

Reports on 031207A:

**

The First Report:

This is a very interesting paper. I always have thought that this discussion does not finish in the results of Michelson and Morley (the same Morley in 1923 **doubted** about the existence of the ether and may be you must have heard that **also Einstein** did it, previously, in 1921). Additionally, defenders of this theory argue that the Lorentz contraction of length, in the sense of displacement, is "a physical" fact that happens as a result of which the speed of the light in emptiness is a constant, and precisely that is what does not allow to observe the wind of the ether during that experiment. Such previous explanation lead physicists Italian (Maurizio Consoli and Evelina Costanzo) to propose an experiment similar to the one of M&M, that not yet has been done, within a gaseous atmosphere to be able to observe the referred wind. Aside, from the absolute reference to which the theory of the ether forces one to agree (with which I do not agree), I have not found better arguments than those established by Einstein in his seminal paper of 1905, which conclude whereupon that the concept of the position in the space, or time, is not an absolute thing but a relative one. Nevertheless, such arguments are not good enough because they admit apparently non-soluble paradoxes, depending on where the observer is, or what its speed is (?). At the moment they are developing theories of ether on the basis of tensor algebra that are applicable to the gravitational attraction, as for example, General Ether Theory or General Lorentz Ether Theory (<http://www.ilja-schmelzer.de/GET/>). As it can be seen, it is bodying again the non-preposterous idea of a mean with certain characteristics that serve as electromagnetic transmitter of waves.

Additionally,

- 0) In subsection 2.1, after equation (12); where and how did you obtain value of ether density ρ , for completing your argument of calculation of A , by comparing equations (12) and (1)?
- 1) Second line, page 5: It reads "..smaller that that..", should be read "..smaller than that.."
- 2) Title of subsection 2.2: It reads "...GRAVITATIN", should be read "...GRAVITATION"
- 3) I don't agree, in general, with all extrapolations and assumptions within and after subsection 2.2, because they are not enough sustainable.

At this respect, I was very enthusiastic with this article because it certainly contains good ideas about ether, but must be worked out more carefully, detailed, but more synthesized for a publication as a "Theoretical Physics" paper. My

recommendation is that necessary author, in order to accomplish requirements of this journal, make the effort of reducing the extension of his paper in order to be published in JVR.

The Second Report: