

## Whose relativity is it, anyway?

As far as I knew, there were only Einstein's special & general theories of relativity. Recent reading has indicated that Einstein's are, historically, not the first theories of relativity, & may not even be originally his. Einstein's relativity has been attributed to R. G. Boscovitch, & a previous, different theory of relativity, has been attributed to none other than Galilei!

Here is all the information I have. I welcome any further references to these periods of scientific history.

### Boscovitch's Relativity

from *Occult Science Dictatorship* by William R. Lyne, 2001,  
pp. 5-8

...Contrary to what the public is led to believe, Relativism was invented not by Albert Einstein, but by a Croatian Jesuit priest named R. G. Boscovitch (1711-87), the first exponent of Newtonian ideas in Italy, who attempted to account for all physical effects in terms of action at a distance between point particles. [Boscovitch, *Theoria Philosophiae Naturalis*, Venice, 1763.]

The concept of luminiferous ether was soon abandoned, in spite of Huygens' development of a brilliant wave hypothesis. [*Traite` de la lum.*, p. 17] A "corpuscular" theory of light - based on Newton's earlier hypothesis [Newton's *Memoir*, *Phil. Trans.* vii (1762); Royal Society, 9 Dec. 1676 (Birch iii p. 255)] - was adopted almost universally. So the ether theory had been abandoned before in this earlier mid-18th century instance, in favor of a corpuscular theory of light. Ether theory was to be taken up again, then abandoned at the beginning of the 20th century, for the same reasons... Relativism and the corpuscular theory of light.

back in the 18th century, Boscovitch and his assistant Michell had taught the doctrine of the mutual interpenetration of matter, i.e., that two substances may occupy the same space at the same time, without excluding each other. [Priestley's *History*, i p. 392]

In 1782, George Louis LeSage [Mem. de Berlin for 1782 (Berlin, 1784, p. 404)] published a proposal to account for gravitation by means of the ether theory of Renee Descarte, that a cloud of excessively minute particles - "ultra-mundane corpuscles" as he called them - which resembled the neutrinos of modern atomic physics, filled all space. According to Le Sage, the ether moved with great speed in all directions. When two particles or bodies of ponderable matter were near each other, they would partly screen each other from bombardment by this ether, so that less bombardment on their screened sides increased to the force on their unscreened sides, pushing them together, appearing to be an attractive force between them, which Le Sage identified as Newton's force of gravity.

In 1889, Sir William Thomson [Baltimore Lectures, pp. 413-14, 463 and appendices A and E] made the assumption that material atoms move through space without displacing the ether, a concept which reflected the Boscovitch theory. But by 1896 [Letter, Fitzgerald to Heaveside, 8 June 1846], he had redacted this theory in embarrassment, when he realized how ridiculous it was.

Albert Einstein's wife, a Croatian scientist, was probably responsible for introducing Einstein to the Relativism of Boscovitch. This is probably the origin of rumors that Einstein had "stolen" the theory of Relativity from his wife. When Tesla was asked about Relativism, he disdainfully exclaimed, "I have already heard about this from Boscovitch." Tesla's well-known objections to Relativism were probably formulated while Einstein was still a boy.

Boscovitch and Michell had arrived at their Relativist Theory by reflecting on Baxter's doctrine of "the immateriality of the soul", a religious doctrine appropriate to a church, but not really essential to a scientific laboratory. If the Jesuits had gained control of science more permanently, there would probably be prayer benches in physics labs today. They said 'an atom would have no definite size, but should be conceived as extending through all space'; and 'a molecule would consist not of atoms side by side', but of 'spheres of power mutually penetrated, and the centres even coinciding' [Cornu, *Comptes Rendus* xcii (1881), p. 1368]

