



## A SAD STORY

1. On 02/02/07 as part of a scientific correspondence concerning a paper that I was revising for the *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* dealing with applications of Clifford algebras to the theory of isotopic lifting of some Lie algebras, I decided to contact Mr. Ruggero Maria Santilli on a specific issue in which I thought he could be of some help. As a consequence of our exchange of e-mails he sent to me the following invitation:

Are you interested in becoming an Editor of the HJ or AGG? We are now expanding their editorial board and would love to have an expert such as you.

Sincerely,

Ruggero

2. Before giving an answer, I asked for some details of his proposal, which he promptly provided<sup>1</sup>. Then, on 02/13/2007 I send the following message to him:

Dear Ruggero,

(i) Thanks for your explanations. I accept the invitation to be a member of the Editorial Board of AGG.

(ii) To your knowledge I inform that I am also member of the Editorial Board of:

*Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras* (Birkhäuser)

<http://www.springer.com/east/home?SGWID=5-102-70-76459158->

[detailsPage=journal|editorialBoard&changeHeader=true&referer=www.springeronline.com&SHO](http://www.springer.com/east/home?SGWID=5-102-70-76459158-detailsPage=journal|editorialBoard&changeHeader=true&referer=www.springeronline.com&SHO)

[RTCUT=www.springer.com/journal/00006/edboard](http://www.springer.com/journal/00006/edboard)

*Random Operators and Stochastic Equations (ROSE)* (W. de Gruyter)

[http://www.degruyter.de/rs/278\\_8702\\_DEU\\_h.htm](http://www.degruyter.de/rs/278_8702_DEU_h.htm)

*Bull. Soc. Sci. Lettres Lodz: Ser. Rech. Deform.*

<http://www.ltn.lodz.pl/index.php?action=wydawnictwa&seria=15>

(iii) I gave a look at the page with the addresses of the members of the Editorial Board of AGG and found that you must revise the addresses of two friends of mine, namely Pedro Nowosad (which lives in Ribeirão Preto, not Ribeirão Preto) and Diego Rapoport (who is now in Chile). See the correct addresses in the attached file.

(iv) Finally, I think you will enjoy (and eventually become worried) reading the attached papers which I wrote after revising papers and/or books for Foundations of Physics, Springer and Elsevier.

Best regards,

Waldyr

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Santilli said: "All our Editors have complete, independent and final decisional authority on the papers they review that, following their acceptance, are passed directly to the printer without any review by the IBR office. There is no duty or obligation since Editors review only the papers they wish to review, usually a few per years depending on personal contacts and other factors. Unfortunately we do not have an honorarium for Editors because we have no publication charges, but the Editor receives a complimentary subscription for their personal use "only" not to be passed to their libraries".



3. The point I would like to emphasize here and that is really important in order to understand an odd aspect of the character of Mr. Santilli is that the papers mentioned in 2(iv) above are papers where I criticized hardly Mr. Evans theories, namely:

- The non Sequitur Mathematics and Physics of the 'New Electrodynamics' Proposed by the AIAS Group (with A. L. Trovon de Carvalho), *Random Oper. Stoch. Equis.* **9** (3), 161-206 (2001). **MR 2002d:78002** , <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0302016>
- An Ambiguous Statement Called 'Tetrad Postulate' and the Correct Field Equations Satisfied by the Tetrad Fields (with Q. A. G. de Souza) *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **14**(12), 2095-2150 (2005), <http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0411085>

Now, since Mr. Santilli did not immediately realized that the papers were already published he sent on 02/13/2007 the following message to me:

Dear Waldyr,

- (i) Thanks for your acceptance of the position of Editor of AGG. I shall send you as soon as I have a moment a formal letter of appointment along the points indicated, namely, complete, independent and final decisional authority, no honorarium, but a complimentary subscription.
- (ii) We are now composing the first issue fog AGG 2007, that for March, and we would love to publish there your long paper "An ambiguous statement...", in the event available, because I consider this type of scientific exchanges truly basic to advance knowledge as compared to the usual soliloquia.
- (iii) We would also be interested in publishing in the HJ, if available, your paper "Non sequitur...". In regard to your third paper on multidimensional mathematics I hope to have the time for an exchange between your comments and our (multivalued) hyper mathematics.
- (iv) To appear in print we merely need the papers in our FORMAT you can see in the instructions of our ibr web site below. Incidentally, pleased keep these simple requirements for format handy for recommendation to the authors you may be in touch with to avoid delay.
- (v) Any recommendation of papers would be greatly appreciated since we have openings for 2007.
- (vi) IMPORTANT: lease let me have the complete address, including email you wish for listing.
- (vii) Can you please contact Rapoport and Novosad requesting the courtesy of their latest addresses and emails for proper listing in the March 2007 issue? Thanks.  
Looking forward to a long lasting collaboration

