

# To Be Done With The Judgement of Anorgonomy

Paulo Correa & Alexandra Correa



© Correa & Correa, 2001, 2002. All Rights Reserved

**TO BE DONE WITH (AN)ORGONOMISTS:  
CONVERSATIONS WITH (HOPEFULLY!) THE LAST ONE**

**A complete response  
to J. DeMeo's attack on Aetherometry**

By

Paulo N. Correa, M.Sc., Ph.D. & Alexandra N. Correa, Hon. B.A.  
Aurora Biophysics Research Institute

© Paulo N. Correa & Alexandra N. Correa, 2001  
All rights reserved  
ISBN 1-894840-03-8

## In memoriam W. Reich

Teacher and Healer  
Founder of a Materialist Psychiatry  
Pioneer of Bioelectric Research  
Founder of a Bioenergetic Medicine  
Discoverer of Orgone and DOR  
Inventor of the OR Motor  
Founder of Functionalist Biophysics  
Dedicated antifascist

and the inspiration for these authors' work.

## CONTENTS

<b>I. Short and sweet introduction</b>	<b>p. 4</b>
<b>II. Long and severe rebuttal:</b>	
1. Regarding AS2-01: VERY basic nonelectric functions of the electroscope.	p. 6
2. Regarding AS2-02: On the aetherometric analysis of atmospheric electroscopes	p. 13
3. Regarding AS2-03: Critique of Reich's concept of an electroscopic OP.	p. 26
4. Regarding AS2-04: Electroscopic demonstration of reverse potentials of kinetic and electric energy flow	p. 30
5. Regarding AS2-05: The Reich-Einstein experiment and the thermal anomaly in ORACS	p. 37
6. Regarding AS2-06: Variation in the discharge rate of electroscopes inside the ORAC.	p. 44
7. Regarding S2-07: Decoding the thermal and nonthermal equivalents of the Org	p. 54
8. Regarding AS2-08: Photoinduced arrest of electroscopic discharge & the Hallwacks photoelectric effect	p. 56
9. Regarding AS2-09: The Allotropic cycle of oxygen, ozone & water: Foundations of Aetherochemistry	p. 60
<b>III. To be done with the judgement of Anorgonomy</b>	<b>p. 63</b>

"You don't believe that your friend could ever do anything great. You despise yourself in secret, even -- no, especially -- when you stand on your dignity; and since you despise yourself, you are unable to respect your friend. You can't bring yourself to believe that anyone you have sat at the table with, or shared a house with, is capable of [a] great [discovery]. [...] But when the discovery comes out in the newspaper, little man, then you believe it whether you understand it or not."  
W. Reich

## I. Short and sweet introduction

What follows, dear or undear reader, is a record of the authors' relationship with Dr. James deMeo, a relationship which lasted from 1996 to the present, and went from cautious distance to a recent encounter on the occasion of the authors' spontaneous invitation to demonstrate to Dr. deMeo their Aether Motor. While the encounter seemed to promise the evolution of a mature scientific and friendly relation, this would soon degenerate into a conflict that encapsulates not just the difference between the authors' aetherometric theory and Reich's orgonomic theory, but, still more to the point, the difference between the latter two theories and the anorgonomic caricature of Reich's work jointly manufactured by all self-styled orgonomists since his untimely death.

The reader would be ill-supplied if we simply provided Dr. deMeo's criticism of the first 8 monographs of Experimental Aetherometry along with our counter-criticism. These two documents are the end point of a road, and they arise in a specific context. Accordingly, we also provide, together with the present document, an e-mail archive of the pertinent exchanges between the authors and Dr. deMeo.

We thank Dr. deMeo for having given us this opportunity to examine in public our differences towards that which pretends to pass for Reich's Orgonomy, but is, at bottom, neither science nor intelligence of nature, but a mere slapstick collage by orgone soap-peddlers who most often cannot even read, let alone write. This is also an opportunity to present the issues of science behind what is, in effect, preventing the insights of Reich from being put to good use.

Dr. deMeo calls his critique of Experimental Aetherometry 'constructive'. Critique, however, is not critique if it is not destructive. And as for the declared 'constructive' element, it stands - in light of the actual content of his remarks - as a most cynical obfuscation of his document's intent. We shall not fault him for trying to be destructive of our work. After all, we now understand that this was the job he had determined to undertake, no matter what, without regard to the risk of being shown, in public, to be an incompetent evaluator by presenting a critique which lacks both the substance of any valid destruction and any attempt at being constructive. We do not intend, therefore, to engage in any further prolonged discussions with Dr. deMeo, since we consider, on this matter of physics, our response to be rather final.

We now realize we were mistaken about the possible openness of Dr. deMeo, which originally motivated us to invite him to attend that demonstration. His initial pledges of concrete support - as allies engaged in a common combat - were one by one withdrawn as he successively reneged on each and every of his offers. The attached archive of messages makes this plain enough.

We had, of course, hoped his criticisms would have been both *intelligently* destructive and *intelligently* constructive and made in the spirit of effectively addressing the theoretical issues raised in the aetherometric monographs, so that a fruitful dialogue could result. Instead, his so-called evaluation indulges in a neo-Reichian cheer-leader dress-down of our work, without ever bothering to concretely address those issues. What his 'critique' does demonstrate, and rather clearly at that, is a total lack of desire to read or even attempt to read and understand our work, which he instead chooses to distort in unbelievable ways.

It was with some sadness we realized the total waste of our efforts to provide a bridge to deMeo - given his ostensive and oft-professed desire to see Reich's work both clarified and recognized. But we were nonetheless happy to be provided with an occasion to do just what he had suggested, in a letter to us, that we should do: to name the idiocies of Reichianism and their authors. And this we will do - in our time and at our pace. For, as readers of Aetherometry have no doubt already remarked, it is our firm view that the so-called supporters of Reich's work, no less than its detractors, have contributed to the ongoing banalization and mystification which plagues its understanding.

We should also note that we had a presentiment of this outcome of our relationship with deMeo on the Friday night preceeding the planned demonstrations of our work on the PAGD, Reich and Aether Motors - for we had then a strong disagreement about his Saharasian theses which, in our view, basically confuse, distort and mystify the very distinct realities of savages, nomads, barbarians and civilized peoples - in the name of a politically-correct and ethnocentered genitalism, and a supposed love of women. Nevertheless, we assessed his openness as separate from his overt neo-FreudoMarxism - and hoped he would do likewise.

Now, however, we can better see what lies behind this genitalistic armor: the defense of another turf carved on the body of an imaginary despot, Reich-the-image. A shrine of detached, inscrutable relics oblivious to their origin, their trajectory or context. Where one still had a hope of finding an orgonomist, one found simply the last representative of a species that never succeeded in doing justice - even to the thought of its assumed despot.

If Reichianism were not weak in this infantile fashion, it would long ago have repeated, extended and completed the work of Reich, without falling into unspeakable mysticisms. And so, what follows is, in a sense, its epitaph.

## II. Long and severe rebuttal

### Regarding AS2-01:

#### VERY basic nonelectric functions of the electroscope.

DeMeo's critique begins almost well, were it not that he immediately sets a quasi-Newtonian tone, by referring the kinetoregenerative phenomenon to a problem of forces:

"(...) energy expended by this same charge gas to oppose the force of gravitation (...)"

or, even more starkly so,

"The author's postulate of an "antigravitational" force at work in the electroscope (...)"

Whereas the first statement is passable even if the proposed aetherometric treatment is based upon *energy*-affine concepts - such as positional work, opposition to gravitational potential and experimental determination of an angular momentum to pendular and (hidden) electroscopic oscillations - the second statement is an error, for there is no 'antigravitational force' per se at work, and none was invoked by the authors. On the contrary, the authors demonstrate that, in the absence of interfering factors which they isolate and study, there must be a physical treatment for the experimentally observed varying work performed against the local gravitational field by massbound monopolar charges trapped in the electroscope. Accepted physics considers the value of any gravitational positional energy at a given instant, as the totality of this energy, as if there were no need to invoke a constant energy flux that regenerated the kinetic energy of trapped charge when the deflection is arrested for prolonged periods. This bias is even betrayed by the notion that the electroscopic interaction of repulsion is an electrostatic one, as if the charges trapped were simply reacting in a static fashion, fixed on the surface of the leaf-system and with no kinetic energy associated with them. The combination of these two errors in perspective yields an essentially *static view of both electrical and gravitational interactions*, to the detriment of understanding *the dynamic fluxes* involved in both.

Indeed, integration of that positional work over time demonstrates that there is an experimental variation in angular momentum of the electroscopic leaf that has remained unaddressed to this day. Accepted physics proceeds as if there were no constant work which the electroscopic leaf, so to speak (since it is the trapped charges that perform the work), must perform against gravity. Lift your arm up, and find out, for yourself, how much energy is required to keep it extended while performing work against terrestrial gravity.

Harold Aspden put it best, when he addressed the problem of which force is a reaction to the weight of a bottle standing on a table, in his *The Law of Perpetual Motion*, when he defended his marvellous conclusion that "the table is under stress when that wine bottle sits on it, and it asserts an upward force on the bottle" (Phys Educ, 28:202, 1993). That is precisely the perspective we also assert here: if the table did not resist the weight of the bottle, the latter would simply go through it and fall to the ground. The table's reaction is not the result of an antigravitational force per se, but the expression of the work which those molecules of cellulose, lignin and fibrin must perform to prevent that bottle from

falling through them and to also preserve the integrity of that table. The work which those charges perform against local gravity is also a reaction to the weight of the leaf they deflect. In order to conserve themselves as charges, as monopolar massbound charges affected with a quantum of mass-energy, they employ the electrokinetic energy - that they were assigned with when the electroscope was charged - to perform work against local gravity. In the absence of a gravitational field, they would still endeavour to conserve their electrokinetic energy - and hence the electrostatic repulsion would be, in principle, perpetual. But in the presence of a gravitational field, they find another way to conserve both themselves - as massbound charges - and their electrokinetic energy, by picking up nonelectric and nonelectromagnetic energy from their environment. The reaction force is indistinctly an expression of the kinetic energy of the charges engaged in monopolar repulsion, but this kinetic energy has two distinct components, one electric, and the other antigravitic, the latter only existing and being made visible by the agency of the former, and for purposes of the conservation precisely of the former. We can therefore state that charges trapped in electrostatic repulsion act to conserve themselves and their electrokinetic energy term.

This is the essence of the experimental part of AS2-01. So, when deMeo writes that our concept of a kinetoregenerative phenomenon

"appears as a parallel concept to Reich's original discussions on the ES as being responsive to orgonotic influences, which was partly based on his observations of ES discharge-rate inhibition within orgone accumulators."

he is missing the entirety of the argument as well as its roots, since it arose precisely to *explain* the facts regarding electroscopic discharge arrests, which we observed both outside and inside ORACs, and which simply demanded an approach that - while precluded by the facts from being either electric or electromagnetic - necessarily had to address the problem of the counteraction of weight in a gravitational field. More importantly, deMeo's discourse ("ES discharge-rate inhibition") implies that the spontaneous discharge is a normal electroscopic function, almost the designated purpose of the electroscope, as if classical electrostatics did not assume that electrostatic repulsion was indefinite in principle, and the spontaneous discharge itself an anomaly (including the discovery of radioactivity by its employment). And thus he proceeds as if this 'in principle' of classical electrostatics did not hide the condition: 'in the absence of a gravitational field' - which is obviously not the case for any and every terrestrial electroscope.

But then he proceeds in another direction, one that he will weave over and over into a growing tissue of mysticism:

"However, the substitution of the mysterious force of gravity, in my view, provides no added clarity or insights into the problem as compared to Reich's discussions on *orgonotic charge*, or *orgone tension*. The mathematical validation of the basically mysterious nature of the electroscope is, however, a new approach to the matter."

But there is no 'substitution of the mysterious force of gravity'! This is simply a further excursion into the sloppiness with which deMeo began his tirade - by the concept of force.

As can be seen from the deMeo message archive, the authors have challenged him to produce evidence of what these mysterious 'orgone charges' are all about. The authors are convinced that, even though he is unable to confirm such an identity, his entire thinking

reveals that what he means by 'orgone charges' is massfree *negative* electric charges. And this is confirmed by the fact that deMeo takes recourse to Reich's notion of orgone tension, a notion which is precisely the analogue of the electric notion of varying concentrations of massbound monopolar charges affecting greater or smaller differences in electric potential. But the premises of such thinking are easily refuted, as we shall see ahead, and as we have written in our recent *Introduction to Experimental Aetherometry, Vol. I*:

"Reich measured the rates of decrease in potential over time to find that, when electroscopes are exposed to ORACs, these rates significantly slow down. This suggested to him that, whenever the local atmospheric tension is high, and the discharge rate decelerates, the deceleration could be understood as the electroscope being less able to discharge its own tension than it would were the local medium tension low. This guiding thought would be a very good concept if the spontaneous discharge of the electroscope were solely an electric process. Say, for example, that the 'orgone' charges trapped in the electroscope were negative electric charges and say, in principle, that they could be either massfree or massbound negative charges. If the local medium were an electric medium with a fluctuating local density of charges of the same polarity, then, whenever the density of negative charges in the medium increased, a negatively charged electroscope (charged with a definite value  $Q$ ) would take longer to discharge than the same charged electroscope would, if the local medium had a lower density of negative charges. One might correctly object that this would only be observed if the electroscope case were grounded since, if it were floating, it would then acquire the same charge density as the medium, and thus the same charge  $Q$  in the leaf-system would not elicit the same deflection. And one should also add that, if the local medium were to have a high enough density of those charges (negative in the present example) that exceeded the charge density of the leaf system (ie  $Q/V$ , where  $V$  is the volume where charge is trapped in the electroscope), then it should charge the electroscope with charge  $Q' > Q$ . All these facts are observed in our own experimental studies of the response of electroscopes to negative ion generators reported in AS2-02 and AS2-06. Leaf deflection on a negatively charged electroscope can be arrested by targeting the leaf-system with a stream of negative ions - bringing the fall of potential over time to zero, and demonstrating that the electric tension in the surrounding medium (occupied by the electric field of the negative ions) dramatically alters the rate of leaf fall. It would then be easy to imagine a sea of massfree negative charges ('orgone' as opposed to negative ions which are massbound charges) whose varying density affected the observed rate of leaf fall for a negatively charged electroscope. And if the density of this sea increased above the density of the negative charges trapped in the electroscope, then it could even charge it, so to speak, spontaneously."

"The problem with this interpretation is a simple one: if 'orgone charges' were monopolar electric charges (which they would have to be for such a model to work at all), in our example above, negative electric charges, in principle massfree, then it should be enough to expose a positively charged electroscope to the same locality (inside the ORAC) and measure not a slowing down of the rate of leaf fall, but the exact opposite, a correlated acceleration in the rate of leaf fall. This, however, is just simply not observed. All the arrests of the spontaneous discharge rate of the electroscope inside ORACs apply indistinctly to negative and positively charged electroscopes: the ORAC arrests both leakage and seepage."

"Reich's analogy with negative electricity is all the more insufficient as he himself claimed that 'orgone charges' were not particles of negative electricity. He was therefore stuck with either a useless duplication of the electric interaction or the creation of a new type of monopolar charge (as, for example, QED as done with color and the other 'properties' of quarks), but massfree (and thus unlike ions, which are massbound charge carriers). The contention of AS2-03 is precisely that, with the OP notion, Reich went down the wrong path in search of a measure of orgone energy, effectively reducing the question of orgone tension or 'orgone charge' density to a mere negative-copy of the electric explanation."

DeMeo proceeds as if none of these facts have any bearing whatsoever on why *the authors' theory is different from both Reich's and classical treatments of the electroscope*. He summarizes AS2-01 in the following confused manner:

"Reich's work on the Orgonomic Pendulum Law is also brought into discussion, with a final calculation that the mass-antigravitational energy output of the charged ES is 228 times greater than the raw electrical charges input. However, the calculations are based upon the original assumption of an antigravitation function which has not yet been established. No proof as such is presented in this one paper to demonstrate the author's postulated antigravitation function, at least in a manner that is any more specific than the very general theoretical indications which flow from Reich's orgonomy (ie, the general tenets of cosmic superimposition)."

The authors devised both an experimental and theoretical method to observe and analyze the kinetoregenerative phenomenon, in which:

1. Experimental evidence for the variation in electroscopic angular momentum of the deflecting gold leaf over time *is provided*;
2. A mathematical treatment of *the exact conversion of mass into length, extracted from Reich's Pendulum Experiments, is provided* (which neither deMeo or any other (an)orgonomist has to this day been able to provide, and which Reich left unwritten);
3. A treatment of graviton energy, its frequencies and wavelengths, is for the first time enunciated on the basis of the pendulum functions and the conversion of mass into wavelength (did Reich ever claim this?);
4. The experimentally measured *electroscopic angular momentum is rigorously shown to be a function of this graviton energy* (did Reich claim this?). Carnot's and Aspden's treatments of the pendulum are then applied to it;
5. Finally, since the electroscope leaf is composed of pure gold, the gold graviton frequency that was aetherometrically ascertained is applied to our experiments in order to determine *the exact kinetoregenerative energy* feeding the antigravitational work and calculate the power of its experimentally observed flux. It is obvious that Reich did not succeed in doing this, otherwise we would already have had an instrument capable of quantitating OR energy or its effect as 'latent heat' - not just fall in potential or positional work over time!

