Beamship Technology: a Re-working of Early 20th century Discoveries

Russell Anderson

Applied Electrogravitics 377 Avon Rd., Ste. D-119
Devon, PA 19333 russanderson3@hotmail.com
484-255-1072

Some Basic Background

The concept of an electric aero-spacecraft with no moving parts was initiated by the Yugoslavian electrical wizard **Nikola Tesla**, who lit the entire world 100 years ago, at the turn of another century, with his revolutionary AC electric current. In 1916-17, Dr. Francis Niepher performed meticulous mass-deflection experiments under rigorous scientific conditions with lead spheres suspended by wires with shielded and unshielded containers. An accounting of this important series of experiments is in TRANSACTIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE OF ST. LOUIS VOL.23, 1916 and 1917. Related article is in THE ELECTRICAL EXPERIMENTER, March 1918.

Before 1905, **George S. Piggot** was routinely suspending small silver balls to water globules, corks, wood, using the electrostatic field from a specially designed Wimshurst machine in a glass container under several atmospheres of pressure to raise the current level. Output voltage was typically 500KV. The field was propagated by a charged sphere. A small curved conducting plate on the floor acted as a ground. He observed unusual patterns of blue dots with filaments over the suspended objects, sometimes with an anomalous 1/2 cm "dark band" on the suspended objects. Piggot states, "It is my firm conviction that that somewhere on the outer confines of our planet there exists a similar contracting belt thru which naught but the gravitational vibrations of the sun penetrate, and these vibrations absolutely annihilate or absorb all other less powerful ones". If the force was Coulombic in nature, objects would be first attracted, and then strongly repelled by the charged metal sphere. After the objects were suspended, Piggot found he could remove the conducting ground plate, and the objects still floated, suspended. The phenomenon of levitation was accompanied by "luminous halos".

In 1925-27, **Albert Einstein** released his scientific "gem", his "zur Einheitlichten Feldtherie", or the Unified Field Theory for Gravitation and Electricity, to the press and the scientific community. It combines electricity, magnetism, and gravitation into a single mathematical expression, showing how High-Voltage/Low Current electricity (Electrogravity) -and conversely Low-Voltage/High-current (magnetogravity) "acceleration-fields" (G-field) could be produced using then-available relatively LOW-technology. Indeed, a very simple technology. The unifying field is the electrical field (because it can produce gravitation and repulsion fields, as well as magnetism). His Crowning work was released with much press write-ups and fanfare, then it was quickly forgotten as if the scientific community and the world had suffered some kind of collective amnesia!

All of the readers of this magazine need no introduction to the pioneering work of American Scientist **Thomas Townsend Brown**, who was playing around with an X-ray tube around the same year as Einstein's Unified Field Theory was released. He filed his first patent for this newly and accidentally discovered "electrogravitational-effect" which causes motion in a high-voltage condensor or capacitor configuration. He was only 17 at that time. The discovery that high-voltage/low amperage electrostatic potentials applied to an object causes motion in the direction of the positive pole, and electrical charges naturally move to the OUTER surface of an enclosed charge-conductor, held strong prospects for what Brown would later name the "space-car", and wrote an article "HOW I CONTROL GRAVITATION". His pioneering work, and demonstration of devices in Hawaii during World War II, drew attention from the department of Naval Intelligence. He was invited to work on "Project-Rainbow" (the Philadelphia Experiment for Electromagnetic Stealth) because of his pioneering work on what was starting to be understood very covertly as a true WARP DRIVE. Experiments with certain new and classified arc-welding apparatus at the Philadelphia Navy Yards to weld armor-plate for battleships was (by use of banks of primitive but powerful avalanche-discharge capacitors) producing anomalous and unexplained effects, such as disappearing tools and other apparatus in the heavily shielded welding chamber. These strange effects were accompanied by a strange "blackout -zone" which, like Piggot's early work, was not optical in nature. TT Brown's devices in his AH Bahnson Labs home movies lift more than their own weight and move inside vacuum chambers in these films. TT Brown later founded NICAP in 1956, which became the most respected UFO data gathering and hard scientific organization in the world, besides the US department of Naval Intelligence itself, and the Foreign Technology Division at Wright-Patterson Air Force base in Ohio.

