baseboard during radiation, and Shimizu to show the use of a carrier that is radiation-transparent for supporting an article that is to be treated on both sides by radiation.

While applicant presently has no strong disagreement with the examiner's analysis of the disclosures of Sherts and McMaster, applicant does disagree with his analysis of the teaching of Shimizu. We also disagree with how the examiner combines Sherts with McMaster. We further dispute Shimizu's relevance to the art and whether it would be obviously combinable with either of Sherts or McMaster.

We also question how such a simple two-step invention can be considered to be obvious when, to arrive at it, it is necessary to combine three documents together (four for claim 2). While there is a general rule that it matters not how many references are strung together so long as they collectively make obvious the subject matter sought to be patented, there is another general rule that the greater the number of references strung together, the ~~less~~ more likely it is that the invention was truly obvious. In the words of Circuit Judge Medina in Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc. v. Kollsman Instrument Corporation (2d Cir., 1967) 152 USPQ 446,51:

> It is apparent that the more numerous the references ..., the less likely it becomes that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have arrived at the result reached by the patent in suit. ... [Citations omitted].

In Bela Seating Company, Inc. v. Poloron Products, Inc., 160 USPQ 646,61, the Court concluded that the stringing together of a plurality of patents in an "attempt to invalidate plaintiff's claims tends in and of itself to negate the position of defendant that the patent in suit is invalid".

~~It is agreed that the conventional method of forming~~ glass laminates is with the assembly horizontal. The discussion above gives good reason why this should be so. Sherts, relied