

142.4480

New York, Nov. 4th 1903.

LM-0059

To Mr. E. Davidson
On the 'Phonetic Interrupter'

Dear Sir,

In the matter of the vertical wire, I wish to say that before I filed the application on the Phonetic Interrupter, the use of that wire like of the other ground wire, was contemplated by me; and this assertion is confirmed by the following expressions from the original specification on the Phonetic Interrupter: = H and H' are the reerophones of the secondary circuit and also of the electrical oscillations. = And later answering the letter from the Patent Office, of March 4, 1903, relatively to the question made in this same letter: = The numbers H, H' are not understood. They should be more clearly described and their function explained. = I said: = H and H' are the two poles of the inducted circuit of B, and also the two connectors in which the wire connects the two wires, one of the antenna and the other of the ground plate = (See the answer given to the Patent Office on Aug. 3, 1903 relatively to the communication mentioned above).

In the matter that was not detailed, I have after explained: 1st, because it was necessary to satisfactory answer to the questions asked in the same communication of the Patent Office; 2^d, because to secure these various applications of the Phonetic Interrupter and of the luminous and electric waves produced by it, declined on account of an official suggestion, it was necessary not only declined the various applications that my apparatus may have to answer to the questions asked; but also to present an explanation and a *modus operandi* equivalent to a graphic illustration to secure these various applications of my apparatus. Here are the ~~one~~ questions asked and to which principally I refer: = The invention as a whole is not understood. It is not known whether or not this is a system for the transmission of speech by means of electro-magnetic waves, or possibly by light waves or whether it is a system for transmitting signals by the flickerings of the lamps &c or whether the apparatus is intended to be used for some other purpose = A comparative study made among the so called new matter in connection with the above quo²

tation from the Patent Office may be sufficient to justify the so called new matter as also, butly necessary as furnishing the explanation desired by the Patent Office, and also so to retain my rights with relation to the various applications to which this apparatus may be used in connection with the devices in my co-pending applications explained.

In the matter of the first claim, I wish to say sincerely that I cannot understand why it was refused?.. Please ask the reason, therefore, of the non-viability of it, ~~and~~ or construe it so that I may be accepted or cancel if it is impossible.

Yours truly,
J. B. Landell