But instead of realizing these acute differences between Aetherometry and Reich's contentions, as well as those of classical physics, and being fair as to what he allocates to whom, deMeo simply asserts that "no proof" is presented, and that if one is presented at

all, it merely reduces to what flows from Reich's orgonomy... This is a tiresome old chant of the Maretts, the Oggs, the Bakers and other Reichians. As with Christians who ended up assimilating everything to the Christos, as, for example, Chardin - where even the energy of the universe was assimilated as merely the 'stuff' of the Spirit of the Christos - this is a procedure dear to those who refuse to admit to fundamental differences: on the one hand, the Correas have only repeated what Reich said; on the other, what the Correas say must be rejected because it is at variance with what Reich said.

Let us cross these t's right away: those who speak in this manner, do so because of their essential incapacity to understand or to admire others and their work, an incapacity which is always incapable of appreciating and affirming the distances. Moreover, the sign of their incapacity is precisely that they fail to realize *that science is above all a matter of looking at the old with new eyes*. Reich himself practiced this to an extreme degree - often neglecting to reference the work of others who investigated similar connections but did not seize them with the same eyes or conceptual rigor (a case in point is Le Bon), or taking resort to a phraseology that did not discriminate adequately (another case in point being the scant references to Tesla who described all of the original ambipolar energy phenomena and linked them to the energy of living systems). If one considers Reich's concept of orgone energy in its early days, one can easily see why he felt a need to rename the Aether: his renamed Aether was not static but dynamic; not inertial but imponderable and massfree; and its charges were distinct in nature from monopolar charges. But when Tesla speaks of an electric Aether, of statodynamic electricity, of an imponderable Aether, he is speaking about Reich's orgone long before the latter was conceived. Was Reich clearer than Tesla? In many respects yes - the Aether is not simply imponderable; it is also massfree - which from the start implies no relativistic constraints. But did Reich prove that orgone was not an electric Aether? Did he enunciate a theory of electric charge in ambipolar states? No, he did not. In fact, he discovered instead that orgone could not be functionally identical with the Aether, understood dynamically, because at least one other form of massfree aether energy also existed - DOR ('deadly orgone', as he would come to call it).

However, the deeper reason why deMeo refuses to understand the depth of the AS2-01 discovery of a kinetoregenerative phenomenon is precisely because he believes that there is nothing new anyone can discover with such an old piece of science as the electroscope. He forgets what Sydney Fox once stated regarding the essence of scientific discovery, precisely what constitutes any difference - in perception and thought - that suffices to qualify a discovery:

"Many results in science [...] illustrate an observation of the late Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, discoverer of vitamin C, to the effect that research is to see what everyone else has seen and to think what no one else has thought."

And where, then, does deMeo run to validate his supposedly Reichian position? To classical electrostatic theory which he, nevertheless, fails to comprehend. He writes:

"Simple charge-repulsion theory as per the classical viewpoint also appears quite valid, at this early part of the discussion where the orgone accumulator is not addressed. For example, a simple insulated metal plate, or an electroscope which has the deflection-leaf removed, can still be charged, and still exhibit a weather-dependent discharge rate, without any work being expended against gravitation per se. The "Charged Plate Monitor" instrument is based upon such a principle, and much of classical electrostatic theory relies upon measuring apparatus other than the electroscope."

If we understand this device properly, it is essentially an electrometer where the kinetic energy of the trapped charges is effectively replenished, thus masking the kinetoregenerative effect, precisely as we point out in several of our papers. Indeed, electrometers are only capable of measuring the flux of charge that needs to be supplied in order to compensate for charge loss in order to preserve the same potential of deflection, whether vertical or horizontal. Such devices cannot be used to study the kinetoregenerative phenomenon. And it is obvious why this is so. They are specifically designed to permit the constant 'purchase' of further electric energy that compensates for the loss of charge and its kinetic energy. Electrometers can never read anything other than neutralization currents; they cannot read, for example, the value of the kinetoregenerative power inferred from the rate of leakage, since this power, and its kinetic coupling to the trapped charges, are not electric!

DeMeo continues -

"I have an older electrostatic voltmeter in my lab which deflects a needle horizontally, rather than vertically, and therefore would not be subject to gravitational effects -- though the spring-action of the indicator needle might be equated with a gravitation function, in which case the work expended would be against the spring in this example."

Again: if there is no gravitational interaction in the apparatus, then the kinetoregenerative power cannot be measured or inferred. Such objections are experimentally invalid - precisely because they are nonsensical. If one is attempting to study the gravitational interaction of the electroscope, one obviously does not employ an electrometer, where this interaction is, by its very nature and by the nature of the electrometer, masked.

And finally what does deMeo propose?

"For what it is worth, my own investigations into the ES, from the standpoint of classical meteorology, suggests the cloud of charges around the electroscope are "trapped" by a "skin effect" of some sort, which governs their slow dissipation in a manner analogous to the way the water droplets inside clouds can be slowly (or rapidly) dissipated away into the surrounding open sky. When the "skin effect" of the atmosphere is strong, clouds will grow. When weak, clouds dissipate or do not form at all. This term, "skin effect" comes from classical meteorology, which (at least in the 1960s and 70s) acknowledged that thermodynamically-calculated rates of expected mixing of drier cloud-free air into saturated 100% RH clouds simply does not happen appreciably, and so there must be some force acting like a "skin" to provide a "membrane" around the clouds, to keep them together. There is no classical understanding of just what "skin effect" means -- but from the viewpoint of orgonomy, it is an expression of the water-attracting, self-attracting orgone charge within the cloud."

A tired old analogy with a quasi-classical concept that remains mysteriously undefined: a 'skin effect' that mechanistically selects how many negative charges exit or enter the electroscope and which varies for 'gimme that straw!' as a 'function' of the equally mysterious 'orgone charge' - blissfully devoid of any defined physical and mathematical characteristics. It could be an arbitrary act of God, insulating more power to one cloud than to the next. Of course, deMeo forgets that the concept of a skin barrier has long existed in modern physical theory in the form of the potential barrier which electrons must overcome to produce the Hallwachs effect at the electroscope. But any weather-induced or humidity-related variations in this surface barrier need not concern us here - precisely because *the kinetoregenerative phenomenon is a physical property found at the antipodes*

*of photoelectric emission.* So, this 'skin' notion is simply thrown into the arena for apparent lack of anything better, to see if it sticks somewhere.

"The same theoretical approach might be applied to the electroscope, based upon the observation that ES discharge rate is slowed in an accumulator, and speeded by a dor-buster'

How this notion of an undefined membrane is now gingerly applied to electroscopes, ORACs and DOR-busters must remain a mystery, for initiates only...But there is more, for we are suddenly credited with -

" an excellent theoretical discussion on the inherent anomalous nature of the electroscope, but this is founded upon the examination only of electroscopes which yield a measurement by virtue of charge working against gravitational forces. It is understood, however, that this paper is primarily providing the groundwork for later discussions and proofs."

Even though the reader will not know, from reading deMeo's evaluation, what, if anything, was positive about AS2-01, this statement is offered in order to make the critique 'constructive'...The qualifier -

"but this is founded upon the examination only of electroscopes which yield a measurement by virtue of charge working against gravitational forces"

is even more amusing, inasmuch as *all* known electroscopes conserve both their charges and the electrokinetic energy affected to these trapped charges precisely by acquiring from the medium the energy they require to perform work against the local gravitational field. That is a fact, since no one has ever studied, even on NASA missions, electroscopic responses in the absence of a gravitational field.

DeMeo completely fails to realize what the objective of AS2-01 was: to provide a methodology for analyzing the nonelectric energy component of the electroscopic interaction in the presence of a local gravitational field, without falling into gratuitous electric reductionism unwarranted by the experimental facts.

**Regarding AS2-02:  
On the aetherometric analysis of atmospheric electroscopes**

Here, deMeo's assessment begins with an eulogy - another disingenuous sign of a false positivity! -

"The electroscopes calibration sections, comparing encased and open, negative and positive-charged electroscopes, grounded and ungrounded, are excellent."

For soon enough, in the very next sentence in fact, this eulogy of our methodology becomes nothing more than a convenient springboard for an unreferenced eulogy of himself:

"I have not seen such material published before, but do know some of this kind of study has been undertaken by others (for example, myself) with roughly similar but not identical empirical observations."

Perhaps he could tell us and the (ever so shrinking) reading public *where* he, or, for that matter, Reich or any of his self-proclaimed followers, ever even discussed, let alone proceeded to analyze, the spontaneous discharge rates of identical, paired outdoor electroscopes charged respectively with positive and negative electricity? **Dear reader, it never happened.** And this is what deMeo and others are now scrambling to obscure: the gaping hole we have uncovered in the comfortable, 'common-sense' Reichian discourse surrounding electroscopic function. But rather than acknowledge the importance or the novelty of the experimental aetherometric analysis, deMeo slides, instead, into a most disingenuous attempt to plug that hole with some 'fast-setting cement' - no matter how unfounded, undocumented, and filled with obscure innuendo of 'rough similarities'. And equally essential - lest deMeo leave any impression in the mind of his followers that Aetherometry might somehow provide a scrap of information worthy of consideration - is the note that these elusive observations he cites are "not identical" empirically.

The next sentence he offers is a complete nonsequitur:

"On p.16, Figure 11 graph shows two days of ES measurements -- the second day of measurements clearly shows a problem which I will bring up again later, of the absence of significant measurements for a period of around 10 hours in the AM."

And what problem is that? deMeo never tell us: he contents himself with drawing the attention of the incautious reader to a problem that is imaginary. In light of our argument, it is quite irrelevant that on the second day of that graph an early morning measurement could not be made (and thus that a gap of 8 hours occurred which does not exist in the same Figure for the previous day). There was, however, one measurement performed near 4 am. The leakage and seepage rates still peaked at midnight and slowed erratically in the afternoon. Further, if one applied this specious argument of deMeo's to Reich's work, one would need to throw that work out entirely. For example, on pages 138-139 of *The Cancer Biopathy*, where Reich produces 11 graphs of daily variations in the speed of atmospheric spontaneous electroscopic discharges, all of these graphs begin at 8 am and finish at 11 pm. There is a daily gap of 10, sometimes 11 hours. In other words, half of every day is missing - not simply one third of one day on one day! It is ridiculous to reason this way through the data. And it is specious. Yet, one of the reasons why our data

always incorporated at least two points during the nighttime was precisely this gap in Reich's work. Further note that the spontaneous electroscopic discharge also and always accelerates into the night and morning, as a function of increasing humidity - or the process of cooling that increases that humidity - and that *the critical core of this study is the investigation of what decelerates that spontaneous discharge during daytime, not what decelerates it into the night, and which has long been known to be an apparent function of increasing humidity.*

DeMeo, however, is undeterred in his constructiveness: he next moves, in the same breath, to an analysis of the hidden variables identified by the authors:

"Some of the more simple and direct conclusions from these data -- that cloud cover and increased RH correlate with an increased ES discharge rate -- is not under question, but other conclusions given later on are affected by the absence of morning data. I merely point it out here, as the graphs are sufficiently expanded on this figure to show the problem in a clear way."

This is the most insidious of deMeo's tacks - the repeated insistence that there is a problem of missing data, that this deficiency covers the morning hours, and that this coverage is systematic. All this from one half-figure and one daily instance, which he continues to expand by innuendo. It suffices to look at the subsequent Fig.s 15 and 16 to see full around-the-clock coverage for another two days!!

DeMeo next objects to our experimental demonstrations that variations in humidity and temperature do not appear to be causal with respect to the observed accelerations or decelerations of the spontaneous electroscopic discharge, because they often lag behind the latter. He objects that these factors are not co-variants of a more fundamental function, and sticks to the classical perspective that humidity is a causal factor:

"On p.21, the authors challenge the causality of RH in the ES discharge rates: *"Therefore the spontaneous discharge parameter V/h is parallel to and covariant with the %RH parameter. We take care in making this statement and avoiding any suggestion of causation, since it is a commonly held opinion that it is the variation in relative humidity which provokes the variation in spontaneous electroscopical discharge."* Much emphasis is placed upon imprecise diurnal variations in both RH and ES parameters, *"that complete arrest of leakage or seepage rates... occurs either before or coincidentally with the driest ambient air [with]... no absolute correlation between the values of %RH at which arrest occurs and the occurrence of the arrest itself. This evidently indicates that the variation in electroscopical discharge is not caused by the variation in the relative humidity, but is covariant with it as a function of a still unknown atmospheric parameter or set of parameters."* While I also am convinced there are other parameters besides RH which affect electroscopes, the author's [sic] conclusion suggests no major or even minor role of RH, and on this I would strongly disagree. "

What the authors did, in fact, was limit themselves to verifying a phenomenologically apparent lack of causation in what regards the deceleration of those spontaneous discharge rates. Moreover, only a very bad reading of these texts could suggest that the authors have not put forth a mechanism whereby the avidity of water for latent heat plays a substantial role in withdrawing from charge trapped in a conductor access to that pool of environmental energy. To state, as deMeo does, that water-vapor plays no role in the authors' experiments and theory is simply a gratuitous untruth. While one may not necessarily ascribe a malevolent intent to his remark, it certainly springs, at the very least, from a strikingly poor and careless reading of the monograph.

Then comes the insinuation that our data just does not have the resolution required to support our conclusions regarding the existence of local hidden variables responsible for the deceleration of the spontaneous discharge of electroscopes:

"Regarding the ES data which is referenced for this conclusion, it is not taken at sufficiently precise intervals over the entire course of the day, nor of any sufficient number of days, nor even taken at the same times of the graphed RH data, as to make any such discussion of causality, or lack thereof, highly premature. I would suggest to re-draft Figures 17B and 18B as two-way plots showing only RH and ES parameters, as the time-of-day parameter is too unsystematic, with too many missing data, to give the 3-way scatter-plot the legitimacy and significance the authors impart to it."

In this 88-page monograph, the authors dedicate one paragraph to the (inverse) correlation between relative humidity and leakage and seepage rates for a 9-day period, and one sentence to the 3-way scatter plots. All to make a simple point, shown best in Figs. 17A and 18A, that the discharge rate factually accelerates into the night and early morning and decelerates between midday and night, almost parallel to relative humidity which increases into the evening, night and early morning, and decreases into the mid-afternoon, but with a slight shift. That there is such a lag of RH with respect to the electroscope is easily understood from a functional standpoint: if the deceleration of the discharge is evidently induced by solar radiation, and if the same radiation is responsible for decreasing humidity with increasing heat (sensible and latent), then the response of the electroscope to that radiation is a much more immediate one than the response of water-vapor, which is necessarily cumulative and ponderous, and therefore slower. All the slower, even, as it involves the intermediate agency of sensible and latent heats.

DeMeo continues:

"What kind of RH meter did they use to make these measurements, and why were they not coordinated with the times when the ES discharge rates were made? Why does there appear to be more RH data than ES data?"

Why does deMeo insist on *not* reading - glossing over our statement (on page 21) that calibrated identical dial hygrometers were employed for these studies?

As can be seen from a careful examination of Figs. 17 and 18, and the description of the methodology employed for assessing the spontaneous discharge, the time markers for the electroscopic measurement are centered within the 1 or 2 hour period employed for the determination, whereas the RH data are instantaneous readings. For the most part we could center the readings to obtain perfect temporal coincidence between RH and electroscopic data points (and only those were employed in the 3-way scatter plots), but it was not always possible to anticipate when and where leaf fall was to be scored or could be scored. The methodology also implies that a data point taken, say, at 09:00 might have been the result of a discharge measurement that either began at 08:30 and finished at 09:30, or began at 08:00 and finished at 10:00.

Returning to deMeo, who has failed to grasp the exact details of the methodology employed:

"Regarding the author's [sic] observation that the trend of the RH data in Fig. 18C is fairly flat, but the regression line of ES data in Fig. 18D and 18E are slowly progressing upwards, I note their ES data for those extended periods is rather sparse, with only a few data points per day, and some days with no

apparent data points -- it therefore would be valid to compare their ES data only with similar days and times of measurements for the RH data."

DeMeo is correct, there are in Figs 18D and E a total of 4 days in that monthly period that have either two data points or none at all, but all other days carry 6 or more data points (often juxtaposed in the graph due to compression of the X-axis), and we contend that the data is sufficient to present a trend that is not observed in the RH data of Fig. 18C. Again, these readings and their frequency were made to be as coincident as possible.

Except for an interruption of one day in a monthly period, RH measurements were taken regularly every 2-4 hours, and the electroscopic discharges were cumulative, even where points are not apparent, since they were carried on continuously around the clock without any interruption other than to reset the electroscope back to its charged state when the lower limits of the proportional discharge region were reached. If there had been any sudden accelerations of the discharge, the data would have shown it most indubitably.

Next, deMeo asks:

"Did they use an electronic humidity recorder at their lab for these measurements, and was it placed in the same location as where the ES measurements were taken?"

DeMeo should know by now that we are great adherents of manual labour and seeing with our own eyes. That is why we have never bothered with fancy thermistors or electronic humidity sensors, since *they simply are not reliable under a variety of conditions*. In fact, we have a great deal of contempt for researchers that resort to ill-proven methods of detection and discard the tried-and-true basic tools, because they are afraid of hard work and would rather be seen as fancy dons. Maybe this misplaced sophistication is from the outset both a defense for their incompetence and an excuse for their failure.

"Perhaps I am missing something, but the author's [sic] appear to suggest, if one is to enclose an electroscope inside an enclosed aquarium, and mechanically increase the humidity inside (by introduction of wet rags, etc.) but keep temperature stable, that this would not affect the discharge rate. Have they performed such a control experiment for RH?"

Why should the authors conduct a control experiment on a notion which deMeo erroneously obtained - that the authors supposedly contend that relative humidity does not affect the electroscopic discharge, when the authors themselves discuss the tug of war that water-vapor and trapped charges undertake in order to capture sensible and latent heats??

