

Through the study of the Universal Laws ruling the physical world we are encouraged to recognize the presence of the Divine Mystery.



Antonio Ruggeri Dr. Ing.
modexp@iafrica.com

31 May 2009

Considerations over the problem of the knowledge of the Universe

day/dialogue eight

Criticism of present theories .

P.: up to now we spoke of mass-energy and its possible dual existence , but we always said that we were dealing with an entity which can be represented either as a fluid filling the Euclidean space curdling as indefinable particles adhering to each other or absorbed “dissipated” in the ESF as a final act of dissipation after having undergone various phenomena of transformation-degradation in which their initial capacity to concentrate into clusters of particles of enormous but foreseeable density (neutron m-e M_{RM}), is switched (thanks to gravitational transformation) into the capacity to acquire decompression, and so on... m-e has substance and its presence can be measured through various methods, since the Euclidean space contains m-e as Ether/ESF and the physical mass is a mixture of m-e in different states of existence and passages of status of existence of the m-e adhering to the physical mass whilst interacting with the ESF are perceived as transformations-degradations generating Forces acting on the physical mass and related through the equivalence principle to the mass-energy originating them.

Force can be interpreted as a transitory phenomenon (tied up to transformation-degradation of m-e from a status to the successive) reflected by action causing movement of a physical mass M.

The above description of how Force is acting on a physical mass is not complete, since presence of m-e in the Euclidean space, superimposed to the ESF is intended as presence of a field (static or dynamic) of m-e inserted in it through special transformation-degradation and can induct on another physical mass an opposite field and act against it producing a dynamic setting (I refer to electric and magnetic phenomena), but here, as far as possible I do not deal with these phenomena.

A change of configuration in the Euclidean space happens when a physical gravitational mass is present in it since there is always absorption of the ESF by the gravitational content of a physical mass causing the emergency of the gravitational field in the ESF and absorption also is present when at the end of

the cycle of degradation inside the physical mass the mass-energy comes out of it as dissipation absorbed by the ESF and is in a particular status of existence permitting it to exist as a field of flowing m-e superimposed to the ESF whilst expansion over larger volumes per unit of time, (dissipation) causes it to lose compression.

The physical mass M by definition is composed of m-e in different states of existence, they have characters and their presence can be described and measured indirectly inside the physical mass M since through transformations-degradations along time intervals, they cause in the physical mass, development of measurable static Forces or of dynamic Forces originating measurable movements of it in the Euclidean space or originating movements which being restricted consist of vibrations affecting the physical mass, all of which we measure through a physical entity called energy, related to the physical mass concerned, through the principle of equivalence..

Static Force, Starter Force, Dominant Force, Total Force, Work, kinetic energy, Heat etc...are different manners in which the m-e released through transformation-degradation or present with its character is measured through the movements it causes, and the relation between presence internal to the physical mass of m-e with these describable characters and energy (which is description of their movements) is expressed through the Law of equivalence.

How comes then that is claimed the existence of mass less particles (and by consequence unsubstantial fluids)? If this is possible your theory certainly will be considered falsified.

I: this is the same old story and has to do with the obsolete theory affirming the invariability of the physical mass M (which elsewhere I called also Heavy Mass M_{HM}), this I think comes out from resistance by the Scientists to abandon the habitude of measuring energy without relating it to m-e and its transformations-degradations of the spin character (connecting the physical mass M of the object observed to the Law of increase of the inertial m-e with the increase of velocity and to the necessity that gravitational transformations-degradations must be internal to the mass).

There is always someone busy to shore up the idea of invariability refusing to abandon it even when there is clear evidence that the opposite is true, and adds the idea of instant creation of the universal reality inside an "Universe empty of substance" (therefore non existent) topping it with other physically unsound perceptions.

Science is based on search of knowledge of the physical world per se, and from genuine scientific advances not only we began to perceive that the physical Universe is ruled by universal Laws but we are encouraged to recognize that there is a Divine Mystery going beyond these Laws.

We only can enquire and awe at any new discovery and this process can go on forever, nevertheless we should realize that in many cases we have the capacity to influence, through the exercise of our personal choice (based at times on a moral imperative), the automatic chain of events ruling the physical world.