My background and work

I primarily have a background and degree in computer programming, electronics, most fields of science, Flying Saucer Technology research (almost 30 years worth), Radio/Control fixed and rotary-wing aircraft since 1972. I have been experimenting and working with high-energy and electrogravitic devices and systems since 1987. I built my first small High-Voltage generators starting around this time. I built kits from Information unlimited and elsewhere.

In late January 1990 I built my first working 2-foot flying discs, which were a direct replication of Thomas Townsend Brown's most important representation of his electrogravity-propelled scale-model vehicular concept, from US Patent #2,949,550. In January 1992, I built a 120KV high-voltage/low-current electrostatic generator from an Information Unlimited kit, primarily for force-field propulsion research.

In June 1999, I built a tower and rotor apparatus to complete the experiment, and I powered it with the output from a 100KV generator I built from an Information Unlimited Kit. The results were spectacular, and taught me a great deal about what was involved in producing and maximizing the Biefeld-Brown Electro-gravitational effect. **I suspected from my research, and my experiments, that the basic effect was not due to current-flow and resulting ion-wind. When there was current-flow, the effect is attenuated, power consumption goes up, and thrust goes DOWN.** In late June of 2000, I presented this working TT Brown Electrokinetic Apparatus with larger 1-meter discs at the 2nd Antigravity Conference in Reno, NV, hosted by Jim Cox. A VHS videotape of this working and spectacular presentation at the first part of the conference is available from
www.soundphotosynthesis.com

Now that I had mastered producing horizontal thrust, vertical thrust, or antigravity, was the next goal. About this same time, there was buzz all over the Internet about claims of two or three individuals who sounded credible at the time who had successfully replicated the many multi-layered "gravity-warp capacitor" or "electric rocket". Oddly, these claims could not be verified, and the individuals making the claims disappeared back into the woodwork. Such actions are bizarre and hinder the progress of true science, which is undergoing a shift in paradigms right now, if not a change in dogma.

I spent months die-cutting hundreds to thousands of tinfoil and aluminum-foil circular-notched conductor plates and wax paper and mylar rings. I did some initial testing with a Tin and wax-paper 400-layer gravity warp-capacitor heap, according to plans I had acquired from H & A Industries in 1992, and what was on Bill Beatty's amateur science site. No one else has come forward with positive results on this tedious and time-consuming device. So much work for so little effect! And, if you short out the stack with too much power, you must tediously and laboriously search thru hundreds of layers to find the dielectric layers with the telltale carbonized holes. The Electric rocket has been recently successfully replicated and tested in hard vacuum and patented recently by Hector Serrano. The Serrano effect is identical to the so-called Biefeld-Brown Electrogravitational effect. They are one in the same thing. I may dust off my completed 400-layer grav-cap, but I hardly find it worth the time and effort, because of my recent work starting in early October 2001.

