 and Voyager 2 Saturn flyby. I am also including a pdf of the biography of the enclosed article's authors for your review.

Although not at Jet Propulsion Laboratory any longer, I still have a friend working there who would vouch for me. His name is Dr. Randii Wessen, and he is also a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society (as I noticed you are). He can be used as a reference for me. If you feel it necessary for some reason to talk to me face to face, I can arrange for a trip to London. I would be happy to buy the first round of what would probably be to me an evening worth the trip. And, it would give me a chance to get to Foyles; my favorite bookstore.

Or, if you are in the Los Angeles area, I would be happy to arrange a meeting over dinner. I would also be willing to talk about my Jet Propulsion Laboratory days to appeal to your interest and Ph.D. concentration on upper atmospheric physics, but would probably bring along JPL colleagues closer to your field of interest to liven

up the meeting. However, CalTech closed their bookstore last September. Similarly, I was doing research at UCLA two weeks ago, and also found the bookstore there lacking content of interest to physicists. UCLA also narrow-mindedly closed their Physics and Chemistry library at the end of last year, moving a miniscule smattering of physics and chemistry journals to their Biomedical Library. Unfortunately, there is really nothing left as far as bookstores to equal Foyles or even Blackwells in the Los Angeles area.

Yours will be the last journal we consider. I look forward to a response from you when time permits, advising us to submit the attached article to Nature, or for us to abandon any hope of objective peer-review, and to just post it on the internet.

With kindest regards to you, and with hope.
Sincerely yours,

Bob Koppany