One of the most fundamental points at this stage of search of the knowledge, is that the mass-energy subjected to transformations-degradations is conserved a fact that is reflected in the principle of Equivalence and the physical characters which we measure in the phenomena of movement affecting a physical mass are related to the degradation of the Spin character of the mass-energy inside a physical mass which though is conserved is subjected to change of status of existence.

Every transformation (acting in time and therefore requiring a definition of standard of time, which here is based by necessity on Newton's ULG at local absolute conditions for a system or at universal absolute for the whole universal reality) to which the physical mass is subjected, is affecting degradation of spin character of one of its physical components made up of mass-energy and can be measured as Force acting on it, whilst if an amount of m-e endowed of unidirectional spin is accumulated in the physical mass, after transformation-degradation generating a Force, it can be measured on its own as Total Force belonging to the sum of the particles of mass-energy endowed of unidirectional spin conserved after transformation.

This concept is reinforced by the particular recognition that presence of a gravitational field in the ESF caused by a mass M_{LGM} develops a gravitational Force, inside a physical gravitational mass under its influence, and if that Force causes movement towards the center of the gravitational mass M_{LGM} , there is an extra directional release of the spin of the particles of m-e inside that physical mass M , (acceleration) dependent from the velocity.

The physical mass in accelerated movement conserves its overall physical identity showing no sign of this internal transformation, and the sum of gravitational or of external origin, Forces applied consecutively along an interval of time is reflected internally as a Total value called Kinetic Energy of the physical mass M or Total Force.

In other words, the m-e is presently measured in units of physical mass, and (if we refer to Kinetic Energy of a physical mass M) it is in equivalent units of energy that we measure phenomena producing movements related to internal presence of particles of m-e endowed of Spin (since is the Spin of these particles that interacting with the ESF is cause of movement on the physical mass M).

The phenomenon can be explained if we assume that the physical mass M consistently attached to these particles permits us through measure of its movement to measure the effects that the Spin of these particles has over it when absorbed by the ESF.

M_{Heat} and dissipation here are described as two consequent states of existence of the m-e (with dissipation representing a third peculiar status of the m-e, disconnected from the physical mass, in which the Spin character is totally degraded, and permits to the m-e to which it belongs to interact completely with the ESF).

Since dissipation is made up of m-e only inertial (non gravitational as present perceptions intend) and is influenced by the gravitational field of depression and flow in a way that seems subjected to gravity, the presence of inertial particles (clusters of inertial mass in dissipation) may have induced to deduct that these

particles when there is no gravity to influence them, (as it can be for the M_{Heat} trapped inside the physical mass which is m-e far from the neutronic status and therefore is non gravitational, but conserves inertia) are mass-less.

Therefore to mention particles without mass does not make sense, since any particle is the conglomeration or cluster of basic particles which as we said are indefinable but definitely are made of a substance having the character of m-e, measurable directly or indirectly in units of mass (Ton).

To express presence of mass-energy as M_{Heat} freed by the atoms of the physical mass but trapped inside the interstices existing between the external atomic surfaces, we recur to the concept that the density of M_{Heat} can build up (temperature), from a maximum in the center of the physical mass M , and temperature must explain the slow movement of the M_{Heat} towards the external surface of it where the compression of the spin is lost in favor of velocity of absorption in the ESF as dissipation.

You can see that if one wants to submit a theory soon or later finds himself to criticize those of others and the risk is that one can find himself involved into scathing controversial debates in which the arguments usually are not in favor of Science but just lost causes, being them based on territorial problems, or rather we can say that the problem is based on the fact that everyone defends emotionally its own turf.

My intention is to say that when we deal with Science, I not only perceive a problem of territory from the side of those scientists that to survive have to earn their daily bread (a fact that does not bide well when the achievement of Truth is the aim) but I also perceive that there could be Powers (a group of individuals, a Community, a Nation etcetera ...) which intend to sustain their collective ego, have the means and opportunistically persecute their purpose.