The Lifter and The Evolution to Beamship Model Flying Craft

Although I had attempted a few small "Hagen" patent-type antigravity (VTOL) models in the early 90s, I found their performance poor at best and their power consumption high. In late summer, 2001, someone, I forget who, on the JLN's lab list of researchers and anomalous science-experiment and technology enthusiasts ran across a website owned by Transdimensional Technologies, of Huntsville, Alabama (famous for NASA research facilities, the late Dr. Rolf Schaffranke, author of the important ETHER TECHNOLOGY, under the pseudonym "Rho Sigma", and Dr. Tom Bearden) had produced a hovering device. From my previous work, I recognized it immediately as TT Brown's Electrokinetic Apparatus that I had successfully replicated and demonstrated before a live audience years earlier. I noticed the capacitors were made from Aluminum FOIL, not the thin-but-heavy Aluminum sheet stock from Home Depot that I had been using for years, (I had assumed that to make my 3-foot discs hover and ascend vertically, I would have to use voltages in the hundreds of kilovolt range, and generate high x-ray, UV, and possibly gamma-ray emissions as a by-product, in other words, a typical flying saucer with all the associated radiological effects that have been documented for over half a century) so they could lift their own weight. The result matches almost exactly the simplest graphical representations of TT Brown's patent from 1960, and De Seversky's Ionocraft patent from 1964, which was a thin foil cathode plate with a thin anode wire separated from the cathode by stand-off insulator posts. I was eager to reproduce these devices (I don't know how I overlooked this simple solution, it was all sitting in those old 1960s Brown and De Seversky patents I have studied for 15 years previously) and many people around the world, especially the webmaster of the JLN Lab's site French researcher Jean-Louis Naudin, who began replicating many different types of larger and more sophisticated devices, some of which resembled model spacecraft, and began amassing tables of very useful data, that researchers could use as basic guidelines to follow. I replicated the first hovering device, the "Lifter" (so-called by Transdimensional Technologies) as a 1-foot triangle, with 2-inch foil cathode and #42 enameled copper magnet wire. To energize it I used a commercial power supply from Gamma High-Voltage Research that I had acquired from Ebay some years ago. It was perfect

for antigravity research, having full metering, and variable voltage from 0 to 40KV, and current limiting from 0 to 1.5 milli Amperes of current. The heavy 1-meter discs of the Electrokinetic Apparatus were too heavy and the rotor-friction to great for this low-powered device (60 Watts, maximum), but for the lifter, it proved ideal.

My first "lifter" antigravity device worked, but its performance was less than ideal. It had to be stripped of its lower balsa-wood frame and some of its foil before it would degravitate (counterbary), and it "maxed-out" the current-limited power supply at 33KV I 1.5mA, for a stable hover (actually this is an upward flight configuration, because the device is tethered to the lab table with 3 sewing threads). That is 49 Watts. The concept of a hovering TT Brown Electrokinetic Apparatus had been proven to my satisfaction, however, and I initiated more research into past works and patents to raise efficiency to workable levels. The performance was slightly better than my early 1990s "wire-grid" type devices. I found this slightly encouraging.

After a couple months reading and research (why re-invent the wheel, its all been done before), I started to replicate larger models in February and March 2002, but kept coming up against a size-barrier with the Multi-cellular (grid) approach that many researchers had assumed would raise thrust, and efficiency. This approach obviously did neither, as no one seemed to be able to produce hovering devices above a certain size, the current consumed (adding to total wattage consumed) was prohibitive with the low-powered (still high-voltage, low-current) devices that most of the mostly amateur researchers were using. Researchers around the world started to replicate different versions of the basic lifter 1 (an 6 to 12-inch equilateral triangle). The lifters are always tethered to the testing surface with 3 strings to keep them from going dangerously unstable and possibly short-circuit when they reach the limit of the umbilical supplying power to the device.

From my previous Biefeld-Brown effect replications years earlier, and from carefully reading Brown's EK Apparatus patent, I knew that increasing the diameter of the wire would reduce leakage current created by coronal discharge, mostly coming from the forward electrode, which in the 2 and 3-foot saucers consisted of an arc of copper tubing in the front quadrant of the saucer, or disc. Corona robs power (amperage) from the disc that otherwise would be used to "propel" the disc. Increasing the diameter of the copper tubing, as per Brown's patent if the effect was due primarily to ion-wind, more current and current flow between the electrodes would be desired to effect more air movement. But this is not what I saw in the saucers. **There was apparently another, far more powerful but subtle force effecting silent propulsion of the saucers that had nothing to do with charge-transfer and ion-momentum.**

In February of this year, I undertook an effort to replicate and improve performance and reduce power consumption of the lifter device, based on data from my electrogravitic work of years past. I started by using thicker diameter enameled copper magnet wire, #35 to #30 diameters. I first built a 1-foot equilateral triangular basic "Lifter-1", weighing only 3.5 grams. On March 16th, I built a lifter with the thicker #35 enameled copper wire.