In 1846, Michael Faraday [Faraday, *Thoughts on Ray Vibrations*, *Phil. Mag.* (3) xxviii (1846), p. 1045] appeared briefly to fall under the influence of Relativism, proposing to 'dismiss the aether', or to replace it by lines of force between centres', with 'the centres and lines of force together constituting the particles of material substance'. By 1851 however [Cornu, *Comptes Rendus* xcix (1884), p. 1045; *Exp. Res.*, SS 3075], the spell was broken, when Faraday began the modern era of theory which Relativism opposes today. Faraday suggested that if the existence of a luminiferous aether were to be admitted, it might be the vehicle of magnetic force, adding, 'if there be an ether, it should have other uses than simply the conveyance of radiations'. This sentence is regarded as the origin of the electromagnetic theory of light.

The religious nature of Relativism has changed very little since 1763. In the meanwhile, ether theory has prevailed, been rejected twice, and is now in resurgence. Both the 1763 attack by Boscovitch and the 1905 attack by Einstein resulted in the suppression of ether theory. The present religious dogmatism of Relativism has petrified the field of physics in universities and student laboratories, and has driven more creative and innovative students away, causing a "brain drain", and attracting the least creative students. [William Cantrell, *Commentary on Maxwell's Equation's and Special Relativity Theory Infinite Energy Magazine*, Vol. 7, Issue 38, July/Aug. 2001]

The flaky concepts of 'time-travel', 'mutual inter-penetration of matter', 'atoms extending to infinity', 'matter or time dilation or compression', and 'time dragging' or 'frame dragging', have taken a toll on the minds of the world's students and scientists for long enough, so that the time is now ripe for a change.

That's all I have on Boscovitch's relativity - it may seem like a lot to read, but so far, it's the only thing I have found available TO read on the subject. What I have on Galilei's relativity is even less:

from *Ether Technology* by Rho Sigma, 1977, reprinted 1998 by Adventures Unlimited Press  
pp. 65-68

The most important contribution to the ether controversy in modern times seems to come from an Italian, Professor Marco Todeschini of the Theatine Academy of Sciences, Physics Branch, a recent contender for the Nobel Prize.

In a foreward to Todeschini's book, the President of the Academy, Mr. Angelo De Luca, points out that in March 1956, at the 25th International Convention of the American Society of Physics, the scientist Oppenheimer revealed that the behavior of anti-particles and the occurrence of sub-atomic phenomena are in sharp conflict with Einstein's relativity, and in harmony with Galilei's. The return to classical physics, says the President, should therefore be needful: "...the conclusion that it is Galilei's relativity and not Einstein's which is found in the universe ... allows modern theoretical physics to eliminate all its uncertainties and antitheses, proceeding on a ground of solid reality and opening wide horizons to scientific progress and its application."

Considering Michelson's experiment and Bradley's astronomical aberration, discovered in 1728, Professor Todeschini reaches these conclusions: "A motionless ether exists in the whole Universe. It exists, but in proximity of the Earth it moves jointly with it in its

revolutionary (rotating) movement round the Sun." If this is actually the case, the negative outcome of Michelson's experiments finds an explanation.

Instead of a weightless ether, as until now conceived by physics, Todeschini postulated a fluid space possessing a constant density.

From this theory, he was able to demonstrate that "the Sun is located in the center of a huge spheric field of fluid rotating space, which moves subdivided like an onion in many concentric layers having constant thickness and rotation speeds diminishing with the increase of the square roots of their radiuses. From my theory it also follows that the Earth is located in the center of a similar smaller rotating field, placed at the periphery of the bigger solar one." Todeschini has conducted numerous tests to back up his claim, and the science oriented reader will have to read his books in order to comprehend his conclusions.