Ruggero

4. Now, I ask to the reader to keep in mind that from 3(ii) and 3(iii) above it is obvious that in the beginning of 2007 Mr. Santilli thought that my criticisms on Mr. Evans



theories were **important**, and he did **not** think that I did anything unethical, since he would like to publish those papers in his journals. He even commented in another e-mail: “You and I are "adult scientists" and, as such, we know the dark side of science. I respect you because you have the courage to fight it as I do. Tolerance is scientific suicide.”

However, I explained to him that publication of the papers was not possible, since they have already been published in other journals.

5. I also informed him that I was just ending a series of very good papers written with some of my collaborators and that I decided to submit the papers to AGG, something that I (unfortunately) did.

6. After sending my papers to AGG I soon received an acceptance letter<sup>2</sup>, and indeed four of five papers I submitted have been published in 2007.<sup>3</sup>

7. I also accepted after a careful review some papers (listed below) for publication in AGG and informed their authors that their papers have been accepted for publication.

- Igor Leite Freire, Noether Symmetries and Conservation Laws for Non-Critical Kohn-Laplace Equations on Three-Dimensional Heisenberg Group.
- Osmar Aléssio and Irwen Valle Guadalupe, Determination of a Transversal Intersection Curve of Two Spacelike Surfaces in Lorentz-Minkowski 3-Space  $L^3$ .
- Ivan Struchiner and Márcio A. F. Rosa, On Zeeman Topology in Kaluza-Klein and Gauge Theories.
- Roldão da Rocha, Igor Leite Freire and Márcio Antônio de Faria Rosa, *Spacetime Deformations and Electromagnetism in Material Media*.

8. Now, very *serious incidents* happened involving the above papers. Indeed, the first two articles have been published without the authors' authorizations in *Hadronic*

---

<sup>2</sup> Dear Professor Waldyr Rodrigues,

I am pleased to inform you that our Editor in Chief Prof. Santilli has studied your five papers agg0, 1, 2, 3, 4, found them excellent and approved all of them for publication in *Algebras, Groups and Geometries*.

To proceed efficiently from now on, please contact directly our Publisher Hadronic Press (reading us in copy) and provide them the ORDER of appearance of the articles that you desire, but identified by TITLE, since they have only print outs. Our Publisher will then provide you all publication data.

Your consideration of our Journal has been appreciated.

Yours, Truly

Dr. George F. Weiss

Editorial Manager

AGG

<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, in one of them, Hadronic Press wrongly printed my name, which has been also wrongly printed in the front cover of volume 24, issues 1 and 2 of 2007 of AGG.



*Journal*, instead of *Algebras Groups and Geometries*. Due to this fact, some of the authors became, of course, very furious and informed to me that they wanted to sue a lawsuit against *Hadronic Press* in American Justice. Due my intervention they did not take any action until recently. But for reasons that will become clear in a while, I cannot see any reason for them not to go away with their plan. More, I will certainly join them in that enterprise.

**9.** Besides this episode, it is necessary to quote another one, in order to demonstrate the very low administrative organization level of Hadronic Press. I was asked on June 2007 to write a referee's report on the paper: *Resolving Russel's Paradox within Cantor's Intuitive Set Theory* (by Feng Su) submitted for publication in AGG.

After studying that paper I felt that it was not suitable for publication in a Mathematical journal, but before taking a final decision I asked the opinion of an expert, and on basis of the report that I received<sup>4</sup> the paper has been rejected.

Well, for my great surprise I discovered that the mentioned paper was already published in HJ **29**. 227-232 (2006)!

**10.** Now, despite those facts, I decided to give a confidence vote to Mr. Santilli, and thus did not resign, as it was originally my intention, from my position as member of the editorial board of AGG and decided to maintain a good relationship with him, hopping that the journal situation would be improved in future.

