

Seiler Stasse 29,
Hamburg, Jan 6. 1895.

Dear Sir

Having returned a proof (translation) of my paper (corrected) for publication in the Phil. Mag.: I should just like to ask your opinion more on a matter of policy, if you would kindly give it (were there perhaps or a question of scientific fact).

What I mean is, all who have thought on the subject, know that in the case of a falling body, the motion generated, comes from the ether (or medium), according to any dynamical explanation of gravitation; and when the body strikes the earth's surface and shakes its molecules into vibrations by the concussion, these ("heat") vibrations develop waves in the ether, ~~and~~ ~~are~~ or are "radiated" away. So we have a cyclical process here, where motion passes from a material medium, and back to that same medium, in a circle. Even if the "luminiferous" (electromagnetic) ether were different from the gravitation ether, that would not alter the principle here involved: since evidently two media - if there were two - could not be immersed in each other, without the

(2)

motion ("waves" &c) generated in one medium being, ultimately at least, dissipated or equalized through both media, frittered away into heat, that is. For it appears that one medium could not be immersed in another without dynamical equilibrium between the two establishing itself, in time.

The question now is as to the policy of treating this (or what follows) in a supplement, or in an extra paper in Phil. Mag., say.

We may therefore see that stars or stellar suns do not "pour their heat unrequited into space", but return their stores of motion to the source whence they were derived. For if gravity be due to a material medium, and if (as is supposed) solar energy be derived from gravity: then manifestly solar energy is only returning to its original source, to be available again in some other region of the universe. ~~perhaps~~

Of course, if chemical energy be due to gravity at contact (in the way more particularly elucidated or proposed in my paper), as many now believe: then an animal or a steam engine lifting or then an animal or a steam engine lifting or weight, is an instance (again) of energy coming from a material medium, and returning to it again in a circle. So also, in the case of an uncoiling

spring driving a clock. If "cohesion" be due to pressure of streams of atoms on the peripheries of filament molecules in contact at their boundaries (sometimes bent bent by the pressure into geometric, "crystalline" figures of equilibrium): then "cohesion" acting to uncoil a spiral spring, is a mere case of ethereal translation of atoms converted into ethereal waves ("heat"), in the works of the clock.

A locomotive converts all its energy into "heat" as it progresses with its train: so obviously we have the cyclical process of energy exchange again here: the same being true of work derived from falling water (cataracts), or from* winds.

What I only doubt is that some may say all this is known as deductive consequences or result of dynamical views of nature: there is no use (it may be said, query?) in publishing it; but it is understood. Is this so, do you think to a sufficiently general extent, to render treatment of the matter in connection with a dynamical theory of gravitation, superfluous?

For your expression of opinion I should be much obliged - in the hope too that the above may not be without a point or two scientifically: which no correspondence at length, is expected.

* Since winds are due to differences of pressure and the consequent

11/61

Yours very truly