GRAVITY: a combination of phenomena

by Dino Kraspedon

This is the second of five extracts translated from the book Contato com os Discos voadores, *by Dino Kraspedon, which first appeared in Sao Paulo, Brazil, in* 1957. *The book gives a summary, largely in the form of questions and answers, of conversations the author had during several meetings in* 1952 *and subsequently with the captain of a flying saucer. We have entitled these extracts:*

1. **Why and how planets move.**
2. **Gravity: a combination of phenomena.**
3. **About light.**
4. **How some of the saucers fly.**
5. **People of other planets . . . and ourselves.**

"MY ADVENTURE began in November, 1952, when I returned with a friend to Sao Paulo from a trip to Parana, when we saw five saucers up in the "sierra" (mountains). I then thought they were Russian spies, since our Nacional Oil Company was beginning to prospect oil near by. I returned to the spot next day and stayed there three days near the road, until one of these machines landed at night near the road. The crew numbered approximately twenty, and one spoke to me in perfect Portuguese, inviting me inside. They wore suits made of what looked like nylon material. I left the ship before they flew away. One of the crew came to my house subsequently and had a long talk with me that has all been published in my recent book."—Dino Kraspedon, in an interview with the Rio de Janeiro paper, *O Globo.*

Q. We supposed, hitherto, that the saucer simply cancelled out the effect of gravity.

A. You supposed something that doesn't exist. Gravity is no more than a wrong interpretation of a combination of phenomena.

Q. What? Doesn't gravity exist?

A. It does not exist. What science calls gravity is a question of difference in the density of bodies. To explain: the smoke of your cigar is heavier than the surrounding air. Yet, it rises as the result of warmth. That is to say the difference in density is compensated for by the temperature of the smoke. Therefore, two factors are at work which can influence this phenomenon; density and temperature.

We can see that a balloon full of hydrogen gas rises, according to the volume of the gas. The same thing happens with helium. That is to say, bodies of lesser density always tend to rise, in the same way that water and oil separate, due to density. Gravity does not prevent bodies of lesser density from rising. Whereas in air, which is of weak density, heavy objects fall rapidly; in water—more dense than air—they fall more slowly. The third factor influencing gravity is the mass of atmosphere and ether surrounding a planet; this can, however, be included in the factor of density. It is wrong to attribute greater or lesser gravity to a planet without knowing the extent of its gaseous mass and the density of its atmosphere. On Saturn, for example, owing to the absence of atmosphere, gravity is considered zero. On Jupiter, which has a very rarified atmosphere, it is quite different. A falling body has a high initial acceleration and then it collides with the low density of the planet. On Mercury, however, where the etheric covering extends more than 600,000 km., atmospheric pressure is high and gravity tremendous.

The fourth factor influencing gravity is the vertical component of magnetism. However, the attraction it exerts on a body is, with small variations, the same as that on any other body. Thus it is that the speed of fall in a vacuum is constant. However, this attraction is not due to mass; it is caused by the magnetism with which the whole body is endowed.

Lastly, we have the energy that exerts pressure upon the universe and penetrates our

systems of galaxies, of which I spoke to you earlier. As a body cannot be subject to pressure in all directions, the earth always shielding it from this pressure on one side, the body feels a difference in the forces acting upon it and falls to the surface of the earth.

This tremendous universal pressure, which is the result of the vibration of God on the infinite point of the universe, is what maintains the atmosphere of the planets.

If the atmospheric pressure has the fabulous power we use to propel our saucers, and if the tendency of gases is towards continual expansion, the whole of the gaseous envelope surrounding a planet would expand into the vacuum were it not maintained by constant pressure.

When Newton saw the apple fall, he could not guess that in that moment he witnessed the effect of the divine presence in the universe. Thus it is that we move and have our being in God.

Gravity is, then, a combination of phenomena and never an individualised force.

Affect of Heat

Q. Why does heat affect gravity?

A. Because it reduces the magnetic force of bodies. You can prove that a magnet loses its properties on being heated. As matter is made up of stationary waves, heat has a powerful influence on them. By increasing the frequency of these waves they begin to give off light. Moreover, it is well known that heat reduces the density of a body. Accordingly, it tends to rise. This can best be seen in the case of boiling water. The warmer water tries to place itself above the cooler, producing currents. We note that heat is a factor which affects gravity, not because it is itself an agent causing the phenomena of gravity, but because it influences magnetism and density.

Q. Does this mean that our science is wrong?

A. Very wrong.

Q. Then all our physics, including relativity, fall to the ground?

A. Only the fallacious principles fall to the ground. Others will certainly remain valid. Does it seem strange to you that this should happen? Ptolemy was a genius, but his entire system collapsed like a pack of cards. The same thing happened with Aristotle. In turn, Isaac Newton came up against the physics of relativity, and its days are numbered.