**11.** Thus, two things happened. First, Mr. Santilli sent to me his new book, *Isodual Theory of Antimatter*, Springer 2006, and asked to me to send my comments on it. Soon, I found some serious errors in his analysis of Freud's identity as described there. I wrote a short note on that subject which has been sent to him on 10/14/2007 as an attachment to the following message:

Dear Ruggero,  
Attached is a note that I wrote on the ontology of Freud's identity, after studying your new book. The note is only for you to know that Freud's identity and Einstein field equations are not incompatible,

---

<sup>4</sup> **Report**

This paper discusses the well-known Russell's Paradox. It aims to present a new solution to the paradox, claiming the Axiom of Regularity is not necessary for obtaining the solution, in the scope of the Zermelo-Fraenkel Axiomatic Set Theory ZF. There is a fundamental **mistake** in the paper, several times repeated - in ZF, Russel's Paradox is not avoided by the Axiom of Regularity. It is avoided by the *Comprehension* (Abstraction) Axiom. An important literature on the subject of the paper is available, as for instance, the book "Set Theory", by Jech, Springer Verlag. The approach of the paper is very naïve and its author does not present any solution to Russell's paradox. I consider that the paper can not be published.

Dr. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx  
Professor of Mathematical Logic  
Centro de Lógica Epistemologia e História da Ciência  
CLE-UNICAMP



Contrary to what you stated in your book.

Nevertheless, I agree with most of your criticisms concerning GR. I attached also a recently published paper of mine (IJMPD, 2007) where I constructed a gravitational theory in Minkowski spacetime which becomes equivalent to Einstein's GR in a fictitious deformed spacetime (which is a usual Lorentzian one with an effective metric and its Levi-Civita connection). I hope you will enjoy my efforts.

Best regards,  
Waldyr

Mr. Santilli promptly answered as follows:

Dear Waldyr,

I sincerely appreciate your message and the two enclosures because that's exactly the type of comments I need. Please give me some time to study them. I will definitely quote your paper on IJMPD. If you have any additional criticism, you can sure for my gratitude.

Sincerely  
Ruggero

PS. let me know about the appendix of Chapter 3 on your studies for longitudinal solutions.

**12.** As it is crystal clear from what Mr. Santilli wrote he appreciated, at least, my effort to write the scientific note on Freud's identity and said explicitly: "that's exactly the type of comments I need."

**13.** Now, the second fact adds some spice to the "sad story". In November 2007, while I was still recuperating from a hearth surgery, I have been informed by some friends that two new associations dubbed the *Santilli-Galilei Association* (SGA) and the *Santilli-Einstein Academy* (SEA) have been created in England. One of the objectives of SGA is to nominate Mr. Santilli for the Nobel Prizes of Physics, Chemistry and (sic) Mathematics. At this instant, I started having a very bad felling, which materialized soon than I expected. For indeed, in a few days after I learned about the existence of those associations I learned also that Mr. Evans has been made Chairman of them. Worse, yet was the fact that the SGA at the same time announced that Mr. Evans won a "Santilli-Galilei gold medal" for his fight against obscurantism in Science. I started having nausea, for it is well known that Mr. Evans<sup>5</sup> is the king of nonsense<sup>6</sup>, and thus I

---

<sup>5</sup> British Civil List, as he nominates himself.

<sup>6</sup> This statement is purely technical and cannot be considered a libel. It means explicitly that almost all his papers on his "ECE theory" are nothing more than a potpourri of nonsense Mathematics. The statement has been endorsed by several competent mathematicians and mathematical physicists. See details in <http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~bruhn/GCUFT.html>



decided to contact Mr. Santilli, taking into account that a few months earlier he left explicit, as already mentioned above, the opinion he had about Mr. Evans papers.

**14.** On 10/14/2007 I sent the following message to Mr. Santilli:

Dear Ruggero,

1) At Myron Evans' blog (<http://www.atomicprecision.com/blog/>), we can read a message (see below) from Francesco Fucilla, president of the Santilli-Galilei Academy of Sciences saying that **you**, Jeremy Duuning-Davies and himself will be more than happy to give to Evans the position of deputy chairman of the academy.

2) I hope that Fucilla is mistaken and that you do not endorse his statement. But in the case you **really** endorse Mr. Fucilla's statement, I am obligated by coherence to end our collaboration, resigning to my position of member of the editorial board of AGG, for I cannot be in association with anyone that supports Evans scientifically. I already told to you that his theories are simply a pot pourri of absolutely nonsense Mathematics and Physics. **Simply garbage**. My statement may be experimentally checked by anyone that has competently studied differential geometry at any reasonable good university.