I made the three sides 1-foot long and exactly 2-inches high. After experimentation, I found the optimum spark gap for my High-Voltage power supply (Gamma High Voltage Research 40KV with current limiting to 1.5mA). The small silver-colored device leapt off the test table and pulled violently against its anchor strings to a distance of about a foot. This seemed like a great deal of force for such low power. The large discs of my TT Brown EK apparatus required a good deal higher voltage to initiate motion in the direction of the anode. The device consumed 26KV I 0.56mA DC, which calculates out to 14.56 Watts. I was getting more excited, because this was the best efficiency seen of any result yet posted.

On March 19th, I tested 2 lifters glued together in a "diamond" shaped configuration.

This 2-foot device weighed 6.0 grams, with the same #35 wire and a 2 and 5/8" air gap. It took 25KV to nullify the weight of the device, and it achieved a stable hover at 35KV I 0.8mA. That is 28 Watts. This is about what I had initially expected, double the power for double the Watts. Still, this was far less overall power going into the device to achieve a stable hover than my first primitive and radically shorn and trimmed device. After lift off to the extent of the anchors, I found I could reduce power slightly and maintain a stable hover. On march 22nd at 3:49 pm I got the diamond lifter to achieve a stable hover with a 2 and 5/8" air gap at 29.5 KV I 0.32mA. This was only 9 Watts! This was unheard-of efficiency. I was further encouraged to build and test larger hovering devices to see how large I could get them with my low-powered commercial power supply.

I then built a "lifter-2", which consists of three 1-foot triangular capacitor cells taped together. It weighs 11.4 grams. March 30th at 3:22 pm, the device achieved a stable hover at 38KV I 0.57mA for 19.76 Watts total power. The larger device was more energy efficient than a device 1/3 the size. I wanted to see how far this could go, so I added three more lifter cells to make a 6-cell device, 3 feet on each of its three sides. I was eager to check the performance of this fairly large device. This was the diameter of my horizontally propelled TT Brown Discs.

This device weighed 21.6 grams. I kept the spark gap the same distance on this device. However this device failed to achieve counterbary (lift). It just sat on the test table, filling the air with the smell of ozone and

making a sizzling sound (corona noise). I noticed that the current maxed-out on the power supply at a fairly low voltage and would not go any higher.

I concluded in my disappointment that all that wire from all the inter-connections to the cells was causing corona leakage and robbing current, which otherwise would be used by the device for propulsion.

The idea then hit me that perhaps I could make a device with the same outer diameter as the 3-foot device, but have greater efficiency because of a much shorter length of wire. I built basically a 3-foot (1-meter) version of the first 1-foot device. This device weighed 16 grams. It lifted off the table with amazing force and hovered stably with I 52mA 30KV which is 15.6 Watts. Not only had I achieved a larger-size device, but far better power efficiency for a much larger and heavier device. I was overjoyed! I saw that I had a great deal of lifting force to spare. I had not even come near the limit of my power supply. I added extra bracing at the corners and extra balsa and a triangular paper "payload -tray" in the center of the device, supported by three 1/16"x1/16-inch balsa stock. The extra bracing and payload area added approximately 2 more grams. With a 5 gram payload, the device consumed 39.9 KV I 0.99mA, for total power consumption of 39.5 Watts. I was really encouraged at that point, because I knew that these results were unheard-of, in terms of energy efficiency. I had solved the problem of decreasing efficiency by dispensing with a "grid-based" device. Increasing the area of the capacitor plate was one of the factors that increased performance and efficiency, lessening the input power requirements with increasing size. Now the Biefeld-Brown effect could be properly studied, now that most of the ion-flux had been eliminated, resulting conservation of energy by the device, and resulting in greatly increased propulsive force.