DeMeo is not so much missing something as he is creating something that does not exist - pulling it out of thin air. Of course, all other conditions being equal, a greater humidity will accelerate the rate of discharge! But *that does not prove by any stretch of the imagination that the diurnal variation in the electroscopic spontaneous discharge is caused by humidity fluctuations, nor that decreased humidity by itself explains the observed decelerations of the spontaneous discharge or its arrest*. It may well be caused by precisely that which causes those humidity fluctuations! No more and no less.

And what if the authors had not conducted such an experiment? DeMeo answers:

"Because if not, based upon what is presented so far, their rejection of the classical model relating RH to ES discharge rates is unfounded. I am no advocate of the strict classical meteorological

model, but I don't believe one can be successful in reforming that model, or introducing a new model, without a more rigorous addressing of RH and water parameters. Humidity is such an all-encompassing parameter which ties back with organotic thermal and evaporative phase-change anomalies (when RH is measured by dry-bulb versus wet-bulb), and with atmospheric electrical parameters (when RH is measured by electronic devices based upon conductivity-resistivity) -- consider the roles here of electrostatics related to cloud droplet size, surface tension parameters and humidity, and one will find a set of natural phenomenon where all of these parameters join together."

Precisely the set of natural *phenomena* (plural!) observed by these authors - temperature, relative humidity, variations in electroscopic leakage and seepage discharge rates, etc - including the drawing action of clouds and cloud-formation, is what is tied in by Vol. 1 of Experimental Aetherometry to the action of latent heat. Curiously enough, here again, DeMeo takes refuge in classical meteorology, rather than following the trail laid by Reich - where humidity is considered to vary as a function of the atmospheric concentration of orgone energy. One is left wondering what is the use and physical reality of the concept of orgone energy - as the CFP of all atmospheric parameter variations - in the thinking of deMeo. And he is, perhaps, the most open-minded amongst (an)organomists...Indeed, deMeo here proves that he has not understood one iota of the notion that temperature and humidity are inversely correlated because they are the result of the diurnal variation in solar radiation, irrespective of whether a cross correlation of temperature and humidity yields a regression curve that is or not perfectly straight.

Next, he writes -

" When I look at their Figures 20A & 20B, it seems to be a fairly straightforward temperature-humidity relationship. The variance from the mean observed in Fig.20B might well be the product of variations in absolute humidity for different air masses during the period of measurement."

But what follows is surprising from someone who claims to be an expert cloudbuster:

"On page 29, the authors state *"it is most likely the conversion of solar energy into atmospheric thermal energy that drives humidity upwards [in altitude?] in the atmosphere, and is therefore responsible for the dryness of the outdoor air coinciding with the highest ambient temperature."* In fact, humidity is never "driven upward" in a manner that significantly lowers RH at the surface, except as contrasted against an atmospheric inversion, where both heat and moisture get trapped close to the surface."

The results of Fig. 20B clearly indicate that, in the summer period studied, diurnally lower RH at the ground inversely correlates with increased temperature. These are experimental facts - impossible to quibble with. The phenomenon can easily be observed in HP cells, and is seen also to correlate with the typical appearance of Cumulus humilis clouds around midday in such systems. It is therefore likely that the drying of ground atmosphere brought about by the conversion of solar energy into atmospheric sensible and latent heats, leads to an upward circulation of water-vapor as heating of the ground surface creates rising air currents - and this leads to cloud formation, as the rising air expands and cools to reach its dewpoint. Precisely in 'atmospheric inversions' humidity would be unable to rise and this inverse correlation with temperature would not be observed. DeMeo has, in fact, got it all wrong.

Moreover, since the latent energy of water-vapor ultimately comes either from the sensible heat it has absorbed - as in the steam engine or in the dry-incubator effect - or from the conversion of solar radiation and its re-radiation from the earth, as in cloud-formation, it is easy to demonstrate that in the atmosphere this is a cyclic process driven by solar radiation:

deMeo is now arguing with the obvious - that which we experimentally confirm and has long been known to climatology and meteorology - and which anyone can confirm with a wee bit of dedication to the subject-matter:

"The atmosphere as a whole acts like a steam engine [as] heating is effected at high-pressure on the surface of the ground (...). (...) The heat used to evaporate water remains in the water-vapour molecule as 'latent heat', which is liberated when the water-vapour condenses again [ to form clouds or fog] (...). (...) For the earth as a whole, the average heat transfer is upward. (...) We can say that global evaporation is the largest consumer of the available radiation energy. (...) Heat radiation (...) from the surface of the earth heats the air above it and evaporates water. Both processes (...) use nearly 30% of the available solar energy" (Flohn, H (1969) "Climate and Weather", World University Library, pp. 22, 27, 33, 36, 38).

But wait, deMeo is about to tell us that the anomalous arrest of the electroscopic discharge - which Reich himself considered critical for his demonstration of orgone energy - is merely a mechanical effect:

"The dryness of air at the hottest time of day is considered to be a straightforward mechanical result, of temperature driving %RH lower, even while there is a constant absolute humidity."

He is correct in assuming that this is a possibility - increasing air temperature can drive %RH lower while absolute humidity remains constant. But the difference between the dry and wet thermometers of a psychrometer must thereby increase, such that the dewpoint also remains constant. Is this, however, what happens? The authors' study in question did not employ psychrometer data - as did some of the other monographs - and thus there is no way for these authors to prove that this is what was, or was not,,happening in those 9 days of Fig. 20B. However, the authors have also conducted extensive psychrometer studies, and those indicate something entirely different from that which deMeo suggests above.

Relative humidity is the ratio of water-vapor pressure recorded by the measuring instrument, to saturated vapor pressure. It yields %RH when the ratio is expressed as a percentage. 100% RH means that air is saturated and cannot hold any more moisture. %RH is therefore a measure of the capacity of air to hold water-vapor. The dewpoint is the temperature at which air is saturated with water-vapor - ie 100%RH occurs - and thus cannot hold any more moisture. If air at a given temperature and, for example, with 50%RH, is cooled, relative humidity will increase to 100% until the dewpoint is reached, at which point the water-vapor will condense to form fog.

Absolute humidity however, is a direct measure of the the vapor pressure of water - expressed either in mm Hg, or in kg/kg of dry air, or still as the density of water-vapor, in gm/cubic meter of dry air. As these measures depend upon air pressure - and will change with height - they are typically replaced, respectively, by the measures of specific humidity, and the 'mixing ratio' of water-vapor to dry air, typically in gm/kg.

Now, before we consider what actually happens on typical bright sunny days, let us consider what deMeo is trying to say. He is not arguing that it is the partial pressure of water-vapor which mechanically rules the rate of electroscopic discharge, decelerating it as the vapor pressure falls and accelerating it while it rises. Rather, he is arguing that the

observed deceleration of the electroscopic discharge around midday at ground level, and under direct exposure to solar radiation, is merely a result of increased capacity of ambient air to hold more water-vapor simply because of increased air temperature, while absolute humidity would remain constant. It is this that he calls a mechanical effect. But, if that were the case, then the deceleration of the rate of spontaneous electroscopic discharge would essentially be caused by sensible heat. Notice that these authors have experimentally controlled for this possibility in AS2-08, with electroscopes experiments performed inside a dry-incubator, and that, even though rates were decelerated with respect to control electroscopes, the decelerations were not of an intensity comparable to those observed in atmospheric electroscopes directly exposed to solar radiation through the atmosphere. *A fortiori*, they were much weaker than the decelerations or arrests observed inside ORACs.

For water-vapor pressure to mechanically cause the accelerations and decelerations of the electroscopic discharge, these should be shown to follow variations in absolute humidity or, better still, in specific humidity. The authors have not conducted such a study, and such a possibility exists, inasmuch as the authors have also found that variations in absolute humidity typically occur prior to those in relative humidity. Yet, this is not deMeo's argument. His argument assumes that absolute humidity does not vary - only the thermal capacity of the atmosphere to hold water-vapor.

This, however, is not what we have observed in unpublished studies that employed dew and wet thermometer readings and specifically addressed the moisture problem in the context of HP cells or bright sunny weather. Diurnal decreases in absolute humidity during good weather were regularly observed at midday, which can only be attributed to solar radiation and the energetic conversions that it deploys. However, absolute humidity would begin rising diurnally well before the electroscopic discharge decelerated or even arrested, indicating further that absolute humidity is not a causative factor of the diurnal deceleration.

Clearly, the facts simply contradict deMeo's contentions.

The most curious part of this mimicry of classical positions undertaken by deMeo is that, in fact, he is a reductionist more than he follows Reich. What he says next is simply amazing - so filled is it with mechanicism:

"Consequently, any linkage observed between solar energy and ES parameters is most clearly linked to the RH-lowering effect. To claim that diurnal effects of ES discharge are the consequence of solar factors (other than temperature-humidity effects) demands a precise controlling of RH, and that hasn't been done."

DeMeo says that, since he postulates that at midday absolute humidity has not changed from morning levels, the observed solar-induced arrest of electroscopic leakage and seepage is merely a mechanical effect of the increased heat driving down relative humidity. The demonstration of such a possibility is strictly incumbent upon him - one cannot object to the FACTUAL lag we observed between relative humidity and the electroscopic discharge rate, by assuming the veracity of something that is merely a possibility. Where are the data for deMeo's assertion?

Moreover, if the 'mechanical' relative humidity effect is driven by increased temperature and thus by increased sensible heat, then is deMeo not admitting that the variations in

relative humidity lag behind the variations in temperature? So why should they not also lag behind what causes these variations in temperature, and equally behind the reactions of any other device - such as the electroscope - which responds to solar radiation?

Even more to the point - what need indeed does deMeo's critique have of any concept of orgone energy? If the electroscopic response is all about sensible heat and relative humidity as causes (that is what he claims), rather than as covariant factors (that is what we claim), then why the mystical recourse to undefined 'orgone charges' and 'skin effects' that have never been shown physically nor analyzed mathematically? DeMeo's critique resembles more an IRS inquiry, a fishing expedition, than a scientific evaluation by a reader who knows and understands what the authors are speaking about.

Again, he returns to the insinuation of missing data:

"The Pressure-Temperature-Humidity graphs on p.32-33, Fig.22C & 22D shows a relationship, well enough, though the problem of missing morning data is apparent -- the curves would likely cross in a dramatic manner if those data had been added, as the lowest temperatures and highest humidities would be just before dawn, assuming no introduction of a new air mass with different properties.

This is specious. Just what relationship do the cited graphs show 'well enough'? As deMeo omits to state, the relationship concerns the structure for High-Pressure cells claimed by the authors.

And what curves would cross in 'a dramatic manner' that do not cross already, since the graphic pairing of the Y ordinates is arbitrary? Indeed, what are the missing points this time? The gap in the daily data is typically of 7 to 8 hours, with a point typically at midnight or 1 am, and a point at 7 to 8 am. Is there any actual objective need for more points than those employed to prove the pattern and the crossing of the curves? What one concludes from these irrelevant remarks is that deMeo has made the destruction of our findings a personal matter - a vendetta for unknown reasons which the authors suspect are far from being noble. He no longer cares which theory he will invoke to object to Aetherometry or to our findings. Whatever can be used and stretched to make his attack appear to be a scientific posture, will do.

This posture of deMeo is all the more curious - as Reich never conducted any study of either relative or absolute humidity or of its effects upon electroscopic discharges (nor has deMeo ever published such a study, if he ever conducted it!), and has failed to realize exactly what it was that we were doing and saying.

Moreover, deMeo disregards entirely the experimental correlation - shown by the authors - of relative humidity, temperature, and leakage or seepage rates of atmospheric electroscopes in prolonged, nearly stationary High-Pressure cells, which Reich had described as the first general characteristic of "integrated orgonotic weather functions", based on the observation that "the curves of the barometer (...), electroscopic discharge rate, and temperature differences [inside ORACs] run basically parallel" (Orgone Energy Bulletin, II(#4):185, 1950). Instead of learning from Reich about covariation, deMeo writes:

"Likewise, they are attributing great significance to pressure-cell parameters related to ES discharge, for which I cannot see any causality involved. The pressure readings would depend largely how close one was geographically to the center of nearby high or low pressure vortices, which would by

themselves have definable (but variable) temperature, humidity and cloud parameters. If one were a hundred miles to the east or west of the current measuring location, the peaks and valleys of the pressure curve might shift to the right or left on the graph by several hours, without appreciable affect upon local temperature or humidity factors -- absolute humidity and the "mixing ratio" (grams of moisture per kilogram of air) remains fairly constant over broad areas dominated by a given air mass, irrespective of temperature, while pressure can vary greatly. One could thereby have similar ES discharge patterns over a large geographic region which would have fairly large pressure and temperature changes. So I cannot see the significance of this argument. My thinking is still bothered by the above-mentioned problem with RH, and so these added steps seem only to compound the problem."

Here, deMeo does not so much fail to realize the correlation of barographic variations with the temperature, RH and electroscopic discharge rate variations, shown in Fig.s 22C-E, as he indulges in confusion - intimating that the authors argue for some form of baroscopic causality, which they obviously don't. What the authors contend is that there are distinct baroscopic patterns that go hand in hand with the temperature and relative humidity patterns characteristic of HP cells. What would be the point of keeping of a record of the baroscopic fluctuations if not precisely to provide a method to locate in time our laboratory with respect to passing cells and their gradients? What matters is that, *at our location*, as the cells passed and, in particular, as an HP cell lingered over that location, these baroscopic correlations were observed. And the data further demonstrates that there is a diurnal cyclic structure to those HP cells. That was the point, and may likely be precisely the hallmark of those cells.

Moreover, the onus is on deMeo to prove his speculation that one could have similar electroscopic discharge rates and diurnal patterns 'over a large geographic region which would have fairly large pressure and temperature changes', since that was never the scope of our work in this monograph. But we wager, from our studies and our knowledge of the subject, that as his electroscopes would spatially traverse from an HP cell region to the region of an LP cell, he would observe not only very different temperatures and humidities, but also very different rates of spontaneous electroscopic discharge. His hypothetical is not only gratuitous but, in fact, contrary to what is observed when one remains fixed at the same location as the cyclonic and anti-cyclonic cells pass above.

And since there are no critical points that he has succeeded in making - not in our view, that is - deMeo's next commentary succeeds in saying positively nothing:

"The above critical points would also provide a fairly simple understanding for similar data variance scatter-plotted on Figs.23 through 28. During the cloudbusting work, I often look for a shift from data points low on a temperature-RH plot towards data higher up on the curve, as an indication of an absolute increase in moisture."

This is meaningless gibberish. First of all, only Fig.s 22-26 involve temperature and %RH. Secondly, whereas before deMeo was arguing that electroscopic discharge deceleration is caused mechanically by increased sensible heat driving %RH down while assuming absolute humidity to remain constant, he now banalizes our findings of a correlation of electroscopic deceleration with increased temperature and decreased %RH as an indication of an increase in absolute humidity, as something he 'often looks for' in his cloudbusting work...

But it gets worse:

"On p.42, as a preface to "Hidden atmospheric variables of solar origin", the authors state that ES discharge rates share various correlations with temperature, humidity, and pressure, but assert "*This correlation is not causal*". I would agree that temperature and pressure are not causal, but that humidity is causal (though not exclusively so), as per my points above. However, by dismissing these variables, the authors derive the conclusion that there must be another hidden variable of solar origin. I would agree that Reich's concepts of *orgonotic tension* and *orgonotic lumination* are possible candidates here, as both appear to have a solar correlation as well, but my impression is the authors do not have these concepts in mind."

It is clear that deMeo wants humidity to be a causal factor - when in fact, it is driven, like the other factors, by solar radiation. Absolute humidity presents no less a diurnal variation than does relative humidity, and while their diurnal cycles are modulated by cloud-systems and fog in cyclonic systems, they are rather pristine in HP cells. Moisture, like sensible heat and pressure, is a parameter ultimately driven by solar radiation.

Our own findings are, in this respect, totally in agreement with Reich's conclusions:

"If the radiation in question [ie orgone energy] were directly connected with solar energy, then many phenomena could be easily explained. (...) Furthermore, [orgone] is radiated into the atmosphere by the sun and is therefore present everywhere." ("Cancer Biopathy", Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1973 edition, pp. 87, 89)

But deMeo grasps none of this - nor even that the authors are in the process of demonstrating that this hidden variable of solar origin responsible for decelerating the spontaneous electroscopic discharge is orgone energy, and that it locally generates 'latent heat', through which medium it acts to feed the kinetoregenerative phenomenon. As the reader can see for him or herself in the appended messages archive, deMeo does not even recognize - and refuses to consider - that orgone energy, or energy *tout court* for that matter, carries and entails physical functions such as frequency and wavelength, and necessarily composes a spectrum.

As will be made apparent below, under the AS2-05 rubric, this same deMeo, however, proceeds - like any other classical or modern physicist does (no originality here) - on the assumption that the energy which comes from the sun is electromagnetic! He seems unable to grasp that *Aetherometry shares with Reich's Orgonomy precisely the contention that the sun does not emit any electromagnetic energy*, and thus not any heat, and that its radiation spectrum encompasses both OR and DOR energy. (We note, however, that when Reich wrote the words cited above, he did not yet know of the existence of DOR).

So when deMeo at last attempts to attribute a role to 'energy', he does not even speak of solar radiation, but of 'orgonotic tension' and 'orgonotic lumination' as candidates to replace the solar-sourced hidden variable which we painstakingly teased out. But orgonotic tension, defined as it stands to this day as a mere analogy of the concentration of electric charges of one polarity or the other, is a useless chimeric notion - precisely as we discuss and demonstrate in AS2-02 and AS2-06. One should instead, and more appropriately, speak of varying densities or concentrations of OR and DOR energies in the atmosphere, as indirectly manifested by their electromagnetic and 'latent heat' effects. Furthermore, 'orgonotic lumination' is an even less desirable notion to replace solar radiation, since whatever it is that light consists of, is not what OR and DOR consist of. DeMeo, in fact, is completely ignorant of how OR and DOR produce light, and which light it is that each produces.