3) I know very well, and indeed appreciate your efforts for freedom of thinking. However, freedom of thinking is useful only when used by a competent man dedicate to search the truth. When used by a crackpot and liar, as is the case of Evans this freedom may result in evil. Indeed, to see that I am right, it is only necessary to recall that Evans website received millions of hits in the last few years. This means that certainly, many simple minded people and even some others that studied science, now thinks that he is a genius and succeeded in constructing a unified field theory.

4) So, if you do not support Evans, **please**, let Mr. F. Fucilla and Mr. J. Dunning-Davies (who should read my attached papers<sup>7</sup> and change urgently, for his own credibility, his opinion about Mr. Evans) know that as soon as possible, and find an elegant way (if possible) to withdraw the invitation to Mr. Evans.

5) I would like to end this message by emphasizing that any association of your name with Evans will produce damage to your reputation.

Yours sincerely,

Waldyr

**15.** I then receive on 10/16/2007 from Dr. Weiss<sup>8</sup> (which I strongly suspect to be an alter ego of Mr. Santilli) the following message:

Dear Prof. Rodrigues,

Prof. Santilli in on travel. For your knowledge, Dr. Fucilla's actions are completely independent from Prof. Santilli and or the IBR. As a matter of fact, the Board of Directors of our Institute had a formal meeting producing the formal decision to ABSTAIN from any intervention

---

<sup>7</sup> These are the papers quoted in paragraph 3.

<sup>8</sup> Which I strongly suspect to be an alter ego of Mr. Santilli...



and co-participation. Of course, the usual evil guys will associate Prof. Santilli to Dr. Fucilla and his associations, but that would be the usual lie.

After clarifying this, I appreciate the intention of your message that is sincerely intended to be constructive and protective toward our reputation, that is the basis of everything we have and are as scientists.

However, the best thing is that you resolve your issues directly with Dr. Fucilla, and this is why I am sending this message in copy to him. Dr. Fucilla may not be aware of Dr. Evans reputation, but he is a very honorable person and I can assure you he will keep your message completely confidential and will be grateful to you as we are.

In regard to your resignation from the Editorial Board of our Journals please feel absolutely free to do whatever you wish. If you associate our Institute and our Journals to what others can do way beyond our control, I can only be sorry for you.

Yours, Truly  
Dr. George F. Weiss  
Editorial Manager  
Institute for Basic Research  
New York Office

PS. Please note that our acrobat reader is malfunctioning and that's the reason we cannot print your latest paper in pdf. If you send the version in Texlatex, and IT IS IN OUR FORMAT, we can print it quickly.

The message contained the following footnote (showing that it has been sent to also Mr. Fucilla:

VERY IMPORTANT:

Dr. Fucilla,

Please put a statement in the main page of your web site to the effect Of what Prof. Santilli and the Institute for Basic Research are and cannot be part of your Associations for reason of evident conflict of interest, and that your associations are completely independent. THANKS

I ask you to keep in mind that Dr. Weiss said: **“... I appreciate the intention of your message that is sincerely intended to be constructive and protective toward our reputation that is the basis of everything we have and are as scientists.”**

**16.** I was writing a reply to Mr. Weiss (on 10/16/2007) when I discovered on Mr. Evans blog that he was since a long time an honorary professor of IBR. Then, I wrote:

Dear Dr. Weiss,  
1) Thanks very much for your prompt answer.



Your explanation is enough for me. I understand that Professor Santilli has nothing to do with Dr. Fucilla's actions (as I suspected) and then there is **no** reason for resignation as member of the editorial board of AGG, and so I will continue my collaboration. By the way, I never contacted Dr. Fucilla.

2) I sent last week to AGG a paper from three authors which I accepted for publication. Is this the paper to which your PS note refers? If yes, I am sending the latex file attached again<sup>9[1]</sup>. By the way there are still two papers of the series that I sent to AGG a few months ago that did not appear printed yet. Are these papers the ones you are talking about?

3) **Good news**. Mr. Evans just posted in his blog the following message:

.....