Furthermore, since I have been able to reach here and there conclusions that seem to be close to the Truth, when I read sensationalistic articles, presently, I am in some cases, able to judge that the writers usually are pragmatic individuals only interested on self-promotion.

The intentions of these individuals could be acceptable if they had spent well the midnight wax but in most cases one can quickly assess that they never had inclination to do so.

The assurance with which they present their work and the ignorance of the readers, are the weapons used by them to achieve success and there are many who succeeded in this manner, but I ask you now: "will they pass the exam of the time? ".

We only know that few of the many savants who lived in the past are today remembered and a majority of those few is remembered because of their mistakes!

It is painful then to criticize those who honestly and in complete good faith followed the path of the knowledge and whose efforts only could develop part of the verity.

Nevertheless I support criticism since I believe that it is necessary, everything must be criticized up to the finest detail, continuously without cease and

repeatedly up to exhaustion, since the Nature does not give up easily, she wants to be challenged, and although she is in possession of infinite secrets we need to strain our intellect to the most of our ability if we want to tear from her a little something or part of it.

The atmosphere undoubtedly was relaxed and my diatribe had been suffered with good attitude and a certain degree of benevolence but now since the dialogue had taken this direction we found agreement in following the same type of informal discussion.

P. : I read in the Internet your article in [Episteme No 8](#) (search Google) published by Prof. U. Bartocci (at the time, Director of the department of Mathematics at Perugia University, now retired) in it you criticize heavily and with arguments a little difficult to follow, the classic solution of the precession of the planet Mercury as proposed by Prof. A.E. and thereafter , when you think that your thesis is demonstrated , you say: "to others the arduous sentence " .

This gives the impression that you feel so sure of what you say that from your side the only thing left to be said is: "judgment has been passed ".

I know and I can see that you are a moderate person and your intentions are good, tell me what makes you so sure.....

I : vaguely I mentioned in the past, that the mysterious precession of Mercury was the first phenomenon which caught my attention, and when by chance through an energetic formula representing power, (Newton's Force multiplied by displacement over a second ,which I felt had to be of elastic nature, that in my UDS I call Dominant Force F_D), in a formula that I put together for the planet Mercury in orbit, but I cannot tell if it was by mistake or by inspiration, I multiplied the value of that displacement over a second for the seconds contained within hundred years, for 2π to take into account the full 360° turn of the orbital velocity of the satellite in orbit inside the field of ESF and the amplification of transformation-degradation due to crossing of the ESF at orbital velocity v_0 , what I obtained was a value very close to the one given by the Astronomers and publicized frequently, it was the advancement of the planet Mercury in its orbit (the precession of Mercury in its orbital path over hundred years)

Many would have said that the result had no consequence and the value obtained was a chance result and that in many cases these formulations could give illusory results etc...

I did not stop there since I felt that there was something to be found and very interesting indeed, my intuition told me that, and for years, whilst I was accumulating the necessary knowledge, I carried on defying those results until they made good sense.

Substantially the value of that displacement was referred by me as "striction" and multiplied by v_0 was called "orbital striction" (as already said, and I called "unbundling" the effects of striction over the gravitational mass-energy) and afterwards I contrived for the striction afflicting an object resting over a Large Gravitational Mass (M_{LGM}) the total value of transformation-degradation affecting

its own mass, from M_{RM} into M_{Heat} (as is taking place inside the Sun and in the stars, and is invariably followed by dissipation) and extended the value obtained to the whole mass of the M_{LGM} which for the Sun came out to be what seems more precise than the one measured up to now.

In the event, the unbundling inside a planet in orbit justifies also the generation of a gravitational transformation inside its physical mass, and in both cases there is establishment of presence of a cyclical unstoppable phenomenon of gravitational relativistic nature (vibration initiated by presence of the Static Force which acting over the atomic mass considered elastic becomes Starter Force) causing the transformation-degradation of neutronic mass M_{RM} into mass M_{ESCM} , which from the physical point of view are the very interesting phenomena generating the light that comes to us from the stars.

