

A. Ruggeri Dr. Ing.
modexp@iafrica.com

7 September 2008

Ether/ESF and proofs of existence

1) A basic explanation about how the atomic presence must be interpreted.

Proof of the existence of the ESF is in the fact that the electron can exist on its own as a cluster of particles endowed of half spin and therefore in a condition in which they tend to penetrate the ESF but are unable to do so, therefore acquire a configuration as in fig 1 .

As in the atom they are in a condition in which their blunted push is producing a boundary whose surface is made of the fabric of the ESF.

The ESF external to the atomic structure tends to absorb the SP particles endowed of spin which constitute the electron but a surface extremely consistent is developed by it, which impedes the dissipation of the SP constituting the electron.

This tendency by the ESF to absorb the SP of the electron also produces a deformation of the field of ESF surrounding the electron but here this topic is just mentioned since its place is better suited with the electric and magnetic phenomena of Science.

Whilst the neutral hydrogen atom is summing up the effects of two deformations of the ESF, the one produced by the nucleus made by a proton and the other produced by the electron if we consider separately the electron and the ion of hydrogen (made up of a single proton), we have two separate fields of deformation of the ESF which absorb mass-energy when the electron and the proton are separated and tend to interact when the electron and the proton are at a suitable distance restituting the mass-energy absorbed along the process of separation as dominant Force in the kinetic status applied separately to both components (the electron and the ion of hydrogen) and finally in the form of dissipation.

Proof of the existence of the ESF is in the fact that the electron can exist on its own as a cluster of SP endowed of $\frac{1}{2}$ spin as this is the character which renders it unable to penetrate the ESF.

As a consequence of this the SPs constituting the electron remain contained inside a volume whose boundary is made up by the fabric of the ESF.

See fig 1 below.




Figure 1

2) The ESF produces the opposition to change of direction of the axis of rotation of a gyroscope and what up to now was interpreted as conservation of momentum is reduced to conservation of mass-energy in the inertial status in the context of a presence of a blanket made of the fabric of the ESF.

A gyroscope is turning at high angular speed around its axis, if we try to change direction to the axis we face a stiff opposition of elastic character.

The Force constituting that opposition is produced by the ESF surrounding the gyroscope which is separated from the ESF captured by the mass of the gyroscope and in circular movement with it.

The ESF surrounding the gyroscope interacts with the ESF in movement forming a field of contraction ending up as a thin fabric in contact with the external surface of the gyroscope and becoming impervious in direct relation to the density of the ESF trapped and spinning




Figure 2

In actual fact the spin of the inertial SPs belonging to the physical mass is conserved, and being the inertial SPs bonded to the physical mass in rotation at constant angular velocity their spin is forced to change direction on a continuous basis.

This happens in dependence of the amount of inertial SP endowed of spin (total Force) belonging to the gyroscope and of the physical characters of the gyroscope.

What must be clear is that the ESF (as SPs in a pristine status entrapped in the mass of the gyroscope) follows the rotation of the gyroscope together with the SPs inertial.

Note: the ESF by definition is mass-energy in a pristine status and the fact that is excluded from inside the atom results in minimal presence of it inside a mass in which occupies the cavities between the external atomic surfaces.

3) How the Michelson-Morley experiment must be interpreted in base of the existence of the Ether-ESF.

Earth on its own is a gyroscope and if considered as a system gives the measure c of the speed of the light to an internal observer, it results equal to the absolute universal value, though is measured inside a system not in quiet and for this reason I say that the measure though is equal to the absolute universal value is a virtual measure (is a local absolute).

Note: local measurements of speed of light are usually made over a plan tangent to the spherical surface of Earth, and we restrict the matter to them.

The reason being that the Earth and the ESF trapped inside it are capable to give a constant measure of speed of light, measured internally, in universal terms.

We are now in a situation in which the Earth from which the observation proceeds moves at orbital velocity which can be considered constant and since the Earth entraps the ESF in the orbital movement and further to it moves the ESF around its axis, an observer on the hypothetic conditions of Earth concentrated on a point virtually would measure a speed c of the light, (local absolute) whereas the true value in terms of observation from the center of the solar system (considering the solar system at rest and the Earth concentrated in a point) would be :

$$c' = \sqrt{c^2 - v_0^2}$$

The above value has been assumed in absence of Earth rotation around its axis, and this is only an hypothetical assumption, supposing now that the observer is making its readings on Earth surface the value of the speed of light as observed from the center of the sun would be:

$$c'' = \sqrt{(c^2 - v_0^2) - (v_R \cos \varphi \sin \psi)^2}$$

With φ angle of latitude and $\psi = \pm 90^\circ$ the longitude .

once the observer measures a c (virtual) inside its system it results to him that the beam of light is reaching him from the sun in conditions whereas v_0 is constant and so is φ , but ψ is variable (since depends from the rotation of the Earth).

The above produces a situation in which observations of interference related to light beams reaching the observer from outside the Earth are made in cyclical conditions depending from the diurnal rotation of the Earth.

As can be deduced from the above relation, the observer will have a value of fringe of interference calculable using the velocity of rotation at Earth surface which only depends from ψ and is not influenced by the orbital velocity v_0 and from the value of longitude φ which for the observer are constants.

The situation changes dramatically when the beam of light is internal to the System, since a light beam originated on Earth (which rotates together with the floor of observation) is always producing an invariable condition of observation in which the ESF entrained by the system Earth in orbital movement and in diurnal rotation has no effect over the measuring apparatus, and by consequence is in a condition in which no fringe of interference would be produced.

What said above only represent intuitions and lots of work will be still required. I may consider to expand the argument in future.