Since I now knew the limit of payload for the device at the power level I was using, I added a balsa framework that approximated a central cabin area, and three small styro-foam spheres on the center of the straight sides on short lengths of balsa. The device no longer looked like a test device, but now looked like a scale model spacecraft. I remembered the Edouard "Billy" Meier UFO contact case, and knew that all his original photographs and movie footage of extraterrestrial spaceships the extraterrestrials themselves called "beamships" (there are several styles and variations, all with different specific functions and capabilities, some manned, some remote-controlled "telemeter discs" that had a tri-hemispherical undercarriage that I knew from past research were propulsion condensors) and that the original un-tampered photos all passed rigorous analysis using the latest and most sophisticated computer and other equipment, case detractors not withstanding. Also the spiritual messages of these genetic brothers of Man and their accounting of humankind's history and origins from far across space rang true and struck a chord with me.

I decided to name this new 1-meter model spacecraft Beamship Variation I. The three sides of the device performed the same function on this device that the three spherical or hemispherical capacitors often seen on the underside of full-size "beamships" (Daylight-disc-type UFOs), which illustrates a similar if not identical propulsion methodology to full-size 3 to 7 meter and larger "off-Earth-built" aero-spacecraft. Clearly the propulsion methodologies were exactly the same in the model as in the full-size flight device.

I immediately built a 4-foot diameter model with a full cabin framework and internal payload area and achieved even greater performance and efficiency. I was ecstatic. This 4-foot device I dubbed Beamship Variation II. I received a suggestion from Mr. Tim Ventura of American Antigravity that performance could be increased by using small diameter stainless-steel wire. It seemed unlikely to me that smaller diameter wire would increase performance, it contradicted Brown's patent, and my own past research with large electrogravitic discs. But Stainless steel has a high number of free electrons in the outer valence atomic shells (electron orbits).

So I obtained some #40 stainless locally and the results confirmed Mr. Ventura's suggestion. Corona noise was heard at a much higher power level, and was greatly attenuated in volume. Leakage current was less, and the two Beamships now had more thrust with less power input. They even carried more payload at less power input. Variation II weighs 21 grams and loft a payload of 6 grams at 40KV I 1mA for 40 Watts total power. Again, this was unheard-of efficiency. The anode wires sang a strange harmony as the Beamships floated in the air, stably at any altitude, from floor to ceiling, without any fuel or visible means of support. This was very Beamship-like.

I thought that now since corona discharge on the anode wire was less, I could decrease the spark-gap distance without creating a spark (which kills lift). Thrust seemed initially to increase, but efficiency went down because there was current-flow now, and current consumption went way up. The supply would now max-out at 37KV I 1.5mA and would not increase because of the current limiting. The Beamships now were noisy, as the foils chattered loudly because of all the ion-wind that was now rushing downward along and past the foils. I used a concert fog machine to observe the ion-flux vector, and filmed it digitally with my Logitech web-cam, and with VHS analog video.

Analysis of the fog -tests showed a circular vortex of air surrounding the anode wire that flared out into a downwash of air below the Beamship. I was disappointed, because I thought then that the thrust action of the device was due to simple ion-transfer. A useful-enough effect, but of questionable use in the vacuum of space without an ionizing medium.

Beamship Variation III

I reasoned I had just about enough power in the supply to build and fly a 6-foot (2-meters) Beamship. Since the balsa came in 3-foot lengths, this was simple. As with all the lifter devices and the more evolved and efficient Beamship-series model aircraft, construction techniques are extremely simple and require little skill to assemble. Weight of the Beamship Variation III is 42 grams, with 6-feet of length on its 3 sides. Height of the foils was still 2". Full frame and cabin, with Searl "IGV"-type landing legs, to support the weight of this heavy and very large device. I set the spark gap at 2 and 1/2 inches. At 12:15pm EDT, May 12th, 2002 the Beamship was weightless at 32KV with current maxed-out at 1.5mA.

The device barely lifted off, and "hopped", across the floor once or twice at full power. It had the same loud rattling of the foils due to the terrific downwash of electrified air. I needed to raise the power level. I increased the distance of the spark gap to 2 and 3/4". Now the Beamship took off straight up with power to spare, as if it was one of the smaller craft. Beamship Variation III is weightless at 30KV I 0.85mA (25.5 Watts), and airborne into a stable hover at 35KV I 1.35mA. That is only 47.25 Watts. It can carry a payload of 5 grams, or 5 grams worth of additional framework and structure, to the limit of the power supply, which is 60 Watts (40KV I 1.5mA).