## Testing of Relativity

October 16th, 2007

**Subject:** Testing of Relativity

**Date:** Tue, 16 Oct 2007 06:02:33 EDT

Special relativity is the most accurately tested theory in physics, and in the case of the solar system, general relativity has been tested by NASA Cassini to 1 : 100, 000. The whole of ECE theory is based on relativity, so in view of this **I cannot accept the offer to join the Santilli Organization** because it rejects relativity. This became clear only today in a second e mail. Also the post is probably unsalaried with no defined duties. I must protect the integrity of science and AIAS. Crothers' analysis rigorously reinforces relativity theory but gets rid of errors and humbug that Einstein himself did not approve of in any way.

Civil List Scientist .

.....

4) However, Mr. Evans sometimes informs that besides being the "civil list scientist" he is also an "honorary professor of IBR"<sup>10[2]</sup>. I know that Professor Santilli, due to his nice hearth may have offered to Mr. Evans that position when he was fired from UNC. At that time under the influence of the (now dead) Prof. Vigier, I also offered to him a temporary job at my Institute (at that time I was the director of IMECC-UNICAMP).

---



Fortunately he did not accept. However, since he did not want to be associated with Santilli, maybe it is a **good** opportunity to dissolve his association with IBR.

Best regards and sorry for any inconvenience.

Waldyr

17. Besides that Mr. Evans has been nominated (vice) Chairman of the SGA<sup>11</sup> and then I decided to contact Mr. Francesco Fucilla.

Soon, after some sincere discussions where I could explain my views on Science, he suddenly invited me to be the General Secretary of SGA<sup>12</sup> and I answered his invitation as follows:

Dear Francesco,

1) It would be a pleasure to act as a General Secretary of an Academy of Sciences devoted to the demise of 20<sup>th</sup> Century obscurantism.

But, of course, to accept your honorable invitation I must first to know exactly which will be my duties and responsibilities. Please, send details and also the status laws of the academy.

2) However, I must leave clear to you that in the case I become the General Secretary of the academy my conscience will enforce me to take action to make the other members sign a resolution asking Mr. Evans to renounce his position as vice-chairman and even as single member of the academy. The reason is simple. He is responsible for much of recent obscurantism and nonsense that live on the internet and also in the pages of many scientific journals, and as such cannot be vice-chairman of an academy devoted to demise obscurantism. I think that you became convinced of that statement if you read some of the papers that I sent to you. Besides that fact I also affirm that Mr. Evans is a liar, and as such I do not feel comfortable to be one of his pears (we cannot sit together at the same table). I proved that in one of my papers: W.A.R. versus AIAS.<sup>13</sup>

3) As I am sure that Mr. Evans will not accept also to by my pear I think that honesty implies that I can only accept the invitation in the case that you, first of all, inform Mr. Evans that I will

---

<sup>11</sup> Besides that he informed in his blog on 10/19/2007 that: "The whole AIAS group has been invited to join the Santilli Academy and as President I have no objections. Thanks for the invitation. **I have been an Honorary Professor of the IBR since 1995....**" ...

<sup>12</sup> On 10/19/2007 he wrote: Estimado Waldyr

In Light of your great scientific contribution over the years, The Santilli-Einstein academy of sciences invites you to the post of General secretary of the academy ([www.santilli-galilei.com](http://www.santilli-galilei.com) [www.santilli-einstein.com](http://www.santilli-einstein.com) )

We are sure that with you as a senior member of the academy, it will truly mark the beginning of the demise of 20th century OBSCURANTISM ! In hope of your positive reply, I remain yours truly with sincere esteem. Francesco

PS: We are getting many people of high caliber to join in. However when we first started the association, the solidarity of many supporters of science, gave us the momentum needed to give a wake up call, these guys still represent for us a solidarity voice and nothing else.

I can assure that many more great scientists will soon be joining the crusade, I need only little more time. I am in the process of providing financial means to the 2 academies in order that 3 yearly GOLD MEDALS can be awarded together with cash money, this move will be a quantum leap toward a new dawn! These guys can then be remembered as the MASONS that helped the Great architects of 21st century science.

<sup>13</sup> See [http://www.ime.unicamp.br/rel\\_pesq/2003/ps/rp28-03.pdf](http://www.ime.unicamp.br/rel_pesq/2003/ps/rp28-03.pdf)



become the General Secretary and will act to eliminate obscurantism in the same way as I am doing since a long time ago.

4) After informing my conditions and some of my plans, if you and the other members still think that I may be useful, I will accept the invitation.