This internal transformation-degradation, the “unbundling”, of the mass from M_{RM} to M_{ESCM} , produced by this vibration which in theory could be interpreted as a closed cycle of transformation but in practice since due to the enormous compressions lets the M_{ESCM} inside the atoms to leak out transformed again into M_{Heat} (fueling dissipation), represents more than a change of status of existence of the m-e, it requires at first (when movement starts) the transformation of mass M_{RM} into inertial mass M_{ESCE} and has been presented in the previous dialogue, where I also emphasized that presence of M_{ESCE} is associated to internal time retardation of the physical phenomena when is built up and to time advance when it is reabsorbed as M_{ESLA} in the first part of the elastic cycle and again time retardation and time advance in the second part when M_{ESLA} is reabsorbed as M_{ESCE} which against the gravitational field is reabsorbed as M_{ESCM} etc...

The result is that time retardation and time advance effects cancel each other but are undeniably associated to the phenomenon of unbundling making its presence absolutely necessary during vibration and whereas presence of inertial mass cause time retardation they are not cause of a phenomenon of time advance since the temporal effects along the cycle of transformation are cancelling each other.

The time advance is present due to presence of gravity over a physical mass in local absolute terms or in universal terms.

Also time advance is unstoppable like it is unstoppable the absorption of ESF by the gravitational component M_0 belonging to the physical mass M , the time retardation etc.. this shows that the physical mass M (being largely gravitational) is absolutely subjected to degradation and by necessity to all the other transformations leading to dissipation, according to the case.

Nevertheless I must say that dissipation strongly depends from the value of the physical mass and in the case of gravitational masses large enough, the internal gravitational unbundling is increasingly coming out as dissipation.

Note: in [Ruggeri12](#) I assumed that in the large moons and in the planets there is already enough internal compression to permit the internal unbundling to come out totally as dissipation.

That all the gravitational neutron m-e belonging to a physical mass is subjected to internal unbundling is a fact and when the physical mass is present as cosmic

dust (in which the neutronic mass is in formation) the dissipation must be practically inexistent, but as soon, under the effect of gravity, the atoms of hydrogen are formed we have that huge clouds of hydrogen build up enough gravitational compression permitting dissipation within the Specter of the light and beyond.

When the phenomenon of “unbundling” is due to striction along the orbital path the value of internal degradation produced by simple action of gravity is amplified producing more M_{ESCM} but due to lack of compression, is retained internally and does not come out as dissipation, and this is source of interesting conclusions in regard to the increase of the percentage of the heavier atoms inside a mass in which the presence of m-e as M_{ESCM} (the glue tying up the neutron in the nuclei of the atoms) increases.

I reached these conclusions since previously I had developed the gravitational well or Borehole investigating with its help the possibilities belonging to a periodical transformation-degradation, (naturally only from the theoretic point of view, since it is impossible to build a proper Borehole).

Note: we refer here to the Borehole as a well crossing all the gravitational mass under observation, right through the center to the opposite surface and in which a physical gravitational mass of the right size can fall.

Certainly I could have referred to the pendulum but I found more difficult to present with it the physical phenomena involved.

(see drawing in [Ruggeri15 page 7](#)).

I also realized that in a mass moving along an elliptic orbit there is superimposition of the phenomenon described by the Borehole with the one connected with a perfectly circular orbit.

Therefore, whilst a mass orbits around another much larger, one can consider that the two phenomena (the running along a perfectly circular orbit and the fall and rise inside something similar to a Borehole) are over imposed, this way, the elliptic trajectory is established, in this case we can see that unless there is a very large value of eccentricity, the precession, using my theory seems totally justified in the circular orbit and when one wants to consider the added phenomenon (which is the cyclic phenomenon of fall and rise with a period equal to the orbital period and therefore much slower than the one of fall inside the true Borehole) finds that it is regulated by accelerations a lot smaller and originates transformations that can be overlooked even for large values of eccentricities.

We then have that the value of precession in circular orbits is a reasonable value to consider even if the planet has a consistent value of eccentricity (as it is the case with Mercury).

This is the reason for which I solved the precession of Mercury using the striction along an orbit perfectly circular and the value that I obtained coincided very satisfactorily with the measured one, a result that gave me great impetus and self confidence.