Instead, he resorts to the notion that humidity is a causal factor, forgetting that while high humidity undoubtedly accelerates the spontaneous discharge rate, low humidity, by itself, cannot bring about discharge arrest. This is precisely what is observed in dry incubators, where relative humidity can be made to decrease with increasing temperature, and thus where the mechanical phenomenon described as such by deMeo is operational in the absence of a decrease in absolute humidity: no arrest of the electroscopic discharge is seen in any manner comparable to that observed outdoors under the sun or, even better, inside an ORAC.

These are the facts which we have unearthed, not some half-baked anorgonomist!

DeMeo's discourse subtends a stubborn mechanistic inclination - to make humidity a causal factor, which he mystically justifies as the affinity of orgone (whose functional definition he is patently unable to articulate) for water. Determined to remain oblivious to the functions of solar massfree radiation trapped in the atmosphere, and to stick to the secondary effects as if they were causes (such as the concentration of water-vapor and the capacity of water-vapor to 'absorb orgone'), it is little wonder that knowledge of Orgonomy has not managed to progress since Reich's untimely death.

Instead, out of the spectacle and parody of Orgonomy rose the chapels of Anorgonomy, entirely devoted to journalistic confusionism:

"The discussion of solar protons, relativistic electrons, solar x-rays and flares is interesting, and in some ways mirror studies by others on the mechanism of solar-terrestrial phenomena. However, for those solar phenomenon [sic] which affect the entire earth in total, as with their figures comparing solar x-rays to weather events and ES measurements at their laboratory, the causality being argue [sic] cannot be true, because it implies that all places on earth should experience similar effects simultaneously, which is never going to be the case. When there is high pressure, dry and warm weather in the Toronto region, with one reaction at the electroscope, other places will assuredly be low-pressure, wet and cold with an opposite electroscopical reaction, all during the same epochs of solar variance. It is true that big solar flares can "oranurize" the entire planetary energy system -- we have seen that happen the last several years alone during the peak of the sunspot cycle, with global pressure cell variances temporarily being exaggerated to extremes as a consequence (heat waves and storm intensities both increasing, as the energy becomes highly excited) -- and perhaps a long-term study of ES discharge rates would show a reaction to this during both high-pressure dry and low-pressure wet conditions. But is *oranur* what the authors are referring to? I don't believe so, as they don't ever say it. Their claim, as I understand it, is for a common solar factor which specifically drives both pressure and temperatures higher, and both humidity and ES discharge rates lower. This is not proven by their data, however, and remains speculative."

DeMeo here exhibits his propensity towards absurd acrobatic somersaults. The authors are obviously well aware that the effect of solar ionizing radiation, whether electric or electromagnetic, exhibits a diurnal variation for practically all terrestrial localities, *as a function of location and time*. The weather map running at the base of Fig.s 30A and B, is clearly a local map. But what it does raise is precisely the notion that, independently of the diverse distribution of cyclonic and anticyclonic cells on the atmospheric 'surface', the terrestrial atmosphere has a unity of function in response to ionizing radiation that is solar sourced (and, at that, related essentially to solar flares), independent, indeed, from local coordinates of temperature, pressure and humidity, but responsible, indeed, for trans-local trends in their variation. That was the suggestion and the thought that went with it!

By the time deMeo begins to realize the scope of the problem, though in a distorted and static manner, he decides to proceed by introducing the notion that the ionizing radiations we studied are all part of an Oranur effect! He then wonders why the authors have not introduced such a notion, when, at this stage of our aetherometric presentation, Oranur has not yet been discussed at all. Since he has decided to take this tack, it is as good a moment as any other to contend simply and openly that orgonomists, deMeo included, have no idea of what Oranur actually is. If Oranur - as Reich claimed - is caused by the conversion of OR into DOR upon exposure of high concentrations of OR energy to nuclear radiation (NR), then, as we have begun to demonstrate in monographs AS2-08 and AS2-09, and will continue up to AS2-17, the physical effect referred to as 'DOR' is totally distinct from the effect of ionizing radiation, whether the latter be electric or electromagnetic. In terms of electromagnetic energy derived from DOR radiation, the effect of such DOR lumination is precisely that which we have described as the Hallwacks effect or induction of free-radical reactions.

However, if Oranur is intimately connected to nuclear energy - as Reich also contended it was - and, more specifically still, to the conversion of mass-energy into massfree energy, then, it must be said, no one - not even Reich - has yet understood it exactly: for Oranur then would be precisely the process explaining how ionizing radiation results from the disintegration of matter, without being susceptible to any reduction to ionizing radiation by itself or, for that matter, to the known processes of matter/anti-matter annihilation. Indeed, one would have to show that some other form of energy is released along with that ionizing electromagnetic radiation, and no reduction of one to the other was entailed. Reich never succeeded in teasing out these differences rigorously, and deMeo far less so - since he cannot even follow Reich's thought and perceive its limits. And so the word Oranur becomes a physically meaningless flag he agitates to re-engage fellow Reichians in their complacency; a familiar label to substitute for any attempt at functional comprehension.

To put it simply - if Oranur consists of a conversion of OR into DOR, then its electromagnetic outcome is not ionizing radiation but HFOT (high frequency optothermal photonic) radiation. And if one assumes that what causes that conversion, the Oranur conversion, is ionizing radiation, then Oranur is simply an effect of the latter. Yet, Experimental Aetherometry demonstrates, in AS2-09 of Volume II, that the Oranur conversion of OR into DOR is an integral part of the allotropic cycle of the basic atmospheric constituents, and is carried out without any requirement for intervention of ionizing radiation.

Furthermore, as witnessed by the above quote, deMeo also fails to realize that our study of ionizing monopolar electric and nonelectric components associated with solar radiation aimed solely at establishing their influence upon the spontaneous discharge rate of the electroscope, and thereby at asserting their functional differentiation from that other solar-sourced factor that promotes, instead, deceleration and even arrest of the spontaneous discharge. Hence, what we were measuring was not some abstract 'Oranur effect' that deMeo cannot mentally or otherwise locate - as either a physical process or a mathematical description - but the effect of X radiation and so-called 'relativistic' protons and electrons associated with solar flares upon atmospheric electroscopes.

To complete his 'constructive critique' of AS2-02, deMeo chooses to affirm his ineffable mechanistic bias by making an analogy between 'orgone charges' and monopolar electric

charges, implying that the former are simply the massfree version of the latter, which are massbound, as if electrons arose by the fixing of massless electrons:

"The ionizer experiments are interesting, but do not resolve the above problems. As an aside, the basics of small air-ion theory are reliant upon basic measuring techniques nearly identical to Reich's ES discharge-rate methods [If deMeo had been able to read, in AS2-02, our integrated physico-mathematical theory of the electric and nonelectric functions of the electroscope, he would have found there recognition of all the correct aspects of the ionization theory of electroscopic function]. Other instrumentation is now used (such as the charged plate monitor, or voltmeter-based "ion meters"), but are based upon the same general principles, of a slow discharge from a charged conductor, or measurement of the floating potential of a conductor. Like the field of electrostatics, air-ion research is littered with anomalistic findings. I feel a strong argument can be made to view "small air ions" as the product of orgonotic charge (not the same, but merely a secondary mass-bound expression)."

One could not more clearly fail to understand our aetherometric argument that there are no monopolar massfree charges, that orgone energy is only one kind of ambipolar massfree electric energy, that all massfree electric charge is ambipolar and none monopolar, and that the electric effects of ambipolar electric energy are entirely distinct from those of 'small ions', which is simply an euphemism for free electrons. Indeed, more formal and experimentally definitive demonstrations of these facts will shortly be forthcoming in other monographs of Experimental Aetherometry - but for now, it suffices to point out the gross reductionism that deMeo has elected to make into the foundation of his critique, as embodied in such simplistic propositions of non-thought as these:

- humidity, and not solar radiation, is causal of the variations in electroscopic discharge rate;
- midday arrest of atmospheric electroscopes is a mechanical effect;
- Oranur is simply assimilated to ionizing radiation, whether monoelectric or electromagnetic;
- small ions or monopolar massbound charges are simply the expression of massfree monopolar "orgonotic" charges...

There is not a single mention in the deMeo document of the fact that the AS2-02 study is the first to employ observation of *simultaneous leakage and seepage variations*, that it has succeeded in separating the familiar, 'traditional' effects - such as those of ionizing radiation and those of monopolar ion fields - with their associated variables, from what is truly novel: the demonstration that a local variable, nonelectric and nonelectromagnetic, is responsible for the kinetoregenerative phenomenon described in AS2-01, and is ultimately sourced nonlocally in solar radiation.

Here, then, is what deMeo means by 'constructive': that these authors should follow his bass-ackward lead, dispense with their long years of studied experimental work, and embrace, instead, the simplistic notions which he purveys - pulling them out of thin air, from his magician's hat, as it were.

**Regarding AS2-03:  
Critique of Reich's concept of an electroscopic OP.**

DeMeo opens this segment of his commentary with a perfunctory statement, the basis for which he has yet to prove or reference. These authors are absolutely convinced he cannot do so. He writes:

"In a manner, this entire paper is founded upon a misunderstanding of Reich's views. Yes, Reich discussed the orgonotic potential in some specific mathematical terms in *The Cancer Biopathy*. But in later years, after the *Oranur Experiment*, he realized that orgone energy possessed properties which were far more powerful and dynamic than his early views suggested."

There is absolutely nothing in the "Oranur Experiment" - or anywhere else, for that matter - which would indicate that Reich ever reversed his mathematical theory of the electroscopic OP. We challenge deMeo to prove this preposterous contention. And had Reich indeed disavowed his own notion of OP, deMeo would not be holding onto a ragged, fuzzy notion of 'orgonotic tension' or 'orgonotic potential'. But to get a full measure of deMeo's extreme twisting of the facts, we need only to see *how*, exactly, he proposes to justify his claim. He does so with the following quote from Reich:

*"As it turned out, however, all these minute, elaborate details lost their significance with the tremendous impact of the Oranur experiment. It did not matter at all whether we had or had not treated mice prophylactically; neither did it matter whether or not we treated them afterwards with pure OR for half-an-hour or an hour. We soon had to realize that our former habits of careful timing of OR irradiation in terms of minutes had become meaningless, just as the elaborate health protection devices used in the atomic energy project had become meaningless. Our previous arrangements were to the Oranur action effects as would be the fiddling around with a small spark-producing induction coil to a lightning in the sky during a hurricane." (The Oranur Experiment, 1951, p.297)"*

Now, dear reader, this quote could not have been taken more out of context! In the original text, it appears under the heading of Oranur Results in Mice, and the paragraph preceding it reads:

"We had prepared for the Oranur experiment proper a set of forty healthy mice (...) All of them were treated with OR several weeks before the NR experiment started (...) All of these carefully laid plans were completely overthrown by the actual events. (...) We exposed a first test group of four mice to a naked radium needle three times for half-an-hour each. Two of these mice had been treated with OR beforehand, and all four of them were treated with OR after NR exposure.

As it turned out, however, all these minute, elaborate details...etc"

So where on earth -do "these minute, elaborate details" refer to any notion of electroscopic OP - as deMeo implies? They don't. The quote is simply and disingenuously lifted from its specific context and dropped into deMeo's text with no other purpose than to dispense with the entire argument of AS2-03 - as somehow falling into the now nebulous category of "minute and elaborate details". We could hardly imagine a more revolting, stalinist misappropriation and rearrangement of texts. DeMeo would have his readers believe Reich's concept of the OP and its attendant mathematical formulation reduce to 'irrelevant and minute detail'!

After reading the above paragraphs in deMeo's 'constructive' disquisition, the authors felt like vomiting. Our initial reaction was that deMeo in fact did not even deserve a response. Upon further reflection, however, it occurred to us that his flagrant abuse of Reich's work gave us an unexpected forum to confront what is a rather illustrative example of the typical and entrenched poverty of 'Reichian' or (an)orgonomic thought, and to expose its total lack of respect for *what* was said *and how*, and even and above all, for its total lack of respect for Reich himself! The gall of this fellow, however, has no limits. He blithely notes:

"Reich spoke to this issue at other points in his work, but this quote should suffice for the moment."

Yes, it did - and eloquently - to raise in one's mind the question as to just what kind of a manipulator would distort Reich to this extent. Small wonder that at the end of his life, Reich was so distraught with the thought of the 'decent' followers he would leave behind: dedicated purveyors of disinformation, who were (and remain) unable to even understand his work, let alone carry it forward .

But wait, there is more coming down the deMeo pipeline . Next, the blue of the azure - the blue which Reich attributed to orgone lumination, and which, as we have already begun to demonstrate, in fact corresponds to the main mode of LFOT (low frequency optothermal) photons locally created by orgone energy emitted from the sun - is not at all the effect of orgone, but the effect of Oranur - which deMeo is unable to differentiate from ionizing radiation!!

Even if our man were an accomplished aikidoist who knew how to roll without the punches, one might still feel prone to a feeling of indescribable pity for his extreme confusion - the poor chap has never seen the atmosphere glowing blue, when it does so every day:

"Having personally experienced oranur phenomenon [He means phenomena!] at different times during my experimental work, at levels much lower than what Reich experienced (I have never seen the atmosphere glowing blue, like Cherenkov radiation, as Reich did), I can only give a general affirmation of these facts"

Amidst the profuse litter of nonsequiturs to be found in this portion of the 'critique', there stands out, in the rubble of nought, the astonishing deMeo equation:

Oranur = atmospheric blue glow = Cherenkov radiation

The fact is that Reich often described the glow of DOR as greenish-black, and sometimes reddish. How Oranur, which is supposedly the result of the conversion of OR into DOR, would result in a blue glow - the very marker or sign of the lumination of OR energy - is yet another piece of inscrutable deMean mystery.

Undaunted, our 'constructivist' soars higher into symbological and allegorical deliria, completely oblivious to the subject-matter of the AS2-03 monograph he is ostensibly addressing:

"I often use a temperature analogy to contrast orgone energy under normal background and accumulator-concentrated conditions, as compared to oranur conditions: *Normal conditions* feel like a warm summer day. *Accumulator conditions* feel like a hot day at the beach. *Oranur conditions* feel

like a conflagration, as from a forest fire. Reich had no idea of this "conflagration" type of orgonotic condition when making his careful ES measurements in the early part of his work. After seeing what was possible with oranur, his viewpoint shifted entirely, and the careful measuring of ES discharge as an indicator of a "quantity" of orgone was given up in favor of a more generalized formulation."

This is pure psychotic hogwash. It would be incumbent upon any serious writer invoking such claims to cite where Reich supposedly gave up employing the rate of electroscopic discharge as an 'indicator of a 'quantity' of orgone' - but we, of course, will not hold our breath waiting for deMeo to produce such citations, for they, purely and simply, do not exist.

In any case, he is already somewhere else, carried far, far away by his poetic waxings on conflagrations and forest fire inferno analogies. He has long forgotten about the subject matter, that little OP, that irrelevant detail he had somehow, somewhere felt compelled to write about.

"Not only did oranur reveal the capacity of the orgone to rapidly change its intensity and raw concentration (or "density"), but to "seethe" or "boil" as it were, while also precipitating material substances out of itself. The DOR condition came as a consequence of prolonged oranur. The point is, the flux of energy inside the accumulator could increase, possibly by several orders of magnitude (ie, Krx magnitudes?) very quickly, in a manner totally unrelated to anything seen during ordinary meteorological variations, and this phenomenon wreaked havoc with living systems, with the weather, and with his instruments. At some point the math will come, but not at the cost of redefining (or discarding?) the raw empirical foundations for which terms like *orgonotic potential* and *orgone tension* are empirically precise descriptors."

Uncertain now as to what on earth he might talking about, our man contradicts himself yet again. Having deftly discarded the OP - through his employment of irrelevant, de-contextualized quotes - as a 'minute detail' which supposedly Reich later abandoned because of Oranur, he now announces his prophetic conviction that 'at some point', one day, a messianic math will come - without it being at the cost of either discarding or redefining OP. While the concept of OP does not in any way matter, neither can it be redefined or overthrown. It is cast in stone, like the writings of some prophet.

This, then, is what is presented as a 'constructive critique' of our AS2-03 monograph: an extraordinarily poor recuperation of Oranur and a complete failure to concretely address either Reich's concept of OP or its aetherometric critique, the entire irrelevancy being punctuated by a complete transplant of Reich's notes on his preparation of mice for the Oranur experiment. We couldn't possibly have constructed an apter illustration of the utter poverty and confusionism of what today passes for 'Reichian thought' than these texts which deMeo has bestowed upon us.

Content with his 'work', deMeo concludes:

"This being the case, I don't see any point to making a detailed critique of Reich's self-discarded methodology as given in *Cancer Biopathy*. I support the authors attempt to better understand the relationships between orgone charge and electrical charge, but don't see they have done much better here than Reich originally did."

But how could you *see*, James deMeo, when you mistake mice for electroscopic OP and Oranur reactions for the blue lumination of the atmosphere when excited by solar

radiation? Indeed, how could you possibly *see*, when you confuse Cherenkov radiation with the conversion of OR into DOR caused by exposure of OR to NR?

The authors know that deMeo is caught between a rock and a hard place: he has talked so much about 'orgonotic tension' (the very same concept as 'orgonotic potential'), and yet, when confronted with the AS2-03 monograph, he finds himself unable to read our physical and mathematical critique of Reich's physical and mathematical theory of the OP, let alone provide any critique of its substance, or worse still, provide a constructive critique. Is he our peer, as he pretends? And, even more to the point, is he a peer of Reich?

