

Gravity Control

Verbatim extracts from the Smith archive

Gravity cannot be explained by orthodox science, although it might seem to be possible at first sight. Such attempts will go only so far and bog down because a concept is needed which is not in our science. We think we have this concept, and our efforts with gravity seem to bear this out. There are three basic fields in nature, which manifest mathematically as gradient, divergence and curl, or; tempic, electric and magnetic. Time we think is the reciprocal of the derivative of the tempic field, and it is *not* basic in its own right. We might incompletely describe the tempic field as that which produces change. Or we might regard it somewhat as the Heaviside operator "p" when applied to functions involving time. But we find it simpler to just write "J" and treat it exactly as we would any other field function, by writing back from observation to determine what the function is.

Our major design effort now is looking towards making a magnetic field move without having to move the magnets. It should be possible, since we found that the converse was true. Also, there are some rules concerning fields, which are not in the literature, which might be exploited to attain this end. We refer in particular to the rule that fields can and will remain as separate entities if such arrangement has a lower energy level than that of the corresponding field structure. Also, we found that magnetic fields move only at right angles to their vectorial directions, and in strict correspondence with Maxwell's equations. They refuse stubbornly to move in their vectorial direction, and any apparent motion in this direction is actually a folding in or folding out of the field, always at right angles.

We have drawn up quite a few designs to make the field move, but have discarded most of them either because the present technology was inadequate to do the job, or there was too much uncertainty as to what actually would be going on. We have one design which looks promising, namely notching a circular DC field with a $(1 - \cos \theta)$ function which is rotating and confining the whole in a shield so that the lower energy level is attained if the field structure rotates. We haven't tried it yet, and it will probably be fall before we can test this principle. However, it looks promising.

We visualize the magnetic field to have somewhat the configuration of the red lines (Ed. - on his sketch), with somewhat more field outside of the ring than inside it. There are discontinuities in the magnet structure due to the fact that the individual wafers are square, but this seems to be an asset rather than a liability as it ensures that the field turns with the magnets, since a higher energy level would be required to bridge the gap between the wafers if it did not turn.

Rotation of the magnet-carrying disc causes the field to acquire a velocity throughout its structure, said velocity being directly proportional to the radius. The $V \times B$ will in all cases be at right angles to the velocity and the field vector, and will be proportional to the magnetic field strength and the velocity. We hold that this condition will apply equally within the magnets as outside of them, since the magnetic field exists there also.

Following the above reasoning, it is apparent that a virtual gravitron will form on the outer edge of the magnetic ring and another of opposite polarity on the inner side of the ring. The outer gravitron will be somewhat stronger than the inner one, and the field configurations will be determined by the antecedents of the field (magnitude and direction of the magnetic and charge fields, reducing the gravitron field).

However, since the entire structure is immersed in the earth's gravitational field, the antecedents of which may or may not be compatible with the locally generated field, two complexes are possible, within a field structure or a field aggregate. Experiment must give the answer.

A note to bring you up to date on our gravity work here. The results are satisfactory, except that we blew up the equipment. We calculated that we had a factor of safety of at least three, but were mistaken, and spent several hours picking bits of ceramic magnets out of the local landscape. Fortunately, no one was injured.

We have rebuilt our machine and are now about to look for some of the answers to some questions. This unit has about 14 ceramic magnets mounted in a groove cut in a 3/4 inch thick 6 inch diameter disc. We haven't

yet run it up to full speed as we are very cautious after the other exploding. We don't expect much from this machine except maybe answers to a couple of pointed questions.

We have considered the use of a conventional gravimeter, but we do not think that it would be as good as the precision balance. The sensing element in the gravimeter is several inches from the bottom of the instrument, and since a table of sorts is necessary, it would not be possible to get the sensing element within a foot of the magnets.

Our work here has been progressing slowly because of silly little mechanical troubles. We have built 5 commutators to switch the currents to produce a rotating field and there has been a serious difficulty with each. We are now working on a rolling mercury design which looks promising.

We did try to use the rotating field from the ceramic magnets to drag around a field produced by a coil and current, but there seems to be a problem with the compatibility of the antecedents of the fields, because the limits within which it will spin are apparently narrow and we have not yet been able to determine their magnitude or the rules governing this action.

Because of the commutator difficulties we have not yet been able to try the big rotating field, but we have it all built and if and when we get this last bug licked we should be able to look for a few answers...

Last Sunday (Ed. - October 26, 1959) we wound the machine up and took some measurements. We got about a 1% change in gravity with it, which was barely enough to feel with fingers. It is very satisfying to be able to poke fingers into the impossible and feel it! I think this little machine should be able to develop a 10% change eventually, before we have to build a bigger and better one. We also took some pictures, stills and an 8 mm movie of our machine operating, so we have the evidence now. Even if our gadget doesn't fly yet, at least it creeps!

The effect was measured on a precision chemical balance, when a brass weight increased from 24.4623 grams to 24.4628 grams when active material (cubic inch of aluminum) was 10 inches directly under the weight. Needless to say we have much yet to do and as soon as we have some relationships established we will prepare a suitable paper, a copy of which I will send you if you are interested.

The experiment consisted of a ring of ceramic magnets set in a mount so the whole could be rotated at a fairly high speed, about 12,000 rpm. The ring of magnets was about an inch wide, an inch thick, and about 6 inches in diameter. The magnet strength was about 2000 gauss. There was no doubt about the artificial gravity which was generated by this unit as it could easily be weighed on a precision balance and under certain conditions could be "felt". However, due to the configurations involved, numerical values were hard to obtain as displacement of the sensing bob altered the point of observation, but weight differentials of about 1% were observed several times. (Ed. - See [photos](#) of an apparatus similar to what is described here.)

In your last letter you expressed concern about the field rotating with the magnet, or remaining stationary, with the magnet going around inside the field. We had this trouble too, and it proved most annoying. Apparently, there is a rule for field behaviour, that fields will integrate to form a structure only if their antecedents are compatible and the structure has a lower energy level than the corresponding field aggregate. Being aware of this rule, we are now able to avoid some of the pitfalls which we encountered at first.

Our laboratory experiments have allowed us to make about a 1% change in the weight of objects --- we can make them about 1% heavier or 1% lighter. Now that is a long way from holding a spacecraft up, because we have to go over 100% to do that. But the fact that we can do it --- the fact that the principles which these people from outside gave us and guided us to finding out for ourselves are valid --- certainly indicate that, first, these people are what they say they are, and, secondly, that their technology is that they say it is, that it is superior to ours and that ours is inadequate in many respects.

[Table of Contents](#)