The 42-gram, six-foot model aero-spacecraft only consumes 47.25 Watts at hover, but my first small and trimmed device ate up 49 Watts! Clearly, using the single-cell Beamship methodology had a huge advantage over the "multi-cellular" design that other researchers had built and tested, seemingly reaching an impasse in terms of size and efficiency, which my large single-cell Beamship technique had seemingly solved. In early April my 1-meter Beamship, weighing 22 grams including 5-gram payload, consumed 39.6 Watts. So the 42-gram, 6-foot Beamship used only 7.65 Watts more total input power at stable hover that the 1-meter Beamship. Power-to-weight ratio for the 2-meter Beamship V. III works out to 1.125 Watts to lift 1 gram stably of scale model electric spacecraft. With little to no ion wind, the Beamship had plenty of upward force and achieved stable counterbary at greater efficiency than I had ever heard or read about. Also, I was not aware of any devices in scientific history that has achieved this type of counterbary for this little input power and this colossal size. I performed additional fog-tests with two red semiconductor-emitted laser beams in the plane of one side of the device, one above the wire, one below the foil. The Beamship without all the ion-wind was nearly silent again, except for "singing" and softly "thrumming" anode wires. These laser-beam tests further confirmed the marked absence of ion-wind with a larger spark gap.

At 1.125 Watts-per gram at 57KV I 1.4mA (78.8 Watts) would lift 89.775 grams worth of electric spacecraft. So not only is the larger size in a single cell far more efficient that the "grid" design, in thrust and power consumption, but the reduction in current from increasing the spark gap raised power level to the device, while dropping power consumption of the device. My initial suspicion of ion-wind producing most of the thrust in the Biefeld-Brown effect had been disproven also because of the great weight of the device. I never would have discovered this important fact if I had stayed with smaller devices, trying to raise their efficiency. And I never would have discovered the efficacy of the Biefeld-Brown effect if I had stayed with the multi-cellular "lifter" methodology. One of the factors that raises the level of propulsive force (if "propulsion" is the right word) is increasing the area of the plate, according to TT Brown's patents. So the larger size single-cell capacitor's ability to reduce power consumption and effect greater propulsive force and upward acceleration, was easily explained by the Biefeld-Brown Effect. Brown had been vindicated. My gut feeling had seemingly been confirmed: this was our first warp-drive (reaction-less drive).

My experiments had yielded greater efficiency, and greater size and weight of VTOL hovering models than any that I had ever heard or read about. I still am having difficulty taking in these facts; and it is very awe-inspiring to see such a large device de-gravitate and hover stably at any altitude, from floor to ceiling.

Next for me is a higher-powered supply (60KV), moving up to a three-meter Beamship Variation IV, improvements to the cathode such as a thin, symmetrical airfoil shape, as Brown suggests in his patents, tungsten wire, and then carbon-wire for the anode, and full heat-shrink coverings on the frames, running lights, onboard lasers, onboard digital/proportional Radio/Control, and now that we know the power requirements, and have a good handle on efficiency, onboard power generation. I have already begun designing with my associates our own custom-made outboard and inboard battery-powered power supplies, and finally will cut the power umbilical to the model electric spacecraft permanently, and Beamship technology advances further. If the on/off duty cycle is pulsed at a low frequency, power input can be reduced by two-thirds, at least. Experiments conducted by Jean-Louis Naudin last fall (2001) confirm this phenomenon, suggested by Brown and De Seversky in their patents. Clearly, onboard power can easily be effected, using modern miniaturization and circuitry. Pitch and roll vector control can be achieved by electrically isolating the anode wires on the three sides of the ship, and varying pulses to these three wires. Yaw control can be achieved by simply installing a horizontal-double sided capacitor inside the ship near one corner. Simple full 4-channel flight control is thus achieved.