We hereby dedicate to deMeo the words that Debord wrote in *The Veritable Split* to describe *the cadre* - in this case, one of the legion of cadres guarding the 'science' of nothing, or the nothingness of (an)orgonomy:

"he is the ambitious constantly worried about his future and miserable in all else, this even while he doubts whether he can quite hold his present position. (...) The cadre is the man of deficiency: his drug is the ideology of pure spectacle, the spectacle of nothing."

With such followers, what possible use could the specter of Reich have for Reich's enemies?

**Regarding AS2-04:  
Electroscopic demonstration of reverse potentials of  
kinetic and electric energy flow**

Having made it this far through deMeo's missive, we wondered whether at this point we should not move to promote him to something like a paragon of non-thought or non-desire. But no need - he does it all by himself. He commences his 'critique' of our AS2-04 monograph with yet another decontextualization, in oblique reference to note 4 on page 15 of that monograph:

"Citations are only given for Barth and Mann, who cannot seriously be considered as experts on the subject of Reich's experiments . The papers by Rosenblum, Cleveland, Wengel, Baker, Geister & Wyneken, Konia, and Burlingame all present more details and substantive discussions based upon experiments with electroscopes and accumulators, but none are mentioned here. Why only Barth and Mann? For the record, my own unpublished work suggests some *relationship* between orgone energy and electronegativity, but I simply mention it here. The authors clearly feel orgone energy cannot be electronegative in basic nature (or apparently even to yield electronegative charges under high concentrations) and they make some good points in this direction. However, they also don't review the various orgonotic phenomena which led Reich to his viewpoints, and lead me to defend them."

The pedanticism of this opening is remarkable. First of all, the authors cite Barth, Boadella and Mann as three examples of Reichians who illegitimately amalgamated OR energy to negative electricity - not as experimentalists who studied the electroscope. But deMeo is not upset that we have not cited the others he mentions - some of whom have suggested similar reductionisms - but that we have not recognized unpublished work by deMeo himself (!) that suggests an affinity of orgone energy for 'electronegativity'. Yet, in AS2-09, which deMeo has ostensibly read, the authors propose a physical and mathematical process for the asymmetric generation of monopolar massbound charges from aether massfree energy. What is most telling about the tone of this paragraph, however, is that DeMeo wants to admit that his notion of orgone charge is no more and no less than the notion of a monopolar negative electric charge that simply is massfree. But he hesitates to commit to the words "negative" and "electric", so he speaks tentatively as if small ions or massbound charges were simply the expression of still smaller, as it were, massfree charges, and avoids using the words "monopolar" or "negative" or "electric". It is all kept stringently mystical.

But the facts are simple, and we shall not cease hurling them out:

Orgone energy IS electric energy in a massfree state, but its ELECTRIC charge is not MONOPOLAR, like the NEGATIVE or POSITIVE charges affected to ALL MASSBOUND CHARGE carriers, but AMBIPOLAR. All the analogies of orgone charge with monopolar massbound charges, be they small or large ions, are illegitimate and false. There are simply two different electricities, that which is massfree and ambipolar, and truly was discovered by Tesla - notwithstanding the insufficiency of his science - and that which is massbound and monopolar, and relates to ions of varying mass. All else are mermaid calls to stupified followers of last-ditch churches. If deMeo cannot take the heat, he should step out of the kitchen.

And if deMeo believes otherwise, the onus is on him to demonstrate that inside an ORAC one can spontaneously charge an electroscope with negative polarity, or arrest the leakage

while accelerating the seepage. **What other truer or simpler determination of this affinity of orgone for electronegative electricity is there??**

Another effortless decontextualization follows, as this time deMeo simply subtracts the specific conditions that belonged to the same sentence as the statement he next quotes:

"On p.16, it says *"the human body cannot electrically charge an electroscope"*.

What it says on p. 16 of AS2-04 is this:

"BARRING INTERPOLATION OF SUITABLE INSULATION BETWEEN THE HUMAN BODY AND THE EARTH, AND BARRING THE PHENOMENON OF FRICTION, THE HUMAN BODY IS NOT A SOURCE OF ELECTRIC ENERGY AND CANNOT ELECTRICALLY CHARGE AN ELECTROSCOPE"

If deMeo is unable to read, which would unarguably seem to be the case - based on his systematic abortion of complete thoughts in order to extract fragments opportune to his faith - it is hardly surprising that he is equally unable to understand what it is we are saying: the phenomenon of charging an electroscope can only be brought about by imparting to that electroscope a quantity of monopolar electricity. Instead, with the agility of a mastodont, he proceeds to tell us how - upon contact with a cloudbuster - he drew a large quantity of monopolar charges (in complete agreement with what AS2-04 shows, that the human body draws positive and negative charges upon contact with charged conductors) which obviously made him sick. Nevertheless, it took this orgonomist 24 hours to figure out what even Juan Matus knew - without the benefit of ever having read Reich: that he should plunge himself into a ditch of running cold water:

"However, I do have a dim memory of Reich observing this during the oranur experiment (I'd have to read through his work again to double-check this.) However, I've seen this happen on several occasions. The most dramatic was after absorbing an extreme charge of orgone energy from the cloudbuster, during field work under thunderstorm conditions in Kansas, when the atmosphere was highly charged around the apparatus. I was incautious, and stood too close to the apparatus for too long, and absorbed a strong charge which made me sick for some days (this is called "oranur sickness" by those familiar with Reich's later work, an occupational hazard of the cloudbusting work which yields symptoms akin to mild radiation sickness). Initially my skin was reddened and my total organism had the feeling of "bursting". I had large "hives" develop in about 24 hours, as if I had walked into a patch of poison ivy. Early in the process, I felt highly expansive, as if I could run and fly through the air, filled with boundless expansive energy (a dangerous sign, as I know today). However, on the first evening, I was able to touch electroscopes and have them swing to full deflection, and similarly to cause flashes of neon bulbs by merely walking nearby! Touching objects would sometimes create sparks, but it was impossible to "discharge" the phenomenon -- the reader will have to accept my assertion, that many attempts were made to "ground out" this capacity, by going barefoot, touching grounded plumbing, etc., without success. Only 24 hours later, by soaking for a long time in a tub of water, did the effect vanish."

Precisely our point: the human body is NOT a source of monopolar charge, not per se, and the presence and quantity of such charges normally generated by the body reduces merely to the ion fluxes at membrane and organ surfaces. All other high potentials of monopolar charges in the body are imparted by something else, in this case (deMeo's story) by the electrical charging of a cloudbuster in a stormy atmosphere! In his description, deMeo uses the mystical invocation 'charged with orgone energy' as proof to the faithful that the negative charges came from within his body. But that is a petition of principle, made even

more irrelevant given that it is apparent experimentally, from our AS2-04 precisely, that the body draws monopolar charges on contact - irrespective of whether they are electronegative or electropositive - and retains them for as long as it remains insulated from the earth, or - in very dry conditions and with large doses of draw - until it is discharged by contact with water. This we have demonstrated on numerous occasions.

Our ambipolar OR/DOR field meter can be wired so that a capacitor formally charged with both negative and positive charges can be seen to lose these charges with the approach of a human body, the effect being detected 3.5 to 4 meters away, and increasing in intensity as the distance between detector and body decreases. Likewise, experiments we have performed with insulated human beings show that if we impart - with a Wimshurst Generator, for example - an electrostatic charge to an insulated body, it can be passed by touch to another insulated body, clearly indicating that the high-potential monopolar electricity a body can carry has a different origin from the very-low-potential ion fluxes, and that it is either a function of friction, rubbing or stroking in dry atmospheres, or the result of absorption of electrostatic energy from an external source (lightning, contact with charged conductors such as a cloudbuster, exposure to charged atmospheres).

To understand these aetherometric contentions and findings, try performing this simple experiment we have now conducted countless times. On a dry, clear, sunny summer day, discharge the body by immersing it completely in cold water and keep it barefooted; then expose it to the sun for as long as you want. Approach any electroscope, grounded or ungrounded in its case, and you will see that *you will never succeed in charging it*. You will only succeed in charging it if your body is dry and shod with insulating soles, and if you rub the ground - be it by dragging your feet when walking, or merely by lifting a foot from the ground while standing! On very dry days, or indoors in northern climates during the winter, one can charge an electroscope just by walking barefoot over a carpet, even without dragging the feet.

These are simple facts devoid of personal melodrama, that demonstrate precisely the statement made by the authors on p. 16 of AS2-04.

But deMeo is willfully ignorant of these facts and their dynamics. For him, it only matters that 'sometimes' a human body can charge an electroscope, irrespective of conditions or of any understanding as to how at other times the same body cannot:

"I've never seen such a starkly clear expression of this phenomenon before or since, though on occasion have seen electroscopes fail to discharge when being touched (arguably, this might have a classical explanation), and also seen a slightly-charged electroscope spontaneously increase its deflection by charging inside an orgone accumulator (this would not have a classical explanation)."

As if we had not seen enough of deMeo engaging in mysticism, he now would have us believe that, on occasion (those are his words), he has seen an electroscope spontaneously charge inside an ORAC! Reich certainly never made such a preposterous claim! And the onus lies on deMeo to show how, when, and under which conditions such a phenomenon occurs. As for us, we have never observed any such charging, other than by exposure of the closed Faraday cage inside the ORAC to an externally sourced electrostatic charge - much like that cloudbuster that deMeo inadvertently contacted acquired an electrostatic charge by drawing it from clouds.

DeMeo's list of poorly understood electric phenomena continues:

"Likewise, [charging] by orgone-charging high-vacuum tubes (what Reich called VACOR tubes) they can exhibit a glow by the mere stroking with the hand [sic]. The glow occurs, even when the body is fully grounded, or wired to the two electrodes in the tube ends, or if those electrodes are shorted or grounded to the accumulator, or to earth ground, or whatever. In this example, the tube carried the high charge."

DeMeo is totally mistaken in his understanding of this phenomenon. In fact, the phenomenon (as we show in AS2-04) is no different from the charging of an electroscope by influence - either with an electrostatically charged rod, or with an insulated human body that has been charged externally or by any of the frictional methods already related. Indeed, it suffices to pass such a rod over an ordinary fluorescent tube in the dark to observe a flashing glow. The same can be done with a Vacor tube, as long as the tube is not sealed at pressures lower than 1 microTorr. Neither the fluorescent nor the Vacor tube, however, needs to be 'orgone'charged' in an ORAC or in any other device, for one to observe these glow phenomena; they can in fact be brand new tubes, or have just been evacuated to the desired negative pressure.

And the charge responsible for this transient glow is NOT carried by the tube, not at all! It is carried by the approaching or passing rod or body. It is the movement of the charged rod or body which induces charge formation inside that tube, whether it is a fluorescent gas-filled tube or a high-vacuum tube. In fact, in our laboratory we have developed a method of trapping charge inside the tube while employing the 'influence of electrostatic fields'. The charge then inside of it arises by induction in response to the moving electric field.

Parallel, but different in arrangement, is the response of the same tubes - fluorescent or Vacor - when they are charged beforehand with ballasted AC or DC potentials that are applied at pre-breakdown voltage levels: then, as these authors have long been demonstrating to others, it suffices to longitudinally pass a hand over the gap to elicit breakdown.

This is a good time to remind the reader that these extreme, popular confusions are precisely what has damned the 'orgonomic project' from within: a collectively bad reading of Reich, followed by poor perception, poor thought and poor experimental designs that do not in any way qualify as a replication of Reich's work, followed by ad hoc reductions - all in order to present further repackagings of the new Reich-soap.

DeMeo has gotten even this upside down:

"Normal electrical theory breaks down entirely under such examples, and it becomes very clear, that the electroscope and vacuum phenomenon react to some life-energetic parameter which is not purely electrical in nature, but which elicits reactions which are typically seen during experiments when high voltage electricity is provided."

It is not classical electrostatic theory that breaks down here, but the understanding of the last of the anorgonomists! Indeed, instead of searching for what escapes classical theory - for example: How does electric influence work? Does it require a radiative electric field? How can influence be a source of monopolar charge, when there is no monopolar charge transfer? - instead of searching for answers to these questions which are never even

enunciated by 'orgonomists', deMeo wants simply to have it both ways - orgone is negative monopolar high-voltage electricity (why only high-voltage escapes us...) but 'not purely so'...It is, then, also 'impurely' something else. From this momentous, deep, physically and mathematically elucidating proposition, he concludes *à tort et à travers et tant bien que mal* that we are somehow correct and yet totally in error . To this end, he now presents a new lie and attributes it to us:

"So, the authors are correct to say the phenomenon "cannot be construed as being electric", but incorrect to reject some *general relationship* between orgone energy and electrical charge."

'General' is of little interest to us. What we have put forth and are still in the process of putting forth in our monograph series, as deMeo has now known, and well, for some time (see correspondence), is that orgone energy is ambipolar electric massfree energy. It is not 'electric but impurely so' - a sheer idiocy! It is not monopolar electric energy! It is not the energy of 'small ions', or any other such reductionism which is adequate only to those who purport to do physics by groping around in the dark on all fours.

And it is in fact deMeo who does not have the slightest idea of what are either the direct, concrete, or the general functional principles linking, on the one hand, ambipolar to monopolar electricities or charges, and on the other (in the Aether domain), massfree electric and nonelectric energies.

The lack of any concrete, physical, mathematical and functional links between these different energetic manifestations is precisely what leaves deMeo in the lurch of an ill-defined, simplistic and irrelevant relation between orgone and electricity that explains nothing and confuses everything.

Next, deMeo avows that his own confusionism is not even original, as it can be attributed to the early bioelectric days of Reich's research - when all was explained by varying levels of the concentration of negative monopolar charges:

"On p.22, the authors argue *"that poles can be defined not by a physical property of opposing polarities, but as a relationship between different densities of the same charge "*. This is clearly one of the theoretical explanations, that electronegative polarity constitutes a higher quantity of the same phenomenon which, in lower quantities is called "electropositivity". This agrees with some elements of classical theory, which speaks about only electrons being mobile, moving through wires, while "positive charge" is simply an expression for a lowered quantity of electronegativity. On the millivoltmeter, I've grown accustomed to viewing the electronegative swings as an indication of higher orgonotic charge, with the positive swings occurring when those same charges are removed from the apparatus, with the "zero" point somewhat arbitrarily linked to the charge value of the earth-ground. For years, I have been teaching this very formulary as one theoretical understanding, an albeit incompletely-understood but nevertheless functional equivalence of orgone energy to what is called "electronegativity", or the "electron" (which, by the way, remains a very mysterious entity by itself). But this comes directly from Reich's early work in bioelectricity, from his descriptions on the functioning of the millivoltmeter specifically, and the general functional equivalence between orgonotic charge and bioelectrical charge. Yes, this model raises questions which ultimately need resolution, and the authors have pointed out some of those issues quite clearly -- but this theoretical model also explains quite a lot by itself."

DeMeo, of course, misses entirely the direction of our remarks: they delimit and refer to electrostatic relations between monopolar charges when these present us with well defined regionalizations caused by varying densities of charges of the same polarity. But, as we contend - in our papers, in our interviews, and in our letters to deMeo - all such variations

of potential caused by different densities of charges of the same polarity are phenomena associated solely with massbound electricity, **PRECISELY BECAUSE ALL MONOPOLAR CHARGES ARE MASSBOUND. THERE ARE NO MASSFREE MONOPOLAR ELECTRIC CHARGES!** Therefore, there is absolutely nothing that entitles deMeo to regard negative swings in a voltmeter as an expression of 'higher organotic charge'. This is precisely the confusionism that we have been denouncing as being both unscientific and arbitrarily reductionist, to the point of simple-mindedness.

DeMeo misses the entirety of our argument regarding the **AMBIPOLAR NATURE** of aether energy that is charged electrically, **PRECISELY BECAUSE ALL AMBIPOLAR ELECTRIC CHARGES ARE MASSFREE.**

Then, at last, he addresses the purported topic of our AS2-04 paper that he wants to 'constructively criticize', with a single and gratuitous comment:

"On p.26, in point #2, I think the authors assume a bit too much about what Reich knew, or did not know. All we can do is reference his published papers, but it would be too ambitious to assume Reich had not undertaken experiments with positively-charged electroscopes."

Once more, deMeo wants us to pay attention to an imaginary record of experiments supposedly conducted by Reich. Had Reich checked both seepage and leakage rates of atmospheric electroscopes, as we did in AS2-02 - *and no one else before us did!!* - he would have immediately realized that the local variable which tends to decelerate both leakage and seepage is **A NONELECTRIC FACTOR** ultimately sourced in solar radiation. If deMeo had in any way understood the implications of these experiments, we sincerely doubt he would now find himself in the absurd position of arguing for critical undocumented experiments conducted by Reich from which Reich was too thick to extract any practical conclusions!!

As such, any notion of monopolar charges (whether negative or positive) being at work in conveying the observed electroscopic anomaly is **RULED OUT BY OUR METHODOLOGY AND EXPERIMENTS.** If deMeo cannot live with scientific facts and demonstrations, then he should cease posing as a scientist. If the data is wrong or critically flawed, then the onus is on him to demonstrate it. What is more, had deMeo himself conducted these studies (which he never did) of the atmospheric response of exposed electroscopes, charged **BOTH POSITIVELY AND NEGATIVELY**, then he would have realized, by himself, the futility of the notion that orgone energy can be amalgamated to massbound electric energy, or to the action of negative monopolar charges, even imaginary ones that would be massfree.

Finally, deMeo closes with two completely erroneous and aprioristic identifications:

"As before, the terms *"hidden local variable sourced in the ambient medium"* and *"electrokinetoregenerative phenomenon"* are still being used as conceptual substitutes for *orgone tension* or *orgone energy*. And as before, my objection is, such terms have not so far been proven to hold any greater explanatory power than Reich's original terms. If, by the end of the day, all we have is a theoretical reformulation with term-substitution, then nothing new has been added."

