

The attempt to revive interest in Boscovich's theory,

by Roger J Anderton

R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

There was an attempt to revive interest in the mid-20th Century.

At one of the symposiums on Boscovich that did not get much publicity in the Western science media, (although there was a little mention at such places as Nature in 1958)[1] the main man was Lancelot Law Whyte who had worked with Einstein on the unified field theory. [2]

Lancelot Law Whyte was the editor of the book for the Symposium celebrating the 200th anniversary of the publication of Boscovich's theory. He in 1961 informs us about Boscovich [3]:

“Between 1780 and 1830 several lengthy summaries of the Theoria [of Boscovich] were published in English reference works and surveys of physics. From 1785 John Robison, Professor of Physics in Edinburgh, devoted 100 pages of his lectures on physics (published 1822) to Boscovich's atomism and said, ‘If we shall ever acquire the knowledge of a true theory, it will resemble Mr Boscovich's in many of its features’. The Encyclopaedia Britannica in 1801 devoted fourteen pages to Boscovich's theory. As we shall see the influence

exerted by the Theoria was profound throughout the nineteenth century.”

“After 1910, with the increasing attention to specialized atomic experiments, direct knowledge of Boscovich’s contribution to the theory of atomism began to fade, and most English language histories of physics or atomism written between 1920 and 1950 failed to indicate his importance. From 1929 the Britannica has not mentioned Boscovich under the relevant articles: Atom, Molecule. The 1946 edition of the Britannica (though much larger than its predecessor 150 years earlier and produced in the age of atomic science) gave half a column to Boscovich, this deflation of the value of clear ideas reflecting the prestige of a naïve statistical empiricism. Finally no full-length biography of Boscovich is available in any language.”

Professor Robison the main promoter of Boscovich’s theory in his time, warned of a conspiracy by the Illuminati. [4] His attempt at warning of such a conspiracy might be the reason for the suppression/neglect of his science work along with his promotion of Boscovich.

This neglect of Boscovich leads Pauwels and Bergier to think that so- advanced a theory as Boscovich’s theory in the 18th Century must imply Boscovich was a time traveller. [5]

Then there are anomalies that many in the mainstream physics community would like to overlook such as Tesla

claiming relativity theory pre-dated Einstein; with Boscovich dealing with certain parts of that theory later credited to Einstein. [6]

LL Whyte was attempting to revive interest in Boscovich in the 1960s he had this to say on the neglect of Boscovich's theory:

“Why did so remarkable an achievement [i.e. Boscovich's theory] receive little attention during the first half of the twentieth century?”

“It seems that several factors were responsible. The original wave of interest, from 1760 onwards, was partly stimulated by personal acquaintance with the author, by eighteenth-century breadth of outlook and appreciation of daring speculation, and by response to the simplicity of the idea. But no national vanity helped to preserve Boscovich's memory in the West until the Royal Yugoslav Government and some Yugoslav subjects financed the 1922 translation. During the later decades of the nineteenth century his atomic ideas were still well known, but relatively few examined the Latin text. With rare exceptions the scholars who are known to have studied Boscovich between 1910 and 1950 were either Yugoslavs or Jesuits.”

“The 1922 translation appeared at the time when physical theory had absorbed many of Boscovich's basic ideas and atomic physics was becoming a specialized science firmly based on experiment. Few physicists imagined that anything further could be learnt from a speculative theory dating from the eighteenth century. As already

mentioned most histories of atomism written between 1920 and 1950 failed to make adequate reference to his special contribution and influence, perhaps because they were mainly written by chemists more concerned with experiments than with fundamental physical ideas.”

Note -- “physical theory had absorbed many of Boscovich’s basic ideas.....” i.e. he is saying Boscovich’s theory was the foundation of modern physical theory, but not all parts of Boscovich’s theory were adopted. --- That was in the early 20th Century. Later other parts of Boscovich’s theory have been re-introduced but credited to others, such as Everett’s many-world theory – really reviving another aspect of Boscovich’s theory. [7]

LL Whyte continues: “Yet the story is not yet at an end. For Boscovich’s theory contains elements that have only recently been understood and from which something can still be learnt. It was not till 1922, when Mr J. M. Child in translating the *Theoria* was compelled to study it with exceptional care, that any Western scientist recognized its kinematic character, as others have done since. This is a feature which deserves closer attention, as the advantages of kinematic theories are beginning to be recognized.”

LL Whyte says: “Before 1920 many of Boscovich’s admirers misinterpreted him through their inability to conceive one or more of the following: material permanence without spatial extension; spatial relations without absolute space; or (and most difficult) kinematic actions without Newtonian forces.”

I think LL Whyte did not fully understand Boscovich's theory; there are aspects of Boscovich's theory that only have become understood over the years after Whyte, and have been highlighted at the Symposiums on Boscovich. So, it's a theory in development; or at least a theory that is still under investigation by the mostly unreported elite.

In this period of the 1960s Roger Hahn reports: "It is no exaggeration to speak at present of a Boscovichian revival among historians of science. In the last decade, Roger Boscovich (1711-1787) has been the subject of three international congresses. At least six books and a host of important articles." [8]

Although Boscovich's theory does not get much attention in the West, in the East -if you have not heard of Boscovich's theory, then you might have heard of it by other names such as Spiral Field Theory, [9] where an elite of Russians have picked up on this work having Boscovich as the basis of their unified theory.

References:

[1] Nature 182, p 230-231 (26 July 1958): Bicentenary of Boscovich's "Theoria Philosophiæ Naturalis"- recent studies of Boscovich's atomism, interpreting it as a kinematic theory, have been made by Whyte, L. L. , *Nature*, **179**, 284 (1957), and *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, **13**, 38 (1958); and by Jammer, M. , "*Concepts of Force*", 170 (Harvard Univ. Press, 1957).

[2] Focus and Diversions, L L Whyte, Cresset Press, London 1963

[3] Roger Joseph Boscovich, SJ, FRS, 1711-1787 edited by Lancelot Law Whyte, Published 1961 – Library of Congress Catalog Card #63-21822, Boscovich's Atomism By Whyte

[4] Professor John Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy*, first published in 1798
http://www.theforbiddenknowledge.com/hardtruth/proof_of_conspiracy.htm

[5] Louis Pauwels and Jacques Bergier, The Dawn of Magic, 1960, trans. 1963, p 265- 8

[6] Tesla 1936 unpublished interview, quoted in Anderson, L, ed. Nikola Tesla: Lecture before the New York Academy of Sciences: The Streams of Lenard and Roentgen and Novel Apparatus for Their Production, 6 April 1897, reconstructed 1994.

[7] Beyond Art, By Peter Weibel, Ludwig Múzeum (Budapest, Hungary), Neue Galerie am Landesmuseum Joanneum, Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, p 188.

[8] Isis 1965, 1, no.183, p 70
<http://www.jstor.org/pss/228462>

[9] The Unification of Strong, Gravitational & Electric Forces, Vladimir B. Ginzburg, ISBN 0967143217, USA 2003.

c.RJAnderton2008