If the M-M apparatus is used to measure the effects of sunlight we can only suggest that, assuming that the measurement of the interference be made at the equator, (where for $\varphi=0$ the $v_R = 463$ m/sec) and in condition of $\psi = \pm 90^\circ$.

After all, starting with the solar system, we consider that the ESF is entrapped in the volume occupied by it and moving with it at the same speed and when we restrict our observation to Earth we accept that the ESF not only is entrapped by the mass of the Earth following it but also follows the diurnal rotation of the Earth.

If the observation at the interferometer is made at $\varphi=0$ and $\psi = \pm 90^\circ$ we still have a reduced measure of Ether/ESF wind (every 12 hours) and the fringe produced from the real phenomenon will have a value of possible measurement in respect of the fringe value expected using the original theory which assumed the presence of Ether/ESF wind (over the six months period of observation):

$$\eta \cong v_R / v_0 = 463 / 29800 \cong 1 / 64$$

The suggestion that the Ether is entrained in the system in movement and additionally in axial rotation, gives in this particular case a value 64 times smaller than the value calculated assuming the hypothesis of existence of an Ether wind.

In the other hand the suggestion that the Ether is entrained in the system in movement whilst the source of light beam is internal to the system and moves in concert with it, will give measurements comporting zero results.




Figure 3




Figure 4

Note: the hypothesis in fig 4 is not admissible since we know that the Earth is endowed of diurnal rotation.

Detail 2




Figure 5

3) What commonsense (not very common between us humans) dictates when a search for the Ether/ESF is made in conditions of poverty, and the fruitful results which came out.

The search of the proof of existence of the Ether-ESF made through the use of the interferometer invented by Michelson, produced one of the most serious situations in Science, it resulted from the fact that there was a pretense to use a very sophisticated apparatus whose workings were not clearly understood (and still are not) in order to make a dramatic advance.

Under the above conditions, the conclusion that the experiments carried on with the apparatus failed to demonstrate the existence of the ESF is unacceptable.

What puzzles me is the fact that the best intellects went to attack such an intricate and challenging problem and not wanting to admit the limitation of the scientific knowledge of their times, assumed that the experiment was a failure.

That perception produced an impasse which stills today the official Science is incapable to overcome.

To my perception the scientific pursuit requires a continuous unrelenting criticism; encompassing review of conclusions given for granted by others and to proceed in the path of Science, one may never trust other people's intuitions making them its own.

One day the full workings of the interferometers will be better understood and who knows, maybe many of the conclusions reached when they first were used will be reversed.

The search for evidence confirming the existence of the ESF was for me a question of common sense and before extending it to sophisticated experiments and Byzantine heights, a lack of funds, of grants, and of supportive friends feeding my search with hints and intricate conjectures, forced me to scrape the ground and look at the foundations of the modern scientific thought since I was denied the access to the upper floors and to the cloudy heights.

I told myself that many observations were made available in our present times replicating the basic phenomena investigated by Leonardo, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Lorentz, Doppler, Einstein (to mention a few of ...) and the reappraisal of them in the light of the modern advances could have made a difference in the way the phenomena had been interpreted.

I decided to investigate anew the basis of modern gravitational physics, and the results produced were extremely satisfactory.

It would be futile to recount here the long intellectual effort which brought me to develop the new Universal Dynamic Science (UDS), I can only summarize the results which were obtained through searches based on commonsense.

From a basic intuition saying that "Nature has horror of the vacuum"
(NATURA HORROR VACUI HABET) these are few of the
conclusions which I judge worthy to be presented to the attention
of the reader.

- Hypothesis of the existence of the Ether and of its fluidic characters
- Hypothesis of existence of indestructible (conservable) Speeding Particles SP endowed of spin character, as the unique substance present in the Universe, which are affected by transformations leading them through a cycle of existence (going from the pristine status of Ether/ESF through the various states of mass-energy and eventually through dissipation) which justifies the dynamism of the natural objects which are exclusively made out of them.
- Uniformity of explanation of all the basic phenomena regarding gravitational transformations, starting with the investigation regarding the existence of the Static Force and all the other Forces depending

from release of spin due to transformation, the justification of the presence of gravitational fields through existence of absorption of the Ether/ESF by the gravitational component of the physical mass.

- The justification of the temporal phenomena in the context of presence of physical transformations producing movement.
- The justification of the behavior of the Ether/ESF through the observation of the transformation producing acceleration of movement or amplification of transformation (a fact which in itself proves without doubt the existence of the Ether/ESF)
- Discovery of few of the (supposedly infinite) characters of the Ether/ESF and extension of the results to the calculation of the precession of objects in orbit around a Large Gravitational Mass (with regard to the verification of the values of precession measured for the planet Mercury), theoretical verification of the results of the GPS, and enunciation of an Universal Law of Precession
- Extension of the results obtained using the same theory to the internal release of Heat and to the dissipation coming out of Large Gravitational Masses (the stars) and fitting calculation of the dissipation coming out of our Sun. (see [ruggeri8](#))
- Development of a theory producing a physically acceptable explanation of the simultaneity of representation whose crowning achievement is justified through a relation which I called “Summa Relatio” and through a basic graphic (which can be subjected to further elaboration) which I called “DELINEATIO MIRABILIS” (see [ruggeri7](#))

These are few of the achievements which were obtained through use of observations made by others without the availability of a laboratory and expensive tools and equipment, and through a refinement of critical capacity (using commonsense), the list is longer but I spare to the reader the boring task of going through it.

What I want to point now is the fact that in the first two sections of this paper, two hypotheses have been made, which are going against the grain of the common perceptions.

I am aware that some people will find them outright outrageous, nevertheless as it happened many times in the field of physics we are today accepting as matter of fact concepts which were fought against when they were formulated.....