Indeed, if all we had were deMeo's superficial identifications which he impudently attributes to us, our effort would have been to no avail. But these authors have repeatedly explained:

- that this hidden local variable is nonelectric, and thus not orgone energy per se, but a derived conversion from this ambipolar electric aether;

- that the term "orgone tension" is equivalent to "orgonotic potential", and that these basically electric concepts, SUCH AS REICH ENUNCIATED THEM, ARE ERRONEOUS, as demonstrated in our AS2-03, and are to be replaced by the nonelectric concept of the kinetoregenerative process and its antigravitational functions;

- that the kinetoregenerative phenomenon is locally driven by 'latent heat', an obviously nonelectric form of energy;

- and that orgone energy is massfree energy which is electrically charged and its charge momentum is ambipolar and not monopolar.

So, in light of these scientific and published facts, which we - and not Reich or deMeo or whoever else - have uncovered, how is one to understand the confusion that deMeo appears to have elected himself to disseminate, and which he clearly wants to induce in others who might contemplate a reading of Aetherometry?

We leave the answer of that question to the reader.

**Regarding AS2-05:  
The Reich-Einstein experiment and the thermal anomaly in ORACS**

DeMeo again begins the 'constructive critique' of his fantasms with his broken-record complaint about missing or insufficient data, as if our own data record had somehow been broken under the weight of his blows:

"One major problem affecting nearly all of the temperature measurements related in this document is, the times of measurement are often unsystematic, at different times for different days, and more seriously, *fail to record any data at all from approximately midnight to 10 AM or noontime for most or all of the days in question.* Data points are inappropriately connected together across periods spanning ten hours or more, giving a false impression of significance to parts of the graph where factually nobody knows what the outcome might have been."

First of all, we have absolutely no interest in addressing a blanket charge thrown indiscriminately at very different experiments. Three different types of experiments were described in AS2-05: (1) the stringent replication of the Reich-Einstein experiment; (2) measurement of To-T outdoors in the shade; and (3) measurement of To-T under direct exposure to the sun, to address the blackbody problem.

In the first set of experiments, there is a gap of 9 to 10 hours as deMeo claims. But what he does not know is that these authors conducted other studies with the same setup to ascertain at which time, in the winter, the room reached its coolest point, and this was, not at 4 am, or 6 am or at 8am, but at 10 am. Hence the experimental runs that were selected began at 9:30 to 10:00 am and terminated shortly after midnight. At no time did these authors observe a consistent reversal of the temperature difference. DeMeo should try the experiment in order to convince himself of the facts: the temperature difference is small, but irreducible. (We find it most amusing that other Reichians - Baker, Ogg and Marett - all wanted us to make the difference in this Reich-Einstein replication *greater*, but deMeo wants us to make it *negative*! Why is it that none of them can live with the facts as they are?)

Curiously also, if there were inversions in the temperature difference, and all data points were to balance around the background temperature, as deMeo suggests they might or would with his simplistic notion of thermal lag (see below), how then would he justify the notion that orgone energy exists because it induces a thermal anomaly inside the ORAC?

Indeed, he next sounds like a skeptic of Reich who hasn't bothered to do his homework:

"Figures 1A, 1B and 1C recording indoor temperature variations for six days in February all show this problem, which is serious if one considers the potential issue of thermal lag. One expects to see a positive To-T from thermal lag alone in the period from around noontime through late into the PM or early AM -- and this is, indeed, what is generally seen. However, during the early morning hours, when environmental temperatures begin to rise following dawn, thermal lag would produce a negative To-T. To refute the classical thermodynamic expectation, one would have to show a measured positive To-T at precisely those times, in the early daytime morning, before noon. Figs. 1A,B and C show variations in the control thermometer of around 1 deg. C., with To-T of around 0.1 to 0.2 deg. C. This is such a small quantity, that it is easily imaginable that thermal lag in the morning hours might have developed into a negative To-T -- but we will never know, as no measurements were taken at that critical time."

If there was scientific proof by inference, deMeo would have inferred his 'missing critical data' into no longer missing. Yet, the coolest ambient temperature in that basement room occurred at 9:30 to 10:00 am (he is also forgetting that, with respect to local summer daylight time, this 10:00 am means 9:00 am). So his critical missing link is plain imaginary. At no time did these authors observe sustained or compensatory negative values of the temperature difference. But in fact, this remark of his regarding the imaginary missing data now gains the proportion of a more general mafiosos-style indictment:

"Other graphs in the paper, based upon those same raw February data, show similar problems, which in my view undermines their significance considerably."

In other words, deMeo, a self-styled Reichian who runs a Reichian cottage industry, remains unconvinced that, under stringent conditions, there is an anomalous sensible thermal phenomenon above an ORAC, precisely as Reich claimed to Eistein that there was!

Hmmm.

Again, the onus lies on him to prove the error of our ways - and those of Reich as well.

Notice how this attitude that deMeo now adopts contrasts with what he recently wrote to his OBRL list about precisely this part of our paper after he had read it (or so we hope, as so he claimed!) in IE (#37):

"Fascinating New Article on Reich and To-T Experiment in Infinite EnergyMagazine

"The Reproducible Thermal Anomaly of the Reich-Einstein Experiment Under limit Conditions" by Dr. Paulo Correa and Alexandra Correa Infinite Energy, Issue #37, 2001.

The article revisits the Einstein Affair from an experimental viewpoint, and provides an excellent methodology (derived from Reich's original approach, but with important additions) for reproducible To-T demonstrations."

What has changed - one asks - that deMeo now dons the judging mask of the peer that he is not, a mask so severe that it contorts - and at the cost of abandoning everything which in Reich's theory was and is CRITICAL - in favour of a weakly articulated MONOPOLAR MECHANISM that explains nothing, not even what Burr discovered so long ago?

After all, before our stringent replication of the Reich-Einstein experiment, no Reichian folk dared to seize this bull by its horns.

Next, having discarded our replication of the Reich-Einstein experiment, deMeo swiftly moves to our outdoors experiments conducted in the shade:

"Figures 2A to 2D present data for a similar experimental arrangement, as performed outdoors, under a double-layered canvas cover, for 19 days in July. It does appear that there are fewer data points, or measurements, having been made in a given day, and also that many of the days appear to start data-taking near the center-line of the daily record, suggesting a noontime start of data recording, with a midnight cessation of data recording. In any case, particularly in Fig.2D, there is a suggestion, that many of the midnight measurements are very close to a zero To-T. One could ask, if data was taken

at 2 AM or 4 AM on those same days, if the To-T would then have further declined and been negative?

Here, deMeo realizes that there are - in the 19-day period examined - measurements nearly every day at 8:00 am, as well as at midnight - so he changes his tune: he now wants measurements at 2 and 4 am (of which there are a few). Yet, the data more than suffices to establish what Reich discovered and what these authors intended to investigate - that the observed thermal anomalies cannot be attributed to convection currents, indoors or outdoors in the shade, and that their diurnal variation is solar sourced, as modulated by the earth's rotation. Furthermore, the authors clearly indicate that these shaded outdoor experiments cannot provide the answer as to whether the anomaly is merely the result of absorbing blackbody radiation or not. That is why they did not make much of the second set of experiments, and wrote on p. 31:

"Since the ultimate source of this energy appears to be the sun, we may as well study how these boxes behave when placed not only outdoors, but under direct exposure to sunlight"

The facts are that our outdoor data clearly identifies the diurnal oscillation in To-T, and that this difference remains positive, not just for ORACs, but also for wooden controls and Faraday cages. Moreover, the Faraday cage regularly outperforms the other devices - an unexpected turn *that no Reichian has ever bothered to point out.* On this, deMeo writes:

"The temperature ranges in this case were 10-15 deg. C., with daily variations in To-T of 5 deg. C. or more. In reviewing the significance of these data, the authors state (p.29) *"while the metal box rapidly cools and therefore approaches the control temperature as the night sets in, it heats up much, much faster and more intensely than either the ORAC or the wooden box when the atmosphere is being heated by the sun."* I agree with the author's contention, that this is precisely the effect one looks for when making a To-T measurement. However, this is also an admission that the temperatures move towards a zero To-T *"as the night sets in"* (by midnight), and suggests a negative To-T must have occurred in many cases, had measurements been taken."

There is no admission needed. The authors clearly state that, in all devices, To-T decreases towards the evening, but inside the outdoor tent no inversions were observed, even at 1 am or for those few points taken at 3 or 4 am that figure in the graphs.

Then deMeo avows that after all these years of posing as a student of "the late, great W. Reich", he remains unconvinced that there is a thermal anomaly within the ORAC:

"I make these criticisms as a sympathizer to Reich's position on the matter -- I just do not believe the classical expectation has been overcome in this case. In all likelihood, if the morning measurements had been made, probably the indoor measurements would have been positive for most all of the 24 hours (including at night), but probably not the outdoor experiments, which might have plunged to a clear negative To-T in the early AM hours. Most assuredly, if this paper attracts the attention of classical physicists, they will spot this very problem, and dismiss the entire matter out of hand, without any consideration of a possible positive effect in the data."

Yes, one would expect a conventionally trained physicist to proceed in just this specious way - ie to dismiss out-of-hand, and based upon these shaded outdoor experiments alone, our next and final step, which was to expose the devices directly to the sun.

Maybe it is time to ask deMeo what he thinks of Reich's To-T measurements, which were often based upon one point taken per day, as in Fig. 15 of *The Cancer Biopathy?*

Maybe, also, it is time to ask him to step down from his tall donkey and tell us, and the public, where one can find the scientific reports of his own reproductions of the Reich-Einstein experiment or the shaded outdoor experiments or the direct exposure experiments?? Or could it be that all he has to offer is a lot of glib gab?

His 'critique' now moves on to the third set of experiments, the measurement of To-T under direct exposure to the sun and how it impacts the blackbody problem. Here, DeMeo has some kind words to say about our adoption of a perfectly classical method that no Reichian has previously employed:

"The author's next step I find to be most fascinating, and it constitutes a really novel and positive contribution to the question of thermal organometry, which is the use of black and white colored accumulators, directly exposed to the sun, with the approach to evaluate the black-body characteristics of the two accumulators."

But is he able to conclude anything positive from our data - or make anything, for that matter, of it? No. Instead, deMeo returns to his broken record - this time, even more gratuitously and speciously, since the stated objective of the third set of experiments is to determine the response of ORACs and control devices to solar radiation: it is a daytime study, not one intent on determining whether these oscillations will balance because of the insertion of a point at 4 am during nighttime! As far as we know, the sun does not shine at night.

"However, in these experiments once again we are confronted with the problem of no data for the late PM and early AM hours. In fact, Figures 9 through 19 all start with data recorded at around 10:30 or 11:00 AM, and end around 21:00 hours, or 9:00 PM, with no data from that point onwards, except for a single measurement at 2 AM. Nevertheless, they show several anomalous characteristics in the thermal dynamics of black and white colored accumulators, as compared to an ordinary metal box and to normal air temperature. Much more might have been learned, however, if the measurements had been taken during the night and early morning periods."

Pray tell, James, what could possibly be gleaned about direct blackbody absorption of solar radiation during the nighttime?

What comes through, loud and clear, is the insidious nature of what deMeo calls 'constructive critique', and which he practices by repeated innuendo. After repeating deMeo's mantra for a while, the unreader (his flock?) begins believing that there is, in fact, critically missing data:

"Figs 20 to 23 display this same data, attempting to make a meaningful discussion of the "diurnal variation" in the temperature curves, but with so much missing data, diurnal variations cannot be adequately identified or understood. As I would anticipate, however, the 2 AM measurements all show expected temperature reversals and negative To-T from probable thermal lag. Is it possible, that with this promising methodology, purely ordinary temperature lag effects overwhelmed the expected organotic effect?"

All the figures he cites clearly show that there are temperature inversions in the exposed outdoor devices, beginning at 1 to 2 am, and that these negative values of To-T only disappear once the device again becomes exposed to solar radiation for the morning period, To-T typically becoming positive only after noon. The curious thing is that these authors do not recall deMeo ever having mentioned in his electronic newsletter, journal or papers

that one regularly obtains negative values in ORACs directly exposed to the elements, or, for that matter, under any other conditions. Moreover, Reich incorrectly made much of negative values of the temperature difference - and so does deMeo when he cites DOR as causing null differences, in the correspondence with the authors - and yet these authors were the first to demonstrate this diurnal variation for ORACs and the regular existence of these negative values. And so it seems deMeo is now merely wishing to appear even 'more papist than the pope', by his constant recitation of missing nighttime data - when it is absolutely irrelevant.

What he next makes quite clear, however, is that he has understood nothing with respect to electromagnetism or light - and nothing of the authors' theory of LFOT photons, or the blackbody treatment they proposed for the data, let alone their aetherometric foundations!:

"There also is another problematic feature probably at work in the outdoor experiments, and that is incident solar thermal infra-red radiation, which can penetrate through layers of canvas and even through the exterior top layers of a sun-exposed accumulator, which basically is a metal box surrounded by insulation.

As we demonstrate - and, incidentally, as Reich himself thought was the case - there is no sensible heat crossing the 'vacuum' between sun and earth, no IR emitted from the sun as such, as deMeo groundlessly assumes with his 'solar IR radiation'. This is a poor way of thinking and speaking, only too pat and accepted, but which betrays as much the lack of comprehension of conventional physics with respect to the nature of photons and solar radiation, as it does of the novel critical insights provided by aetherometric theory - not to mention of the orgone radiation that emanates from the sun, and how it produces light. The radiation emitted from the sun is ambipolar (electric) massfree energy, and practically all blackbody photons, INCLUDING THOSE LFOT PHOTONS PRODUCED IN THE IR REGION, are local productions resulting from the interaction of this solar sourced OR and DOR with Matter, in particular, ordinary leptonic Matter, in our atmosphere. This is what Aetherometry alone teaches!

Moreover, deMeo misses the fact that in our direct sun exposure experiments, we also recorded the surface temperature of the tested devices, and thus were able to determine their blackbody profiles, WHOSE MODES LIE PRECISELY IN THE IR REGION!

Yet, as we extensively demonstrate in AS2-05, these IR-modal blackbodies cannot be formally accounted for by absorption of solar-induced IR in the locality of the devices. The penetration argument is of little import if absorption itself is insufficient, or if the electromagnetic flux incident over the devices is equally insufficient. But these facts aside, it is a solid fact of quantum mechanics that IR photons do not at all possess the power of penetration that deMeo attributes to them. Heat propagation through materials, whether conductive or nonconductive, is far from consisting of the same mechanism that produces LFOT photons and, furthermore, IR penetration is poorer even than, for example, that of UV light (which we examine experimentally in AS2-08).

Undeterred by the experimentally demonstrated irrelevance of his superficial 'off-the-cuff' remarks, deMeo adds:

"As mentioned in a prior communication with the authors:

*"...some thermal IR effects surely must have been at work in your outdoor setup, penetrating through the canvas [and]... perhaps some of your outdoor to-t effects under the canvas were due to solar organotic excitation or incident IR radiation penetrating through the canvas... in a manner similar to your unshaded experiments in the open sun (at least for IR frequencies).*

*I believe I mentioned to you my work years ago in solar energy construction and home design in Florida, where it was usual to recommend a metal foil layer above the insulation layer just under the roof surface, so as to "reflect IR radiation back upwards" to help with summertime cooling.*

*A few experimental homes were constructed with basically a roof-top water layer, which totally absorbed the solar IR, which was the main problem with keeping homes cool in summer. The IR was known to penetrate through roof tiles, tar paper, plywood and eventually into the upper floors of the home, unless there was a metal or water layer at the top surface of the home. This principle, nobody following Reich has considered except for myself, and you also in your discussions on black-body radiation, but with a different emphasis than I am giving it here.*

This issue, of thermal IR coming from the sun, would be a factor at work in any outdoor To-T experiment which is undertaken under only light shading materials (such as canvas), or even under a roof-like structure which does not have IR-reflecting or absorbing characteristics. My own preferred arrangement, now the subject of renewed experimental investigation (stimulated by the author's papers in discussion), is to set up an open-air but fully shaded structure, under a dense forest canopy. Or, alternatively, as the authors have done, within an indoor environment. In both cases, however, environmental temperature fluctuations must be minimal, so as to reduce mechanical thermal lag to a minimum, and allow the organotic heating effect to appear and be measurable."

The by now usual 'deMeo stew' gets served over once again - thoroughly mixing the second set of AS2-05 experiments with the third, making it appear as though it was not precisely the problem of the blackbody absorption of photons in the IR region that we addressed by experimental means! Instead of realizing the nonsense he is incurring, deMeo now attributes to IR photons powers of penetration which, in his analysis of the Miller experiment (see IE #37), he was totally unconcerned with. It is a curious flip-flop, particularly as it is factually unfounded and fails entirely to either address or grasp our thermal treatment of the results.

In a previous message to deMeo, the authors countered his stubborn persistence in refusing to actually understand the IR analysis proposed by them, as follows:

"If the solar organotic excitation is related to the incident IR photon energy (incidentally, it would be good if you came clean on this and just told us what it is you are saying: do you know what exact energy and frequency of solar OR radiation produces which exact frequency of IR photon? And do you know how? And do you know whether this solar OR radiation is charged or not, and in what manner?) this does not mean, in any way, shape or form, that incident IR radiation accounts for either the heat evolved inside or above the core cage, or for the electroscopic anomaly which Reich half-identified. Precisely AS2-05 proves that it doesn't - and what you must address at the end of the day is not whether your shade experiments give the same results as ours, we think, but whether these devices display a thermal anomaly even in full exposure to the sun that cannot be explained by any blackbody radiation theory."