Note: the formula giving Mercury's precession was adapted to the gravitational internal transformation-degradation taking place inside the Sun (which is a M_{LGM} ,

producing a dissipation relatively easy to measure) and the value obtained compares very well with the empirical results, but still I was in doubt about the results obtained.

A necessary confirmation was then obtained when I focused on the phenomena associated with the Global Positioning System.

There I tied up the precession values obtained through my theory to the known paradigm of the GPS which is considering the Earth as M_{LGM} .

I was able then, to compare Precession and other temporal phenomena of common knowledge, associated to the GPS, developing a criticism of the known results. (see [Ruggeri19](#)).

Note: the explanations presently given for the GPS are highly unsatisfactory but what is important is that is working, it is undoubtedly a phenomenon of relativistic nature that will produce a revolution in the scientific thinking.

Question after question slowly, during the years, from a precarious start I managed to put together my own theory.

The results reached by Pr. A.E. in regard of the precession are very close to mine and between his formulation and mine there is minimal difference , indeed where I use $\pi= 3.14159\dots$ he used (with the help of an eccentricity $e= 0.206$)

the following expression :

$$1) \quad \frac{3}{(1 - e^2)} = 3.1329$$

as anyone can see , the difference is minimal whilst the rest of the formulation giving the precession is the same , therefore both formulations give a value very close to the measured one .

The value of precession he obtained contains the eccentricity e and the formula obtained has an aspect of normality, promoting its acceptance as true value, since the use of the value of the eccentricity seemed the most right thing that could be done, and since on close observation the formulation tied up to e that he offered, after all, gives a value acceptable (almost unchallengeable).

Nevertheless his formula is deceptive because it is valid only for Mercury and for its value of eccentricity and therefore is not Universal, whilst mine is.

As you mentioned, if one reads the article in [Episteme 8](#) presently available on the internet, he will find in it my criticism and my solution.

Note: I have reported the same results but in abridged form on [Ruggeri1](#) as well.

From my analysis results, in that article ([Episteme8](#)), that if I assume a circular orbital path (overlooking the component of fall and rise in the orbit) I obtain the precession using π and that value is acceptable for a wide range of eccentricities, whereas the value of precession given by Einstein since it depends from e (see the 1 above) becomes unreliable, especially when the orbit is circular since in that case for $e=0$ in his formula , as presented in the 1) above, appears a value 3 instead of the value 3.1329 (see above) and the value of precession would be subjected to a nonviable strong variation.

Note: this can be proved in the GPS since the system is fairly stable in regard of the geometric precession and of the temporal precessional advance though

the satellites have eccentricities difficult to control.

If the formula of Einstein was the valid one the GPS would result a nightmare requiring continuous adjustments based on the value of orbital eccentricity related to each of the individual satellites.

Therefore with a formulation of universal character using π and assumed valid for a range of eccentricities up to the one of Mercury and beyond we justify both precessions in the case of Mercury and the uniformity of values in the case of the satellites of the GPS.

Note: these results are agreeing with the theory developed in regard and permit to proceed as it happens with the interpretation I gave of the Hafele-Keating experiment which I intend to present in future.

We can therefore see that if we put 3 in place of π , (when the orbit is circular $e=0$) the physical contact is lost, since the value obtained is far from the real value of precession.

I can truly say that, in regard to my formulation, I was very gratified, when being able to withstand my own critical arguments, I was forming the idea that I was facing the Truth.

Successively I experienced more satisfaction when I managed to make another step forward, adapting the same formulation to the generation of the M_{Heat} released inside the stellar masses, a fact that makes me hope to be a lot closer to the Truth in this particular issue, than anyone else previously was until now.

Thereafter, from a value of striction I passed to affirm that in Mercury there is an internal gravitational transformation of $m-e$ that as said cannot come out as M_{Heat} and dissipation, since if this were the case from its surface should come out an amount of energy equivalent of $\sim 200 \text{ kW/m}^2$ and afterwards I was also able to affirm that on Earth the same transformation should produce the outpouring from its surface of $\sim 20 \text{ kW/m}^2$ (enough to roast all of us in few minutes) and I was also able to affirm that the same formulation of the precession, duly modified, enables us to calculate well the transformations-degradations that happen in the Sun and, through dissipation, make a star out of it.