Best regards,  
Waldyr

18. I am sure that the reader just guessed that, of course, I did not become the Secretary of SGA and SEA. However, I am an obstinate man and decided to continue trying hard to convince Mr. Fucilla that he should revise his opinion about Mr. Evans and eventually also about some other members of SGA. In this I think to have had some success since he next invited me to be the President of SGA and SEA<sup>14</sup>, positions that I, also could not accept, for most the same reasons that I could not accept his previous invitation

19. Then, in last December, as a complement to a comment to an article written by Mr. C. Marafioti (thus president of SGA) appearing in the news section of SGA, in which he offered (“in a catch 22 style”) a prize of US\$ 1000000 for someone that could find errors on Mr. Santilli and Mr. Evans theories, I sent to him (with copy to Mr. Fucilla) my paper on Santilli’s misconceptions on the use of Freud’s identity and another paper showing clearly the many mistakes appearing in a recent paper that Mr. Evans just wrote on his so called ECE theory.<sup>15</sup>

Those papers have also been sent to Mr. Santilli<sup>16</sup>. However, at this time Mr. Santilli became very furious<sup>17</sup> and after several menaces, that he subsequently withdraw due to the intervention of Mr. Fucilla, he intimated me to publish my notes. I then improved the original notes and produced the following papers (the first one already in publication):

---

<sup>14</sup>On 12/16/2007 I received the following letter from Mr. Marafioti:

Dear Waldyr Alves Rodrigues Jr.,

Professor Fucilla has recommended you to me for the position of President of our Santilli – Galilei / Einstein Academies. It would be a true honour for us. Very little input will be needed from you as President for I will continue handling with daily duties. If you could kindly confirm the said, by sending an email to [marafioti@santilli-galilei.com](mailto:marafioti@santilli-galilei.com) and [fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com](mailto:fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com) we would be grateful to you.

In anticipation,

I send you my best regards,

Sincerely,

Carlo Marafioti

Director.

<sup>15</sup> The main reason why I spend some of my time writing notes criticizing Mr. Evans is to counterbalance his influence on the hundred thousand of persons that according to his statistics read his blog every year.

<sup>16</sup> The notes have not been sent to Mr. Evans, since he blocked my e-mail address since 1997, when I was director of IMECC-UNICAMP.

<sup>17</sup> I will avoid for a while to make public the many letters that I exchanged with Mr. Fucilla, Mr. Santilli and Mr. Weiss on this issue, but I will say here in plain English that there are many proofs that Mr. Santilli is **now** a supporter of Mr. Evans. And I know the real reasons for that, which I will reveal in due time. For the moment it is enough to recall a message that Mr. Santilli send to Mr. Evans (with copy to me on 12/17/2007): “Dear Myron, thanks for your understanding. When facing such attacks it is CRUCIAL to turn them into papers, because dirty science is made via email and cannot be done in papers. Our Journals are at your disposal for inviting criticisms for publication. Since they usually refuse because criticisms are in bad faith, they disqualify themselves. Regards Ruggero ”



- Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr., Differential Forms on Riemannian (Lorentzian) and Riemann-Cartan Structures and Some Applications to Physics, to appear *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* (special issue on torsion),  
[http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0712/0712.3067v3.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0712/0712.3067v3.pdf)
- Eduardo A. Notte-Cuello and Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr., *Freud's Identity of Differential Geometry, the Einstein-Hilbert Equations and the Vexatious Problem of the Energy-Momentum Conservation in GR*  
[http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0801/0801.2559v1.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0801/0801.2559v1.pdf)

**20.** On 01/16/08 I informed Mr. Santilli about those papers, and informed him that I decided to not continue as a member of the editorial board of AGG. Indeed, my letter to him reads:

Dear Professor Santilli,

(i) Attached you will find a copy of the paper: *Freud's Identity of Differential Geometry, the Einstein-Hilbert Equations and the Vexatious Problem of the Energy-Momentum in GR*. This paper is an enlargement (written with Dr. Eduardo A. Notte-Cuello) of a preliminary note that I sent to you sometime ago. It explicitly demonstrates that your (interesting) studies on the subject are unfortunately wrong. Besides well founded criticisms the paper has also some news developments that I hope will be useful for many people interested on this issue.

