

GIOVANNI GIORGI
Ingegnere Eletttricista

Rome, March 29th, 1902

Mr. Oliver Heaviside

Sir:

I thank you for your letter of 17th, which I have duly considered.

I understand that the point of view from which I look at the question differs from yours, therefore we arrive at somewhat different conclusions.

You consider my system as a compromise, because it keeps the existing units, and therein the constants of the ether are measured by an approximate multiple of 4π .

From my point of view, yours own is a compromise, because it keeps the ether as a standard of magnetic inductivity, which in my opinion, is a weak point of the existing system.

Certainly, your proposal of the multiplier 10^9 is a great simplification over existing use, but the multiplier cannot be general; if you apply it to E.M.F. and resistance, then ~~you~~ you do not apply it to current; and, what is more important, you do not extend it to mechanical units. In fact, you use the 10^9 with all units which have to do with μ , and then, why not to explicitly take $\mu_0 = 10^9$, which simplifies matters?

I have been much pleased in reading your paper on vector analysis in the last issue of The Electrician. You have

show a great benefit in advocating a system of vector algebra without quaternions. Especially when it comes about the linear operator, I see a very great advantage over Hamilton's treatment.

I apologise for the trouble which I have caused to you with my correspondence, and I propose to avail myself of your kindness in the future in order to submit to your judgment some other views of mine about electromagnetic theories

I am, Sir,

Yours most respectfully

John George