1 June 2011. When I received this letter 35 years ago I was stunned. Today I still find it stunning. It came from the Editor of the top prestige journal in the IEE (Now IET), which is second only to the New York IEEE as the premier institution for electromagnetic theory and my other subject, Wafer Scale Integration.

I quote; ".... .... I have come to the conclusion that you may have something to tell the electrical engineering profession ....". He goes on; "I would even advise you to withhold information deliberately at first, and suggest to readers that they are making discoveries for themselves .... "

This was outside the remit of an editor, but gave the hint that a central Establishment figure admitted that the system did not work.

Six years later Sinclair had taken up my "Catt Spiral" WSI invention, on which the IEE always before and after refused to accept any material by me, even though it attracted four government funded university research projects and the company Sinclair set up a company to develop the idea which spent 12 million pounds and came to market, winning a prize from US journal for innovation. An IEE employee did publish comment on the project, but I was always prevented from publishing.

As to electromagnetic theory, all attempts by me to publish in the IEE have always been rejected for 40 years, most recently last year. – Ivor Catt. Dunkley always called his letters "Confidential" and I titled all my replies "not confidential".

THE INSTITUTION
OF ELECTRICAL
ENGINEERS
PO BOX 8 SOUTHGATE HOUSE STEVENAGE HERTS. SG1 1HQ
TELEPHONE: STEVENAGE (Std 0438) 3311 CABLES: VOLTAMPERE STEVENAGE TELEGRAMS: VOLTAMPERE STEVENAGE
Secretary: G F Gainsborough CBE PhD CEng FIEE

1

93

sent 12.10. 2.0 back.

Ref: Pot A

12 November 1976

Confidential

I Catt Esq
Crouch Hall
Redbourn
Hertfordshire
AL3 7EU

Dear Mr Catt

Material submitted to Proceedings IEE and later correspondence

The answer from the IEE Electronics Divisional Board is, predictably, negative.

Since our telephone conversation, I have come to the conclusion that you may have something to tell the electrical-engineering profession, but the way you will achieve this is by releasing information very slowly, rather than, as many radical thinkers have tried unsuccessfully, in a flood.

In fact I would even advise you to withold information deliberately at first, and suggest to readers that they are making discoveries for themselves. For instance, a letter in the correspondence pages of a scientific journal might say something like this:

'I am sure that many electronics engineers working on digital-systems and logic design must have come across the same problems that I have in applying e.m. theory to a newer branch of the science. For instance, in the communications world, the behaviour of a capacitor can be predicted and understood from the theory learned at school and university, since 'getting down to fundamentals' takes one no deeper than an appreciation of that convenient concept - the displacement current.

However, for the very much shorter risetimes that digital designers have to cope with, the theory I was taught just will not do. I have found that modelling a capacitor as a delay line takes me most of the way, and I would welcome the views of other workers on this. What about the lumped delay line itself, by the way? How do we treat that in digital design?

I am sure that now is the right time for us to go back to true fundamentals and to form new and more versatile models for components and their behaviour. The exciting thing about this is that, for many young engineers, it may be the first time they have seen beyond such mathematical smokescreens as Fourier transforms, Nyquist diagrams and the like. I have always found it rather strange and sad that, to take one example, Faraday's Law of Induction receives virtually no treatment in post - 1910 textbooks on e.m. theory.

I should be pleased to hear the views of others who have been forced back onto the foundations of their e.m. knowledge in recent years, and I am sure there is an important area of discussion here.'

Please appreciate that I am offering the above advice on a * personel level, and I do not even presume to suggest that Electronics & Power would be the best journal to which to send such a letter. Also, I would soon be out of my depth technically, and so I may not have expressed the problems in the best possible way. But I feel the approach (soft sell?) would be worth trying.

I shall be writing an official reply to Mr. Davidson on the outcome of the Electronics Divisional Board's consideration of the recently submitted item.

Yours sincerely

Bernard Dunkley

B Dunkley
Group Editor
PROCEEDINGS IEE

* i.e. without having consulted any Board or more senior staff at the IEE. RD