Q. But relativity provided an explanation for the irregularity in the orbit of Mercury.

A. It could give an explanation; it remains to be seen whether it is rational. But, even supposing it were, we need to see whether it corresponds with the method nature uses. We can advance a thousand rational hypotheses, whereas nature makes use of only one, rejecting the other 999, however rational they may be; or, again, it may not even make use of any of them. Relativity contains certain erroneous elements which in themselves can be called rational but which nature, according to the view of Sir James Jeans, appears to disregard. For example, it is an accepted mechanical theory that if two rays move in the same direction at the same speed, their velocity in relation to one another is nil; but if they move in opposite directions, the velocity of the one in relation to the other is 2V. However, in order to cope with certain difficulties in his system, Einstein affirmed that whether the rays move in one direction or another, the velocity between them is always V. It is not necessary to have much imagination to see that this principle is false. In order to justify this fallacy, Einstein invented another, greater one; he attributed a space and a time appropriate to each moving body, according to its speed.

Einstein's Space Frontiers

As one error leads mankind to another greater one, he had now to produce a third idea in order to justify the second; he set confines to the universe, marking out a particular space for us. But nature disregards imaginary enclosures, and our desire that the universe should conform to our particular points of view as well as our carefully-thought-out ideas. Throughout she behaves as though she were ignorant of Hamilton's calculus and the importance which earth people attach to formulæ. In short, you can see that the frontiers proposed by Einstein were too narrow to contain what is by nature infinite. Space is indivisible, and time is non-existent. The latter is a mere convention, based on the movement of the stars. It is a mere effect.

If the movement of a body or the acceleration of a mass is due to force, time is then an effect of the force and the latter is the cause. But if the force varies and is consumed, the time will be variable. Now, as space is a constant, it is difficult to imagine how you could create a time/space constant, let alone regard it as a dimension in itself. This is a case of nature disregarding these things. If one multiplies two dimensions, one gets the area; if one multiplies the area by the height, one gets the

volume; now, if we multiply this volume by a fourth dimension, we only get an absurdity. In space, a body does not travel in four, three, two or one dimensions, because space—being infinite—has no dimension. We can, at most, say that a body obeys a direction of stress when it moves from point A to point B.

Up to a point Einstein was right in saying that a moving body in space has its own time, because when leaving the earth there is a change in what is conventionally called terrestrial time. But he was wrong; time is based upon the period a moving body takes to return to its point of departure. Thus time is the result of a circular movement. He made a further mistake when he thought each moving body had its own space.

The precession of Mercury's perihelions, which gave rise to the theory, is a question of the planet's proximity to the sun. Coming closer, it receives more light, rotates more rapidly and moves through space with greater speed.

Curvature of Light

Q. Well, then, what about the curvature of light, observed by Eddington, Crommelin and Davidson during the eclipse of the sun on May 20th, 1919, which was postulated by Einstein?

A. The curvature of light is not due to the action of the mass of the sun, but is caused by the magnetic centre of the system situated near the sun. Even within a solenoid you can see that a stream of electrons is deflected by a magnetic field. There is nothing new in this. If light were to be deflected when passing close to a mass, this phenomenon could be clearly observed in the vicinity of planets, let us say Mars, when it is close to earth. The moon, for example, would be the best place for observation during eclipses. Nevertheless, this curvature was only seen precisely where the magnetic centre of our system is to be found. If there were no repulsion between energy and magnetism your motors would not turn. Therefore, light is deflected by the magnetic centre and curves round the sun. If you had proper apparatus, you would see that light also curves on the side opposite the centre, as though it were trying to get away from the sun.

I wish to imply that the curvature of space is anti-scientific. Space, if it is not transformed, is not relative to anything and has no form at all. It is neither a curve nor a straight line, and it has no dimensions; it is simply space, infinite in all directions. Wheresoever an observer may place himself, he will always have before him the infinite universe.

Q. Then no limit can be conceived to matter?

A. If in space there should be a point that could serve as a limit to creation, there God would be contained. But God is infinite, and the universe is a point to Him. Only a materialistic science could limit creation. If you conceive a limit, what would you then have beyond it?

Q. I should say, nothing.

A. Truly, you would have nothing. But space is nothing transformed by God. Matter also is nothing. If it comprises anything, it is the divine energy that brought life to space. To you matter is something; but make a stream of cathode rays pass through it and it will disappear from your view. You will only see space. All that appears is an illusion of our senses. Only one thing is real; that is Spirit, and that is exactly what earthly science does not admit.