And as if to confirm that he had understood nothing about this third set of our experiments, about their design and purpose, deMeo retreats into some ill-conceived and rushed yet-to-come outdoor experiments in the shade. We hope that his shading canopy-to-be will be so

dark and cold as to contain a lower production of LFOT photons in the IR region than outside of it...

To finish his atrocious evaluation and pass our critical demonstration by in silence, deMeo declares our aetherometric analysis of the blackbody problem (the same analysis which produced the blackbody profiles to begin with...) simply premature:

"The paper closes with discussions about the implications of the various temperature curves, with comparisons of oracs in the full sun versus those in the "shade" (but which, as I discuss, are likely exposed to penetrating solar IR). Given the problems mentioned above, I consider such a theoretical discussion -- at least one so decisive in its claims -- to be premature."

We have this to say to deMeo: there is not a single problem which you have mentioned that impacts the experimental and analytical results of the third set of tests described in AS2-05. On the contrary, your cynically 'constructive criticism' proves your complete lack of understanding of Aetherometry - and fails to deconstruct a single of our findings and conclusions.

The question we must ask is - as Nietzsche posed it: how does such a bad reading come about? After all, it takes some effort, some desire (or nondesire) to so thoroughly misunderstand what is being said and done.

"There are terrible people who, instead of solving a problem, bungle it and make it more difficult for all who come after. Whoever cannot hit the nail on the head should, please, not hit it at all" (Nietzsche, F (1879) "Mixed Opinions and Maxims").

**Regarding AS2-06:  
Variation in the discharge rate of electroscopes inside the ORAC.**

By now, deMeo is getting tired - and indeed, it is a tiresome text he is constructing. He has long ago given up reading our texts. He is patently unable to follow the aetherometric arguments, and the little he does grasp only comes with severe and contorted effort. So he decides this time to begin with p. 14:

"It is stated (p.14) that *"the ultimate source of energy drawn from the atmosphere by the ORAC devices is the sun"*, a conclusion drawn from prior papers, but which I have shown above is unwarranted and not supported by the data."

Would deMeo deny that our data irrevocably demonstrates that both the thermal and the electroscopic anomalies inside ORACs peak in their effect as a function of the diurnal modulation of solar radiation? After all, it is not galactic radiation (which becomes relatively stronger during nighttime) that is responsible for the largest temperature differences, or for the arrest of seepage or leakage indistinctly observed at midday, is it?

As we said above, and are again obliged to repeat here - our findings are, in this respect, a strict confirmation of Reich's statement that "orgone is radiated into the atmosphere by the sun and is therefore present everywhere."

And Aetherometry further demonstrates that the atmosphere essentially converts this solar-sourced orgone energy into both LFOT photons and 'latent heat'.

But deMeo's broken refrain returns - his statements become looser still and ever more capable of even greater falsifications:

"More ES discharge rate data is presented on Fig.2, p.15, selected from a series of measurements previously given in S2-02, which show the absence of late PM and early AM data, as previously discussed."

This is, of course a lie, since Fig. 2 of AS2-06 compares an atmospheric leakage electroscope placed outdoors with a leakage electroscope placed inside the black ORAC, which is not at all the subject of AS2-02.

And the imaginary 'problem' of 'missing data' gets stretched ever further:

"This problem is compounded moreso in the present paper, as the data claim to compare the discharge rates of positively and negatively electroscopes -- but the data points do not match up at the same times (some are not even close, without a matching pair for hours), and considerable daily variation is seen in the graphs, making the absence of data for long periods all the more of a problem."

DeMeo's commentary sees missing and insufficient data everywhere, for everywhere he fails to understand the nature of the method of measurements employed. As discussed in the text and already referred to on p. 14 of AS2-02, the discharges presented in Fig. 2 of AS2-06 are long-term cumulative discharges and so, in fact, the lines connecting the data were both continuous and simultaneous, with the data points scored being coincident except for very few instances, allowing no chance of sudden accelerations existing outside that range! DeMeo could have realized this simply by looking at the extremely slow rates

being compared, both for the electroscopic control and for the experimental electroscope inside the black ORAC. What is more - much more - none of these specious objections of deMeo, even if they were true, would have impacted what the authors claim to prove - that, around the clock, the speed of discharge inside the black ORAC is substantially slower than the speed of discharge of an atmospheric electroscope, and regularly undergoes prolonged arrest, even though both curves undergo a diurnal variation. Fig. 2 demonstrates this for leakage, and Fig. 3 for leakage and seepage.

Who before us has demonstrated these facts ?

Not once does deMeo actually acknowledge that we have inexorably demonstrated three fundamental new facts with the data of Fig.s 2 and 3 alone:

- that comparable electroscopic arrests which are independent of the polarity of the charged electroscope, regularly and diurnally occur inside white and black ORACs, in the period between midday and early morning;
- that spontaneous electroscopic discharges, whether of the leakage or seepage type, present us with a diurnal variation in speed, whether they pertain to atmospheric electroscopes or to electroscopes placed inside black or white ORACs;
- that the speed of these electroscopic discharges is systematically lower inside the ORACs - irrespective of the ORAC's color and of the polarity of the charge trapped in the test electroscopes - than it is for control atmospheric electroscopes.

Is this the critique of an ally or a friend who has a desire to be careful and constructive? Where is the flash of recognition of the problems the authors address? Does deMeo actually believe that any of his imaginary objections would alter any of the three conclusions just enunciated??

"A similar problem exists for Fig.3A and 3B, from which I cannot see anything of substance to be drawing conclusions about [sic]."

DeMeo's reading of these figures suffers from the same lack of realization of the time-cumulative nature of the data. Persistently wrong in his interpretation of the meaning of those points and curves.

His reading falls so short of the challenge posed by our findings and theory, that he even finds humidity data where there simply is none:

"This, in addition to the problem of ignoring the effects of humidity. Figure 4 presents a better data set, with matching pairs of data (though no data in the mornings), and does show an ES discharge anomaly which cannot be explained by either temperature or humidity."

How on earth deMeo concluded from Fig. 4 anything to do with humidity, when it only contains thermal and leakage-rate data!, is beyond the authors of that Fig. 4. Carried away by his own concoction, deMeo begins falling apart, mumbling pure nonsense:

" Why wasn't this approach taken from the very start?"

What approach? That of creating imaginary humidity curves where there aren't any to begin with? Good methodology. Inflamed by his drive to get to the end of the endless figures, he rushes into a momentary bout of weak praise! -

"Figure 6A also is better in this regard..."

and at last - jackpot! - does in fact hit some figures with humidity curves:

....as is 6B and 6C."

Another cup of coffee down the bucho, and our man is as good as new. He even admits that these authors demonstrate a rate anomaly:

"A clear ES discharge rate anomaly is present"

Amazing! But this is qualified immediately by -

"...though it would be difficult from these data alone to clearly draw conclusions about whether the black or white orac produce any clear or systematic differences from each other. There simply aren't enough measurements being taken over the course of the day, and what is measured shows such a large variance, that the curves appear to go in and out of correlation over time."

Wrong again. The leakage data is time-cumulative. As for the differences between the two ORACs, white and black, concerning electroscopic rate, temperature and humidity, we let our data speak for itself: these and other figures all show that, on average, WORACs are cooler; but that is the extent of the differences claimed by the authors, who actually demonstrate that the differences in electroscopic rate and relative humidity are deemed null! DeMeo's text proceeds as if we had claimed the opposite. Frankly, this is a mania.

And at last he admits a checkmate with respect to his previous contention of humidity as a causal factor of the diurnal deceleration of the spontaneous discharge rate of electroscopes:

"All I see here is, there is an ES discharge rate anomaly, with a general slowing down of the discharge rates inside both accumulators, which is not directly related to temperature or humidity."

Such a candid admission is all we we're after.

"Other graphs continue to present data with similar characteristic problems, and with a final conclusion that they have proven that "the effect is nonelectric". I don't see it."

Of course not!, since he willfully chose to ignore the significance and novelty of our method of assessing both leakage and seepage - and to skip, with the greatest of yawns, our Fig.s 7 to 19, where we report our findings for seepage discharges in WORACs and BORACs.

(Readers of Aetherometry: is it possible to believe that deMeo has made it this far in reading our monographs of Volume 1 of Experimental Aetherometry, and still does not understand the relevance of our demonstration of seepage versus leakage rates!?)

Indeed, deMeo refuses to see the obvious - that if in orgone accumulators - be they WORACs or BORACs - leakage and seepage electroscopes are identically affected, the

electroscopic anomaly cannot be explained by accumulation of any monopolar charges, be they electronegative or electropositive!

THIS IS PRETTY FINAL.

And as if the data did not show, most clearly, a diurnal oscillation lagging the impact of solar radiation upon the atmosphere, deMeo immediately backtracks on his above admission that the electroscopic anomaly is not directly caused by temperature and humidity:

"The author's contention that the major factor causing a slow-down in the ES discharge rate is "the energetic influx of solar radiation" also remains unproven, and as shown above is based upon an incomplete addressing of the effects of temperature upon humidity, which clearly can affect ES discharge."

Most idiotic is deMeo's persistence in this moot point, since the diurnal variations in atmospheric temperature and humidity are most evidently driven by solar radiation.

The question here is whether the tendency to decelerate the spontaneous discharge rate of electroscopes is or is not irrespective of the electric polarity of the trapped charge. Since (1) we demonstrated in AS2-02 that solar radiation by itself could bring about such deceleration at midday or shortly thereafter, and since (2) the same cyclic phenomenon is observed inside ORACs directly exposed, or not, to solar radiation - with both a lag and a longer lasting and more intense effect - and since (3) this effect presents no lag towards temperature or humidity variations, appearing rather as covariant to these, then it is evident that the ultimate source of these electroscopic phenomena IS SOLAR RADIATION.

Because deMeo persists in not understanding that the leakage and seepage rates are in general rather slow for all the data shown, and thus that the data was taken continuously for every electroscope, within the proportional parameters of leaf fall, he again engages in specious errors of interpretation and thus gratuitous criticism:

"Other problems appear in the graphs on p.37-38, Figs.19 & 20, where comparisons are made between control, black and white accumulator ES discharge rates. The problem is, there are unequal numbers of data points, suggesting more data were taken for one of the groups."

The measurements were taken simultaneously and continuously, but where the rates are faster - in the outdoors control electroscopes - there are more points, because more detailed measurements were both possible and necessary (as they present a greater dispersion). For slower rates, the points are practically always cumulative, and at the appointed time one may or may not be able to make a measurement of deflection with the required resolution. Clearly, deMeo has never operated long-term discharges either with control atmospheric electroscopes or with electroscopes placed inside ORACs.

From false critique to useless babble is, of course, a very short distance:

"Fig.20 shows approximately 62 control, 80 black and 34 white orac data points, a significant difference which suggests the white orac was not being measured on some days, or times of day. If those missing days were characterized by slightly differing air masses, with different atmospheric humidities, then comparisons between the curves would lose validity."

Since the measurements were continuous and uninterrupted, there is no chance this spurious fear of deMeo's could materialize, because THERE ARE SIMPLY NO MISSING DAYS! All the data that could have been entered for the 19-day period, has been entered. The diurnal pattern is more than proved by the DWLS curves, and so is the difference in rates between ORACs and control electroscopes! deMeo is so determined to misrepresent the data, and construe an imaginary notion of missing data that he now extends into missing days, that he does not even realize the nature of the measurements at stake.

That he would choose, under the guise of writing an assessment, to engage in these uninterrupted misrepresentations and distortions, gives the full breadth of the pressure - from his Reichian peers and supporters - he is under, and to which he has clearly yielded with this underhanded form of response to our generous efforts, and the very openness with which we dealt in our relation with him: "And when you find something worthwhile in others (...) you kill it". Who said that? Yes, you strive to kill it, with no hesitation or care, and with whatever fabrication is deemed necessary!

Next follows some further harping on the electronegativity question - more of the same stew. He first congratulates the authors, and then proceeds to place his own position, with the greatest of ambiguities, on the side of those who assimilate orgone to electronegativity, and thus at the antipode of the position of the authors:

"The discussion section of this paper makes an important point, on p.57, that orgone energy cannot be a simple substitution for negative electricity. However, I don't believe anyone has made such a claim. It is possible that orgone bears *an as-yet undefined relationship* to electronegativity, in a manner which can cause millivoltmeters and electroscopes to react "electronegatively" when charged by organisms. It is a question that requires experimental clarification, to be sure. But the authors have not firmly secured their own conclusions ."

Is deMeo really this thick?? How could the electroscope 'react electronegatively' other than as an electrical effect mediated by being charged with negative monopolar charges???

The relationship between orgone and monopolar electricity is undefined, vague and ambiguous only because deMeo is caught between a rock and a hard place: on the one hand, he wants 'orgone charges' to remain mythically elusive objects, while on the other he wants to assimilate them to negative electric charges somehow - to argue that the mark of orgone is 'induction' of electronegativity. But the fact is that he entirely omits any reference to one of the new methodologies we introduce - the simultaneous comparison of seepage and leakage rates, with the result that, for the first time in these investigations of the electroscopic anomaly, we can differentiate between decelerations caused by electric fields, whether negative or positive, and those caused by nonelectric factors. But he cannot grasp the obvious results of our investigation that employed this specific methodology - **NO ACCUMULATION OF ELECTRONEGATIVE CHARGES WAS FOUND INSIDE THE ORAC. THAT IS A FACT. AND INCIDENTALLY, IT IS A FACT THAT CONFIRMS REICH'S CONTENTION, AND DOES SO WITH THE CORRECT METHODOLOGY, WHICH REICH FAILED TO EMPLOY.**

Nor does deMeo grasp the fact that Reich's employment of a negatively charged electroscope in what became an exclusive study of leakage anomalies, never entitled Reich to make any statement whatsoever about electronegative monopolar charges. All the more

so, since Reich never once reported spontaneous negative charging of his electroscopes inside the ORAC. One can only monitor varying densities of electronegative charges if one employs a positively charged electroscope. AND THAT MEANS, IF ONE STUDIES SEEPAGE ALSO, WHICH NEITHER REICH, NOR ANY OTHER REICHIAN - including deMeo - HAS TO THIS DAY DONE.

To end his disquisition on AS2-06, deMeo proceeds to another tired refrain, on a topic the authors have already discussed with him in previous correspondence:

"I cannot ever recall reading anything which suggests *"with respect to SR and the Michelson-Morley experiment, Reich felt that his theory of orgone energy, like SR, also required a negative outcome of the latter"*. (p.72) This idea has, to my knowledge, no support whatsoever. Reich did state, I believe in *Ether, God and Devil*, that the discarding of ether was (I paraphrase, from memory): "a premature discarding of a useful theory". In fact, he viewed orgone energy as a direct validation of the older concept of "ether", which was far too static for his beliefs. And I have show, how this static vision of the ether led to the eventual rejection, by Einstein and the world of classical physics, of Dayton Miller's exceptional work on that subject. If Reich had been aware of Miller's work, and how Miller had been defeated politically, he probably would have developed a different view of Einstein."

DeMeo here parades his ignorance of Reich, as well as his carelessness in reading him: indeed, it was Reich who first taught that light consisted of a local production of photons - and this is where aetherometric theory followed in his tracks.

But here is what Reich wrote in *"Cosmic Orgone Energy And 'Ether'"*:

"If light is due to local orgone lumination and does not 'travel through space' at all, it is quite understandable that in the Michelson experiment [notice how Reich does not even call it the Michelson-Morley, let alone the Michelson-Morley-Miller!] no phase difference could be observed in the light beams which were 'sent' in the direction of the ether 'drag' and perpendicular to it".

Reich could not have been clearer - only a null result for the MM experiment is compatible with the notion that "light does not move at all but is a local effect of orgone lumination", ie an effect of the luminating action of orgone. Reich, of course, did not realize that this interaction was mostly mediated by Matter, in particular leptonic matter, but he is very clear about deducing that *orgonomic theory is only compatible with a null difference in the MM experiment*.

DeMeo, however, knows better, as he departs in search of a validation of the elusive Miller experiments which, if proven correct, would suggest that there is a stationary aether drag, and thereby prove erroneous Reich's theory of local production of light. This would all be well and good if there were good reason to believe that Miller was actually onto something consistent and real. But these authors think otherwise, as one of them had previously explained to deMeo:

"Next come a series of considerations about what exactly Miller thought he was detecting. One could approach this by systematizing the alternative aether models-

1. If the aether were a static fabric of space, and the earth did not entrain it, the MM experiment should have measured the translatory motions of the earth, whether solar or galactic, or both. As it did not, the hypothesis of a non-entrained stationary aether could be ruled out.

2. If the 'inertial motion' of the earth entrains a stationary aether to create an aethersphere - thus dragging the aether along - the relative velocity between the ether and the earth may be zero (if the aethersphere was a fixed skin) or very small (with the aether lagging behind the earth's movement of rotation, since the latter entrains it). If it were zero, then a negative result to the MM experiment should also be expected. And if it were a small lag (necessarily referenced to rotation, given that a drag referenced to translation would have to yield a lag only when the interferometry experiments were conducted during daytime), it would also fit with a nearly null result, yet it would directly contradict the West to East motion detected by the Sagnac-type experiments - and require precisely a reverse lag (an apparent aetherspheric motion from East to West).

The two preceding alternative models are based on the notion that the rotary and translatory motions of the Earth are givens that cannot be directly explained by any form of coupling to an aether which is seen as stationary. In the second model - that of entrainment or dragging of the aether - the earth is construed to move 'like a rotating ball on stagnant water', as W. Reich put it.