Returning to Michelson's Experiment, Todeschini notes that it was based upon the assumption that the ether is motionless throughout the universe; but, he continues, "I have demonstrated... that our planet in its revolution movement drags with itself its surrounding medium of ether just as it carries along its atmospheric quilt, and this makes us certain that the Earth is in the center of an ether's planetary sphere and that both turn around the sun with the same speed revolution of 30Km/sec." [Todeschini, Marco, *Decisive Experiments in MODern Physics Bergamo, Italy: Theatine Academy of Sciences, 1966 (Translated from the Italian)*]

If we return for a moment to Sir Oliver Lodge, we will find the following statement: "Mr. Michelson reckons that by his latest arrangement he could see 1 in 4,000 millions if it (the ether drift) existed; but he saw nothing. Everything behaved precisely as if the ether was (sic) stagnant; as if the earth carried with it all the ether in its immediate neighborhood." [Lodge, Sir Oliver, *The Ether of Space, New York: Harper & bros. 1909*] Lodge's conceptual theory is confirmed not only by the claims of Todeschini, but also by a Brazilian scientist with the pseudonym of Dino Kraspedon, whose book was translated into English in 1959 (Neville Spearman, Ltd. London, England). This information source states that, pertaining to Michelson's experiment of the ether drift:

"He found none, nor could it be found. The retardation which he thought to find in the speed of light, owing to the resistance of the ether, could not exist if the ether moves with the same angular velocity as the Earth. When two bodies develop identical velocity in the same direction, they remain in the same relative <myspace>position</myspace>s. It does not matter what the speed is to an observer outside the system; it is a question of relative velocity between two points in the same system... However, Michelson is not to be blamed. The blame lies with those who thought that the ether was universal and stationary in relation to Earth. On this false premise, anybody would have come to the same erroneous conclusion. If a minor premise in a syllogism is wrong, the conclusion is wrong, just as if a major premise is involved. False theories produce wrong results. As far as that experimet was concerned, it was the false premise upon which the people of Earth have elaborated a whole theory."

It becomes apparent that Sir Oliver Lodge (an Englishman), Marco Todeschini (an Italian) and the information source of the Brazilian Dino Kraspedon are in full agreement on the important question of the existence of the ether, which is carried around by the Earth, in just the same way as the atmosphere is.

According to the Brazilian information source the etheric covering of our planet extends 400,822 km. beyond the solid surface of planet Earth, and our moon lies within the fringe area of this gigantic ether shell. The ether is described as an 'electric fluid' forming the primary substance and the substratum for electrons and protons, for all physical things and phenomena.

The results of the studies of Sir Oliver Lodge, Professor Todeschini and Dr. [Kurt] Seeseman, coupled with the above-mentioned claims of Kraspedon, point to a gigantic scientific fallacy, resulting in the false conclusions in contemporary physics: "All those (new) experimental results," states Todeschini, "deny the postulate of light's constant speed, put as the basis of physical theories since 1905 until nowadays, and make us certain that such theory does not correspond to physical reality."

"The result of all the optical experiments (by Todeschini) prove to us that light's speed is relative to a chosen reference system, as is the speed of anything else in movement."

Todeschini continues to shoot holes in contemporary theories by stating that "... bodies' shrinkage and times' dilation predicted in Lorentz's transformation equations and forming the basis of Einstein's pseudorelativity do not happen at all in natural reality; actually, they were postulated (as we have shown) following an erroneous physical interpretation both of astronomic aberration and of Michelson's experiment." [Todeschini, op. cit.]

The theories of Einstein, Heisenberg and Schrodinger appear very questionable if the existence of the ether can be verified, and it will not be an easy task to show the obsolescence of all these accepted physical theories. A coming re-evaluation will prove the truth of Max Planck's statement, "A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents die and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."

There is only brief mention of Galilei's relativity, in effect, a few short words in the second paragraph only. The reason why I quoted the whole section is because I'm guessing that the model presented by Todeschini is closest to Galilei's model.

If anyone is familiar either with Galilei's or Boscovitch's relativity, I am eager to review more sources. Until having read the above, I was familiar with none but Einstein's. There is no shortage of material on Einstein's relativity, so I will appreciate it shared content is limited to the former two.