Man's Obstinacy

Q. It is hard for us to learn that our most cherished concepts are completely at variance with reality.

A. Indeed, one of the bad aspects of man is his obstinacy. If I had erred for an eternity, I would welcome the day when someone would enlighten me. Believe me, I am telling you the truth. What pain can anyone feel by putting error aside and seeing the truth?

Q. But it is difficult for us to abandon the science of relativity.

A. It will be difficult for science, also, to abandon the experiments of Hertz and Fresnel, who settled upon the wave theory of light. However, when science has to explain electronic theory, the wave theory is put aside; when atomic theory is in question, it turns things upside down and says that the electron is a particle, and has recourse to Planck's theory.

Before abandoning relativity, first decide whether the wave theory or the emission theory is true. Verify the true speed of light. Determine the action and reaction of the planetary system. Never use two interpretations in one science, in order to explain the same thing.

Q. I have noted the factors which you say affect gravity, but there is a case which should be considered. If it is true that the density of bodies affects gravity, on the top of a mountain the air is more rarified so that iron, for example, being in a more attenuated medium,

should weigh more. However, the contrary is the case; the higher one goes, the less it weighs.

A. But I told you also that gravity is affected by the mass of ether surrounding the planet. If the weight of the atmosphere, at sea level, is equivalent to a column of mercury of 76 cm. for each 10 metres of altitude the column falls about 1 mm. Thus, we must consider the pressure which bodies undergo as a function of their density. The lower the atmospheric pressure, the less is the weight. If gravity were a force with its own attributes and it was that which supported bodies in space, it would be rather difficult for earthly science to explain why meteors are maintained in their orbits. Every year earth collides with millions of meteorites, always in the same month. This means that they are located in one place. Now, if there were a law of gravitation, they would either all come towards earth, or already have been attracted by the sun. However, those which succeed in penetrating the mass of ether fall to earth and the others remain in the same place. They are, then, in balance between the magnetic attraction of the centre of the system and the repulsive force of the sun. For terrestrial gravity to exist, there would have to be solar attraction, but neither of these exist.

If my reasoning were incorrect, bodies in a vacuum would never have the same speed of fall.

For the sake of argument, let us suppose that gravity exists. But if all bodies in a vacuum fall with equal velocity, it ceases to be true that matter attracts matter in direct proportion to their respective mass, at least not if this matter is in a vacuum. If this premise is demolished, it is easy to see that if a vacuum exists between the celestial bodies, solar gravitation—if it exists—should attract all bodies equally, independently of their mass. But all terrestrial astronomy is based on the mass of bodies and their distance from one another. Therefore, your conception of the cosmos is wrong. Besides, when Newton supposed a gravitational force to exist, he had to imagine the existence of an ether. He could not conceive of this force without there being a vehicle for it. And it is strange that, later, relativity denies the ether and yet approves of gravity. It admits what the discoverer of gravity himself could not admit.

This being the case, we do not cancel out gravity at all. All we do is to utilise the forces of nature. If our craft flew on the basis of cancelling out gravity, as you suppose, we would only move in one direction. We would always fly against the earth's rotation, and it would be impossible to fly with it, or anywhere near the poles. Besides, we would be limited to the insignificant speed of 1,660 km. per hour.

Now, it is laughable to imagine a craft coming from another planet with such low velocity and with only one directional movement. Such a saucer would be much inferior to terrestrial aircraft and it would be a case of our coming to learn from you something about manœuvrability and how to fly faster.

(From page 21)

motor. When he tried to start his car again it was dead. Looking upward, he saw what he believed to be a half-inflated balloon, but as he came closer to it he saw it was a large silvery ship created out of something that resembled polished steel or aluminium. When he looked inside he saw four men and two ladies. Later he was taken for a short ride. Then followed a different kind of "ride," for Rheinhold Schmidt was arrested and held without a warrant. Then came a sanity hearing and he was taken to a mental hospital where he appeared before a panel of doctors and nurses. He was put through a series of tests lasting almost two weeks. One gruelling experience followed another until one finally asks the question: "What has become of our civil rights?" The full story is now told in a booklet entitled "The Kearney Incident."

The last speaker to mount the high stand was our gracious host, the indefatigable George Van Tassel. Van opened by telling his audience of a little incident of the Convention. It seems three or four people approached him asking why the American flag was not on display during these war-consecrated days. Van told them he believed in the patriotic gesture but he had a further answer: "My flag is that tree yonder," he said. "My flag is the sky above. I do not have to wave my flag as a symbol—for God alone made *my* flag."

He went on to say that our planet is at its most crucial stage of this civilization. That the strength of any body, whether state or nation, depends upon the knowledge of its people. He stated that the geophysical boundaries of both men and nations can bring us nothing but dissention, trouble, pestilence and war. That only a complete universality can bring us peace and plenty.