The Beamship series aircraft are fascinating research and entertainment devices (see cover page), and are the vanguard of a whole new generation of radio/controlled antigravity model aircraft with no moving

parts and dead silent propulsion. But they are more than that. The Beamships, if allowed, could probably rise up at any speed thru the atmosphere, right up to near-Earth-orbit, and probably keep on going out into limitless space. No need to achieve ballistic escape velocities of miles-per-second. This is non-ballistic flight. They even have a certain amount of wind resistance outdoors and indoors because the electrical field causes air to flow AROUND the model flying craft, not into it. This is such a safer, environmentally cleaner, vibration and nearly silent and more pleasant method of aero- space travel than carrying tons of explosive reaction mass, which can and does explode. No more use of heat energy to effect transportation.

The 21st century has begun in earnest!

Beamship series aircraft are available for sale for research and hobby/entertainment use right now through the American Antigravity website: www.americanantigravity.com. Look for the Applied Electrogravitics antigravity technology website late spring, 2002. You can contact me, Russell Anderson for details on pricing, and new and improved variations, and power supplies for outboard and onboard drive, which are currently in design stages.

Editor's note: More ideas on development of T.T. Brown's patents are on our web site: http://www.faraday.ru. Read about T-capacitor!

Data Table 1

Antigravity device	Weight of device	Wire type	Voltage/current	Total Watts	Payload	Payload/power
1-foot "Flyer-1"	3.2 grams	#42 enameled copper	33KV I 1.5mA	49	None	————
1-foot "lifter-1"	3.5 grams	#35 enameled copper	26KV I 0.56mA	14.56	None	————
2-foot "diamond-lifter"	6.0 grams	#35 enameled copper	29.5KV I 0.32mA	9	None	————
2-foot, 3-cell "lifter-2"	11.4 grams	#35 enameled copper	38KV I 0.57mA	19.76	None	————
3-foot, single-cell "Beamship Variation I"	16 grams	#35 enameled copper	30KV I 0.52mA	15.6	None	————
Beamship Variation I-fully-rigged	18.5 grams	#35 enameled copper	————	39.5	5 grams	39.9KV I 0.99mA
4-foot "Beamship Variation II"	21 grams	#40 stainless-steel	————	40	6 grams	40KV I 1mA
6-foot "Beamship Variation III"	42 grams	#40 stainless-steel	35KV I 1.35mA	47.25	None	————

References

1. Ether Technology, by Rho Sigma,
2. Lost Science, by Gerry Vassilatos,
3. The Philadelphia Experiment, by William Moore,
4. High Energy Electrostatic Research Vol. 1, Antigravity and UFOs, by Raymond A. Nelli, Homemade Lightning, by R.A. Ford,
5. Antigravity – the Dream Made Reality, by John Searl, The Law of the Squares Book 4, by John Searl,
6. The Antigravity Handbook, compiled by D.H. Childress,
7. The Coming Energy Revolution, by Jeanne Manning,
8. Agnew H. Bahnson Labs home movies (1957-60), JLN labs website, Bill Beatty's "weird-science" website, American Antigravity website (www.amercanantigravity.com).

Patent references

1. A.H. Bahnson, Jr. Electrical Thrust Producing Device, USP # 2,958.790, filed May 12,1958, granted Nov. 1, 1960.
2. Marcel Jean-Joseph Pages (France), # 1,253,902 Petit-Viton, filed Jan 5, 1960, granted January 9th, 1961
3. G.E. Hagen, Flying Apparatus, #3,120,363, filed Sept. 11th, 1958, granted Feb. 4th, 1964
4. T.T. Brown, Electrokinetic Apparatus, #2,949,550, filed July 3rd, 1957, granted Aug. 16th, 1960
5. T.T. Brown, Electrokinetic Generator, #3,022,430, filed July 3rd, 1957, granted Feb. 20th, 1962
6. A.P. De Seversky, Ionocraft, # 3,130,945, filed Aug. 31st, 1959, granted April 28th, 1964
7. V. Gradecek, Electric Aerospace Propulsion System, # 3,177,654 filed Sept. 26th 1961, granted April 13th, 1965