I hope you agree with me when I declare that I am satisfied about my results.

In [Ruggeri14](#) I mentioned also the fact that internal transformations-degradations due to internal unbundling afflicting the physical mass in orbit rapidly decrease with the distance from the large gravitational mass at the center of the system.

Note: being the striction an universal phenomenon the orbital striction and the precession are subjected to an universal Law (which will be presented in due course).

Nevertheless (see also [Ruggeri14](#)) Venus and Earth and the gas giants produce internal transformations-degradations of gravitational nature from M_{RM} into M_{Heat} like it happens inside the Sun whereas in Mercury and Mars, considering their small size, that phenomenon is almost nil.

In particular, we have that in Jupiter, due to its large mass, there is a valuable internal gravitational transformation of mass M_{RM} into M_{Heat} , which though is a lot reduced respect to what happens inside the Sun, still is able to produce and

sustain an hefty value of dissipation and to produce continuous furious storms all over its surface.

That Jupiter is a small star on the make (a proto-star), due to the amount of M_{Heat} produced per unit of mass per second, by its own gravitation, cannot be denied, since with the use of instrumentation continuously more advanced, the astronomers are discovering in the Universe at large, objects whose mass is ranging between the value of Jupiter and that of the Sun and they without fail, according to the value of their mass, are gradually varying their signals, shifting into dark red, and gradually becoming more brilliant until stars of masses with densities more or less equal to the one of our Sun, producing dissipation similar to it are observed, and so on...

These results justify very satisfactorily my formulations and my assumptions.

Note: not necessarily all these luminous bodies, as described here, are at the centre of a system (like our Sun is) some are only planets that orbit around stars a lot greater and luminous than them, some are part of a system or group (cluster) of stellar objects that are in orbit simultaneously with each other.

Over and above I must add the fact that presently with the UDS I have developed a complete advancement of CM and almost everyday I add knowledge of intuitive nature based on this theory, a fact showing that it is live and fruitful.

P. : I am sure now that there is merit in your theory and I wish you good luck, since, although the times are, so to say "modern" you could find troubles on your way.

I: if you intend "troubles" coming from the scientific world, their present attitude is to ignore any valid effort made outside their community; therefore the "main trouble" is that I certainly will be ignored.

P. : Now, since you do not deny the presence of Forces (static and dynamic) as those theorized by Sir I.N. and accept both the relation of equivalence and the formula of increase of inertial mass of Pr. A.E. and declare (against the common belief) that the Ether (to which you changed name, calling it ESF) exists and has properties and characters which we must discover if we want to proceed in our quest for knowledge, and they are such that the nature is conditioned by it in a way never conceived before.

Given the fact that up to now there has been only uncertainty, can you tell me how and why these physical perceptions (Newton, Einstein and your Ether) can become part of a new theory?

I. : as you well know, my point of view is that in physics one cannot choose a faith and thereafter try to prove what is right and what is wrong, the process advancing the knowledge happens through criticism and not through criticism opportunism (or rather criticizing emotionally the ideas that we do not believe).

An embryonic presentation of the cycle degradation of the m-e based on the

existence of the Ether/ESF was made by Dr. De Pretto in 1903 of which I quote a translation from his Italian text, made by me, of a few lines extracted by a publication of his work (kindly supplied by Prof. U. Bartocci)

In this manner the cycle of the Ether is complete, its energy is communicated to the mass; the Heat and the light coming out of the Sun and of the stars, are nothing else than a phase of this process and the energy coming out of the mass, comes back to the universal reservoir, to the Ether: nothing is lost and nothing gets destroyed and this is valid for both the mass and the energy.

In this last paragraph, he insists over the relation of equivalence between mass and energy, and this is consistent with the affirmation he made elsewhere that : " in the Universal reality exists only one substance".