**Now, I inform to you that the paper will appear in the arXiv (probably tomorrow morning). However, if you have any comments that you think is necessary to include in the article, please, let me know and I will include it.**

I inform also that I will not submit the paper for publication in AGG or HJ, **but it will be published** in a mathematical physics journal, probably *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras* or *Int. J. Geom. Meth. in Modern Physics*. This will be decided in a few days and I will let you know.

(ii) Attached you will find also a file of the paper: *Differential Forms on Riemannian (Lorentzian) and Riemann-Cartan Structures and Some Applications to Physics*. That paper is an enlargement of preliminary notes that I sent to you containing serious (but fair) criticisms to Mr. Evans works on his "ECE Theory". It is posted in the arXiv at:  
[http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0712/0712.3067v3.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0712/0712.3067v3.pdf)

Moreover, it will appear in the *Ann. Fond. Louis de Broglie* in a special issue on *torsion*. I hope that these facts are enough to repair any damage and misunderstanding that some particular correspondence that I sent to you (and to Mr. Fucilla) in last December may have caused. I sincerely apologize for any inconvenience.

(ii) I take also this opportunity to resign to my position of member of the board of AGG.

Sincerely yours,  
Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr.

**21.** The reaction of Mr. Santilli is in his reply, received on 01/17/08, which reads<sup>18</sup>:

---

<sup>18</sup> I numbered the paragraphs in order to make some comments.



Dear Dr. Rodrigues and Dr. Notte-Cuello,

**S1.** I did read your paper "Freud identity of differential geometry..." by E. A., Notte-Cuello and A. Rodrigues Jr., to appear in the arXiv, on the Freud identity. I regret to indicate that either you did not understand the literature, or the literature was not sufficiently clean, or your work is intentionally orchestrated to serve organized interests on Einstein. In any case, it is my opinion that your above quoted work is a true damage to science.

**S2.** Let me try again. First, your extensive presentation on the lack of "mathematical" disagreement between the Freud Identity and the Einstein-Hilbert field equations is completely vacuum.

**S3.** In fact, in the literature you quote there is even the example that the presentation of the gravitational field of Earth is written in GRT as

$$G_{\{\}\mu\nu} = kT_{\{\}\mu\nu} \quad (1)$$

where the r.h.s. evidently represents the source to the gravitational field of Earth characterized by Earth magnetic and electric fields that, as such, can be written into forms fully compatible with the r.h.s of the Freud identity.

**S4.** The point you misrepresent either because you did not understand the literature, or for the specific purpose to serve Einsteinian interests for personal gains, is that THE DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FREUD IDENTITY AND THE EINSTEIN HILBERT FIELD EQUATIONS IS PURELY AND SOLELY OF PHYSICAL CHARACTER.

**S5.** It is clearly written in the literature, hence I cannot understand why you did not understand, that, as per publications by mathematicians such as Hanno Rund and others, THE TENSOR IN THE R.H.S. OF THE FREUD IDENTITY IS OF FIRST ORDER IN MAGNITUDE, namely, you cannot ignore it in first approximation, such as in the PNN limit.

By comparison, THE R.H.S. OF EQ. (1) AS WE EXPECT YOU TO KNOW, IS EXTREMELY SMALL, AND OF THE ORDER OF  $10^{-23}$  IN MAGNITUDE COMPARED TO THE R.H.S., THUS BEING COMPLETELY IGNORABLE.

**S6.** Since the point is not clear to each of you, let me explain again: the electric and magnetic field of Earth do indeed contribute to the gravitational field of Earth and, therefore, the EH field equation mathematically are fully OK. However, the electric and magnetic field of Earth contribute to the gravitational field in an extremely minuscule way as everybody knows since high school.

**S7.** You are expected to know the above even without reading the literature. Hence, I feel an ethical obligation to denounce your "work" as political and very damaging to human knowledge.

**S8.** In fact, as also written in the literature, what you are trying to assassinate with your "work" is research beyond Einstein on the ORIGIN OF THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD, that is, the modification of the physics so that the field equation reach A TENSOR IN THE R.H.S. THAT IS OF FIRST ORDER IN MAGNITUDE.

The only solution I know is the hypothesis I submitted in my work of 1974 at Annals of Physics, your Ref. [22], the identification of the gravitational field with ALL fields originating matter, as it is the case for the electron but extended to all particles and all matter at



large as treated in extreme details in [22]  
You have not proposed an alternative hypothesis while you have been systematically opposing in a vociferous way totally without science my own work via clear manipulations of statements innuendoes and nonscientific stuff.

**S9.** Feel free to do whatever you wish for I could not care less. My job is to denounce your work for scientific corruption in my forthcoming volumes *Hadronic Mathematics, Mechanics and Chemistry* <http://www.i-b-r.org/Hadronic-Mechanics.htm>

Posterity, a certainly out your accomplices, will then judge.

**S10.** This is also to terminate all personal and scientific contacts as well as to terminate Dr. Rodrigues as editor of AGG and HJ for ethical misconduct.

**S11.** All messages you may wish to send us from now on via email will be automatically trashed and all mail equally trashed. There has to be somebody who stoops the disrupting political manipulations in favor of organized interests on Einstein and leave a mark for posterity.

I am that person

Ruggero Maria Santilli

**22.** Now, I think fortunate to have received this reply from Mr. Santilli, because it demonstrates some important facts.

- (i) First, as is clear from **S5** above Mr. Santilli did not understand until now that the objects in the second member of the equation printed in his book<sup>19</sup> (*Isodual Theory of Antimatter*, Springer 2006) **are not tensor fields**. So, his statement in **S3** that the “gravitational field of Earth characterized by Earth magnetic and electric fields can be written into forms fully compatible with the r.h.s of the Freud identity” is completely non sequitur. This is because the energy-momentum tensor of the electric and magnetic fields of the earth is a true tensor field, and as such cannot be equal to a **non** tensor field object.
- (ii) If nobody informed this to Mr. Santilli in more than 30 years, is not my guilty. But to say, as Mr. Santilli said that I am trying to assassinate with my “work” research beyond Einstein on the **ORIGIN OF THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD**, demonstrates that he is in despair, because he does not have any valid mathematical argument against my findings.
- (iii) Moreover, for anyone that read the present document until here with due attention it is clear the following points.
  - a) Originally Mr. Santilli asked for serious criticisms to his work. Once I produced those wanted criticisms, he immediately sent a letter saying that he decided to

---

<sup>19</sup> The equation printed there supposedly representing Freud’s identity is moreover wrong, as I explained in details in my paper.



denounce me for scientific manipulations. Indeed, he wrote explicitly: “My job is to denounce your work for scientific corruption in my forthcoming volumes *Hadronic Mathematics, Mechanics and Chemistry* <http://www.i-br.org/Hadronic-Mechanics.htm>

**b)** Another point that we cannot forget is that at the time that Mr. Santilli invited me to be member of the editorial board of AGG, he thought that Mr. Evans papers were a collection of nonsense. The proof of this statement (as I already mentioned above) was his desire of publishing in the beginning of 2007 in his journals the criticisms I wrote denouncing the bad Mathematics and Physics of the AIAS group.<sup>20</sup> I recall that he even said concerning that issue: “You and I are "adult scientists" and, as such, we know the dark side of science. I respect you because you have the courage to fight it as I do. Tolerance is scientific suicide.”

**c)** After December of 2007, when Mr. Evans became the chairman of the Santilli-Galilei Association, Mr. Santilli started supporting him for not very clear reasons, and even invited him to present his papers for publications in his journals.

**d)** Among the sad conclusions about Mr. Santilli character that may be inferred from what has been described is the one: his statements of what is good or not are simply political opinions and thus changes from time to time, depending on convenience. Also, a sad conclusion can be achieved concerning Mr. Santilli’s knowledge of differential geometry and it is simply: that knowledge is null. So, they cannot anymore be trusted as scientific statements.

**e)** Last, but not least important it is necessary to be clear that I resigned from my position of member of the editorial board of AGG<sup>21</sup>. Thus Mr. Santilli statement that I have been dismissed for scientific misconduct is a **felony**. Due to this statement and the other facts just described above, I will ask my Attorney to sue a lawsuit against him in USA Justice. He will learn to be civilized after having to pay for his arbitrariness in having published papers without authors’ authorizations and his felonies.

Campinas, February 22 2007

Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr.  
Professor of Mathematical Physics

---

<sup>20</sup> There, the statement that “Mr. Evans Mathematics” is a potpourri of nonsense, is printed more than one time.

<sup>21</sup> I think that my reasons for the resignation are crystal clear for everyone that read this document. Also, it is necessary to clarify that I never accepted to be member of the editorial board of *Hadronic Journal*.