How he had been able to mature these concepts from a background which affirmed the invariability of the mass, can be deduced from the fact that he was updated about the latest developments in the scientific field and therefore conscious about the revolution of thoughts caused by continuous discoveries of electric and magnetic phenomena and from the discovery of radioactive materials.

One can understand that he wasn't alone in forming these ideas of transformations internal to large masses etc...but then, he put them together as best as he could and had them published.

His papers contains embryonic ideas and we can say the same in regard of those of Einstein which went a lot further but would have fared better without using mathematical theories which he did not need.

At the time when these ideas concerning relativistic phenomena, were painfully taking shape in the world of Science, we need to be told that the publications made by Einstein, needed many years before being noticed and this happened only when in the scientific milieu was formed the consciousness that inside a physical mass, internal transformation of mass-energy could be the missing link capable to justify measured values of energy, (Force associated to movement) which otherwise was measured but had no way to be justified.

The step was facilitated by the fact that equivalence was already a known concept, since Sir I. Newton postulated the equivalence Work and kinetic energy and Prof. Julius Meyer postulated that the phenomenon dissipating Heat consisted of another form of energy equivalent to Work and kinetic energy.

Note: this last result (regarding the Heat), brought the conclusion that energy was a conservable entity and has to be intended as a step close to the Law of equivalence (since how can be conserved something which physically has no reason to exist?)

Note: the consciousness was generated by advances on the scientific field, which eventually confirmed empirically the Law of equivalence.

The step forward introduced with the principle of equivalence was so unusually great that the world of Science, instead to carry on with criticism, as would have

been natural, preferred to believe...

There is no doubt that other great minds came very close to the Truth and this is demonstrated from the fact that to disprove the negation of the existence of the Ether have been presented many theories, which many in the scientific milieu find unconvincing and plainly there is a chorus of complaints in regard of present perceptions, but no man of science able to unravel this skein has been found yet.

I think that I made it, though it cost me great personal sacrifices it was a worthy pursuit, and the results were inebriating, but will they understand me?

In this search I tried to confine the subject to the study of gravitational phenomena and the test of the Truths contained in previous theories is on the possibility that they offer to advancements.

In the process I had to expand the RR or SR (if I can use this expression) since what happened was that there had to be a modification taking into account more precise intuitions over the nature of the m-e that made indispensable the use of formulations based on the presence of the Ether, this time renamed ESF by me

In effects I here affirm to have found the basic misconception besetting the SR and (like it happened for the precession) , the difference of formulation between my theory and the one of Lorentz adopted by Pr. A.E. , in most of the cases , is really small, but what gives me self-confidence and impetus is that once introduced the Doppler Effect inside the simple Lorentz's graphics I was able to join and extend these graphics into a three dimensional representation which I called "DELINEATIO MIRABILIS" see [Ruggeri7](#) and [Ruggeri10](#) and was also able to find original solutions to problems of physical relativistic nature laying beyond the simple Lorentz's diagrams.

Einstein apparently was ambivalent in regard of the Ether but was unable to include it in his theories.

From start the General Relativity (GR) was unable to withstand the critical enquiry of prepared minds and its notable success in scientific circles is source of surprise.

It would have been enough glory for him if he had limited himself to the more physical representations that he developed, since in practice in the most important experiments that verify time phenomena and precessions, he presents formulations related to circular orbits and as in practice happens his measure of time is within a local absolute system using Newton's ULG,.

Time measurement is an absolute necessity of representation, when a concatenation of events tied up to movements, subtended by existence of transformations-degradations, are taking place.

The true development leading to justifications of phenomena present in the Universal reality happens only when is postulated the presence of the Ether/ESF, the source of mass-energy as substance subjected to transformation-

degradation, extracted from its natural reservoir which is the Euclidean space through gravitational absorption by gravitational physical mass,.

Associated to these transformations there is degradation of character of the substance gravitational-inertial which loses the gravitational character but still remains inertial.

This simple affirmation had dramatic consequences since increase of inertial content on a physical mass means increased opposing Force when a physical phenomenon develops inside a system and this procures that the physical phenomenon, although invariable is retarded in respect of the same system had it not been subjected to increase of inertial mass.

All the known classic mechanics were enriched by this advance and the theory that had to develop takes into account that in time (by necessity measured as a local absolute value of a physical transformation that substance in a status of existence defined “gravitational” undergoes) physical phenomena, though are of invariable nature, can change the rate at which they take place.

And this did not stop at increase of inertial mass causing time retardations but went on including the observation that degradations of gravitational origin were causing similar temporal unstoppable phenomena, this time of advancement with the increase of the gravitational Force over a physical mass.

The UDS as presented by me is mostly involved on the investigation of how classic mechanics are affected and in the process it can be called “classic relativistic mechanics”.

In other words, we have to take always into account that in the universal reality, the Euclidean Space is always occupied by substance, the ESF, and when due to a chain of transformations-degradations a physical mass comes into existence it has the ability to displace the Ether/ESF.

To passage of status of the mass from “gravitational-inertial (the neutron m_e M_{RM})” to “only inertial M_{ESCE} ” (followed in some cases by return to a status gravitational-inertial, the neutronic mass-energy M_{ESCM}), is associated at first increase of inertial content which is the character reducing the rate of a transformation-degradation inside a physical mass and which determines the temporal phenomena of retardation in respect of the local absolute time of the system, and since a gravitational transformation can reabsorb the inertial m_e M_{ESCE} into m_e M_{ESCM} (gravitational but degraded) the rate of the time phenomenon can in this case be subjected to advance.

We then have that when similar phenomena happen in a context of a relativistic cyclical unstoppable vibration of gravitational character the result is degradation but the time phenomenon retards and advances in a similar rate with zero results at the end of a cycle.

As it is now, physical transformations determining gradual degradation of the conservable spin character inside a conservable physical mass are denied and this denies the development of Force as a physical phenomenon.

Mathematic formulations used today are of empirical nature and purport to describe physical transformations of m_e retarding or advancing the time phenomenon, without taking into account the open cycle of transformation-degradation of the ESF which is taking place inside a physical mass, but then are

unable to carry on the explanations for lack of a theory.

This incapacity to expand properly the CM has resulted in the introduction of an advanced Discipline based on relativity concepts, but dogmatic in content whose use of mathematics based on empirical data observed, in most of the cases does not satisfies since it badly approximates the nature of things.

When it comes to observation became increasingly evident that these phenomena happen but is also necessary to explain how they happen.

In the UDS, when for an observer, an absolute local time measurement is in place (Newton's time) is possible for him to observe time retardation and time advance phenomena and precession (if applicable) in the object observed, as presented in the previous [Dialogue 7](#).

Note: I specified that the time measurement must be a local absolute and has to do with the existence of the ESF and of its function, since if the presence of inertial mass is intended as presence of a field of m-e in inertial status surrounding the central M_{LGM} of the system and dragging the ESF conditioned to follow the system in a status of immobility, forming a sort of alloy with the Ether/ESF that is entrained and moves with it, we then have that the time measurement inside the system, based on the ULG is definitely a local absolute.

Disconnected from the physical reality, the scientific mind is arrived to the paradox of negative time, whereas time being a measure of degradation can advance or retard in relation to the rate of it respect to a basic reference (ULG local or universal) and reversibility of transformations are not considered.

It all boils up to the acceptance of the physical concept of degradation associated to transformation since automatically the reversibility of physical phenomena comes to be denied.

Under these assumptions, then, is acceptable the idea of an open cycle made up of a chain of transformations-degradations in which the ESF is transformed into physical presence of mass which after transformations-degradations return to the ESF as dissipation of m-e M_{Heat} .

Lots of considerations need to be added to the subject before he felt confident to say that I made a further step in the field of knowledge.

In the other hand at the extreme limits when velocities are approaching the maximum value in the system under observation, behaviors are observed which do not fit with the dynamics of the UDS just mentioned.

The m-e under these conditions can be disrupted and breaks into transient clusters of basic particles, and we need to deal with new phenomena and determine Laws of behavior which transcend the UDS as the self contained discipline I intended it to be.

Note: the phenomena just mentioned are out of the range belonging to the Universal Dynamic Science and belong to Quantum Mechanics.