Now, what to me is confusing about Miller's notion of an aether drift is that, at the end of the day, it appears to have nothing in common with the aether drag (rotary or translatory) models - since it suggests that his measurements consist of a detection of a cosmological aether drift that carries the Earth along. But it argues it detects this 'translational' drift at altitude, as a much slower velocity of the aether due to an aether drag model of the aethersphere (otherwise the displacement fringes would be substantial).

But there is another way to construe an aether model that fits both the null result of the MM-type experiments and the results of the Sagnac-type experiments:

3. In this model, it would not be the Earth that would entrain a stationary aether, but instead a consistent motion of the Aether that would propel forward the Earth, the Solar System and even the entire Galaxy or the Local Group. To again employ Reich's words, 'the analogy is that of a ball rolling on water waves more slowly than the waves'. There would still be an aethersphere, created not by dragging a stationary aether, but by a consistent aether spin (the result of the superimposition of multiple such spins, at a cosmic, galactic, solar and planetarian levels) propelling at once both the rotary and translatory motions of the Earth. Outside of the aethersphere, a much faster aether flux should be detectable, but the aether impulses would impart angular momentum to the planet by curving in along cycloidal paths towards the planet's surface, their energy being partially absorbed to drive the Earth's motions, as the wave impulses slow down to near the Earth's speed of rotary motion.

This third model would fit in with the notion that the MM-type experiments should yield a null result, until and unless their resolution approached measurement of that slightly faster rotation of the aethersphere, on the order of 100 or so m/sec faster than the local terrestrial speed of rotation. And the same model would also fit in with the notion that Sagnac-type experiments should be able to measure the rotary motion of the interferometer, and when conducted as a planetarian Sagnac, should yield a faster motion of the atmosphere from West to East, in the same direction as the rotation of the planet. It follows that only the third hypothesis fits the experimental findings, and remains 'unbothered' by the small MM residuals. Moreover, unlike the previous two models of the stationary aether (undragged and dragged), the third model proposes a dynamic aether that itself explains the nearly-perpetual motions of the planet - motions which, therefore, are not treated as simply 'given'.

One might call this aether flux model, an aether drift model - where the Earth, the Sun and the other planets are dragged along by an aether drift referenced to 'the distant

stars'. But the notion of drift itself conjures up the notion of an original event that impelled this drift - such as the mythical Big Bang extracted from the New Aether Drift axed on the microwave CBR - rather than the concept of the multiple-layered superimposition of synchronous and consistent fluxes of aether spin that permanently impel astrophysical bodies, and where the lag of the motion of these bodies with respect to their spinning aethersphere is constitutive of the surface currents sustaining their very rotation and translation, much as the lag of drag-cup motors yields eddy currents that are constitutive of rotor motion (hence the technical concept of slip is nonsensical in drag-cups).

In accordance with this model, one should indeed be also able to detect greater motion of satellites near the shear zone when the aether impulses slow down. This is an old question that goes back to the work of Newton. And it is indeed true that, beginning at an equatorial geostationary distance of 35,862 km above the Earth, when the translatory speed of the satellite around the Earth's axis is ca 3 km/sec, satellite speed increases steadily to a value of 7.8 km/sec at ca 100 Km above the Earth, and to some slightly higher value at a slightly lower altitude still; but then, instead of continuing to increase to a theoretical 7.9 km/sec at the Earth's surface, the satellite is dragged down, suddenly decelerated, such that at tropospheric altitudes, the speed of the flux holding an imaginary satellite afloat in a trajectory parallel to the earth would not be any faster than the variable speed (0.01 to 0.1 km/sec) of the jet stream with respect to the Earth. Note also that it is along the ridges and troughs of the jet stream that cyclonic and anticyclonic systems couple themselves, much as eddy currents counter-couple themselves on the surface of a drag-cup. A suitable approximation would be ca 0.5 km/sec at altitudes of ca 10 Km, in temperate latitudes. This abrupt slowing down of the inner concentric layers of the spinning aethersphere below 100 Km results precisely from the atmospheric and terrestrial absorption of the impulses of the 'aether stream' - and causes, of course, the illusion that free fall is a motion along the vertical.

The question then arises as to whether Miller could have detected that aether drift (and without reference to the W to E motion of the OR envelope), once it is slowed down and made to encircle the planet at a slightly faster rate of motion than the motion of the surface or the rotation of the planet. At ca 1.8 km altitude, and in light of the preceding, it seems unlikely that the value of an aether drift at 9 to 10 km/sec could be real."

From the above, it follows that indeed "Reich felt that his theory of orgone energy, like SR, also required a negative outcome" of the MM experiment. It is rather deMeo's interpretation that attempts to resurrect the old mythical and stationary aether, and abusively base Reich's theory of the orgone upon tenuous foundations which Reich himself specifically discarded.

DeMeo - proud of his performance - concludes this demonstration of ignorance by showing himself somewhat satisfied with his interpretation of the authors' concluding words:

"On p.75-76, the authors provide a clear statement of a problem to be resolved, of the exacting relationship of orgone energy to electricity. The authors are honest to admit *"we are not in a position to yet prove or disprove the adequacy of the solution proposed by this model"*. I think, we are all still at the point of seeking answers on this problem."

DeMeo may rest assured that we have resolved that problem long ago, well before we even knew how to build an OR motor, let alone an Aether Motor like the one he witnessed functioning at our laboratory last spring. The statement he chooses to quote is only a

signpost marking a particular point within the published inquiry he supposedly read. Nothing else may be inferred from it, save that we most clearly claim to have resolved, both practically and theoretically, the problem of the relation between orgone and electricity. What is more, MUCH MORE, we claim we can demonstrate that the world of massfree energy does not simply reduce to the world of ambipolar electric energy, to OR and DOR energy, but encompasses a whole other energy domain. DeMeo ignores completely the findings of the authors in this respect, as well as the case they have been systematically building with regard to the fact that the electroscopic anomaly observed inside ORACs is fed by 'latent heat'. For it is the authors' contention that they demonstrate how the 'OR effect' of ORACs is neither a direct effect of orgone energy (of beneficial aether energy in an ambipolar electric state), nor an electric or electrostatic effect mediated by either electronegative or electropositive charges, nor an electromagnetic effect of LFOT photons. Instead of carefully tracing these trajectories of the authors' endeavour, deMeo choses to bypass entirely the authors' discussion of latent heat in AS2-06 - its manifestation as antigravitokinetic energy in transient massbound forms, the demonstration that it is neither electric nor sensible thermal energy, its reference to the gravitational frame, how latent heat can convert into sensible heat, etc. It is as if deMeo had determined to create a vacuum around the core line of these papers, thereby also illustrating how (An)orgonomy fails to address what even conventional, accepted meteorology knows with certainty, and what we have identified as being responsible for the two anomalies of the ORAC, thermal and electroscopic:

"This liberation of latent heat is one of the most important sources of energy in the free atmosphere. (...) The turbulent transfer of latent heat (...) obeys the same laws as that for sensible heat and is measured by the product of the exchange coefficient A, the vertical gradient of water-vapour content ((...) known as specific humidity), and the latent heat of vaporization." (Flohn, H (1969) "Climate and Weather", World University Library, pp. 32-33)

Effectively, the ORAC functions as an accumulator of latent heat capable of translating this latent heat into excess sensible heat or into a kinetoregenerative power that anomalously arrests both leakage and seepage of negative massbound electric charges, ie negatrons.

These are the contentions, be they discoveries or rediscoveries, of Aetherometry. And on this part of the work, deMeo is silent.

Before closing, two other statements must be made - one, that in 1949, when Reich wrote "*Ether, God and Devil*", he was still de facto ignorant of the existence of DOR energy. Any assimilation of Aether to OR energy *at that time* was therefore a perfectly viable hypothesis, all the more so as the characteristics of OR energy were still incompletely defined. But today, after Reich's discovery of DOR energy in the Oranur experiment, and after our work in Experimental Aetherometry and its demonstration of a 'latent heat' effect inside ORACs, it is no longer tenable to assume that orgone energy exhausts the entirety of the world of Aether energy. OR energy is not a synonym for Aether energy, but solely a subtype of Aether energy - one that is ambipolarly charged, and thus electric, and has a particular physical affinity for cellular systems. There is no way that one can conceptually, physically, biophysically or factually, continue to reduce Aether energy to OR energy. This would be tantamount to freezing Reich's thought in his 1949 hypothesis that all the aether

energy there was, was orgone. We will return to this question in our counter-commentary re AS2-08 below.

**Regarding AS2-07:  
Decoding the thermal and nonthermal equivalents of the Org**

No amount of coffee can now raise deMeo from the dead. His critical appraisal of AS2-07 reduces to a few paragraphs. He confuses the OP with the org, and opens with another yawn:

"This paper builds upon previously-presented materials, and thereby threatens to elevate potential problems to an even more critical level. It revisits the issue of the org, which as I discuss above, was a concept abandoned by Reich later in his work, after the oranur experiment."

His stamina for more fresh invention falters, and only extemporaneous reiteration appears to be in order:

"The paper also repeats the assertion of a solar-energy influence upon the electroscope, for which proper controls against mechanical humidity factors have not been undertaken. And also, presentations of conclusions derived from black-versus-white orac ES discharge rates are premature, until the questions raised above can firstly be cleared up -- namely, the reasons for unequal numbers of measurements (more black-orac data than white-orac data), humidity factors, and the weather changes over the period of study."

Boredom now reaches exhaustion -

"Also:

Point #4, on page 4, relates experiments on ES discharge in a dry incubator. An incubator with moisture added, kept at essentially the same temperature would surely yield a radically different discharge rate.

...and it would fail therefore to show that, in dry conditions, the contribution of thermal heat to the arrest or deceleration of electroscopic spontaneous discharge irrespective of electric polarity, is detectable but not of any intensity comparable to what is observed inside ORACs.

DeMeo, as usual, manages to miss the entirety of the argument presented by the authors: if there is a cyclic structure to HP cells (without interference therefore from substantial cloud-systems), and if there is covariation of temperature and humidity, then HP cells are the analog of a dry incubator; therefore, if electroscopic arrest is construed as being the consequence not of covariation, but *of causation* by both heat (expressed by temperature) and humidity, then how best to demonstrate whether or not this is the case than by testing electroscopic responses inside a dry incubator?

This is a rigorous test of what, as deMeo purportedly should know, are desert conditions - incidentally, conditions of high 'orgonity' - where there is not sufficient ground water available to replace the water that has been evaporated by solar radiation and its reradiation from the terrestrial surface, and most of the radiant energy is used, instead, for the direct heating of air.

Yet, deMeo suddenly approves of the authors' point #7:

"Point #7 - excellent!"

where it is stated (!!!):

"Experiments with dry incubators - which present us with much lower percent relative humidities (down to ca 20%) and much greater  $\Delta T$  values than registered inside the ORACs - never succeed in arresting the spontaneous discharge rates."

Besides these few and erroneous comments, deMeo has no other commentary to make about the present monograph past the Introduction! He reads nothing else, and follows none of the analytical demonstrations, nor their correlation with experimental results and existing thermodynamics. The entire essay is in fact simply discarded, as a personal avowal of an incapacity to understand, or even of the absence of any will to know or find out.

This is an unprecedented step for any pretended or intended critique, and a constructive one at that: to be so constructive as to simply ignore what stands as the object of the critique.

Did deMeo think that we would not call him to the task of having to think and address the facts? That his errors in interpretation, his specious interpretations of the data, his persistent missing of the 'points' being made by the authors, his consistent distortion of what is written and presented, his abrogation of the differences between the authors and Reich (let alone between the authors and deMeo) his habit of comprehensive decontextualization - would prevent these facts from being drawn forward?

Who is now playing for peanuts? - as if to become a peer of any dedicated scientific worker it would suffice to don a powdered wig and lend oneself airs of judicial authority by pointing a finger!

Having thus dispensed entirely with the argument of our essay and its factual basis, he remarks:

"This paper suggests to me, a rather static view of orgone energy functions in the accumulator. The "fire" or "boiling" of OR energy from oranur is basically ignored ."

No scientist could or would ever be satisfied with allegories, and even less when they in no way apply to the subject at hand and are there simply to mask a sheer incapacity to read and comprehend. What does the org have to do with Oranur? Please, confusing the org with the OP is bad enough, but confusing the OP with mice and the org discussion with Oranur is beyond anything but pure petty (f)Oggery...Such is the infantilized level of Me and the Orgones. Disneyland, not science.

We sincerely never expected deMeo to stoop this low.

**Regarding AS2-08:  
Photoinduced arrest of electroscopic discharge  
& the Hallwacks photoelectric effect**

Haggard, fatigued, exhausted by his own state of confusion, deMeo still manages a last single paragraph of 'constructive' commentary on our AS2-08 monograph, addressing solely the figure of p. 36!:

"This paper presents materials (on Hallwacks) which I did not know about, and further elaborates on the theoretical side of aetherometry. However, I would challenge the interpretations given for the schematic on p.36. OR and DOR are not "two qualitative modes of the aether". Orgone is the functional equal for ether. They are one and the same, except orgone is a broader concept which encompasses biological and meteorological phenomena as well. Another functional schematic can be developed, showing orgone as the CFP for the two variants, oranur and dor. The presented ideas on LFOT and HFOT photons is interesting, but remains speculative, and does sound rather reductionistic and mechanistic. If something new is obtained from this procedure, then it might find an independent validation, but such is not the case (as presented in this paper)."

And what does deMeo say in this paragraph? A collection of frank idiocies. He takes issue with the fact that OR and DOR are considered by the authors as two qualitative modes of the ambipolar electric Aether, and that they present these two forms of aether energy as underlying the production of the two types of photons that constitute the phenomenological continua of all blackbody radiation spectra: OR being responsible for the production of LFOT photons, and DOR being responsible for production of HFOT photons.

In place of our experimentally-deduced, reasoned conceptualization of OR and DOR - which is, in effect, in agreement with Reich's conceptualization, greatly extending it and clarifying its physical sense - deMeo invents a series of nonsensical relations:

First, he invents that even though 'orgone and aether are the same' (a mantra proposition), *somehow* orgone is a 'broader concept'; we can schematize this half-baked notion as:

$$\text{OR} \geq \text{Aether}$$

Second, he turns this 'orgone-which-is-the-same-as-aether-but-broader-than-aether', into a Common Functioning Principle of DOR...and ORANUR!!, no less, such that we could schematize his silly notion as:

$$\begin{array}{l} \blacktriangleright \text{DOR} \\ \text{OR} \int - \\ \blacktriangleright \text{ORANUR} \end{array}$$

Third, he unequivocally shows, thereby, that he understands strictly nothing about Reich's organomy - for he does not even realize that DOR is a form of aetheric energy, and ORANUR solely the process whereby it arises from the conversion of OR energy, just as ORUR is the process whereby OR energy arises from DOR energy. He confuses energy,

or energy subtypes, with physical processes of energy conversion. IT IS A DEMEIAN STEW.

This unbelievably sloppy 'theorizing' is a perfect example of what befits basket-case Reichianism. For Reich himself left us with a very different theoretical framework, one in which massfree energy has two fundamental variants, OR and DOR, such that their CFP is (as shown by Reich on p. 155 of "*Contact with Space*"):

▶ OR  
 Aether (Ea) -∫-  
 ▲ DOR

and where their interconversion processes are related inversely:

Oranur  
 OR -----> DOR  
 <-----  
 Orur

In this respect, what are the changes introduced by Aetherometry?

First, massfree energy, Aether, has both electric (ambipolar) and nonelectric ('latent heat') variants, as we have demonstrated experimentally in published and forthcoming material.

Second, the same CFP concept further defines OR and DOR energies as qualitative subtypes of a single electric ambipolar continuum.

Third, the derived electromagnetic field manifestations of underlying OR and DOR energies consist of production of nonionizing photons, of the LFOT and HFOT types, respectively.

All the three statements are also buttressed, in our work, by a quantitative analysis, deploying a new micro-functionalist mathematics.

We can schematize the complete aetherometric concept of the Aether as the Common Functioning Principle of all massfree energy manifestations, as:

▶ OR -∫- LFOT : kinetoregenerative effect  
 ▶ Electric Ambipolar -∫-  
 Aether -∫-                      ▲ DOR-∫- HFOT : Hallwacks effect  
 ▲ Nonelectric

Lastly, Reich's concepts of ORANUR and ORUR as processes are left unaltered, even if phenomenologically, with respect to the experimental processes employed by Reich, they appeared intimately tied to the radioactive disintegration of matter.

Indeed, these authors demonstrate in AS2-09 how there is constant interconversion of OR and DOR in the atmospheric allotropic cycle of water, oxygen and ozone, without any involvement of ionizing radiation, and without any deployment of nuclear energy. This alone should caution one not to employ the terms ORANUR and ORUR loosely, even if one understands that they were employed by Reich as general terms for the interconversion of OR and DOR.

The distinction between LFOT and HFOT photons is an experimental one, towards which even modern biophysics has been evolving. The Hallwacks effect of HFOT photons has been known for over a century, and the free radical reactions induced by HFOT photons, for over half a century.

Credit should be given to these authors for having identified in AS2-08 the kinetoregenerative phenomenon induced by LFOT photons - and for its careful differentiation from the kinetoregenerative phenomenon induced by nonelectromagnetic 'latent heat'. DeMeo, however, simply refuses to recognize this discovery (it is not clear whether he even noticed it is a discovery) - as he refuses to effectively recognize any of our discoveries presented throughout these monographs. Yet, all the life-beneficial pathways that biochemically differentiate the response to LFOT vs HFOT photons have also been reasonably known for nearly half a century - so it should astonish no one that soon enough someone would test to see whether LFOT radiation is responsible for arrest or deceleration of the electroscopic discharge.

With his one single commentary on this entire monograph, deMeo avows himself as a pure purveyor of nonsense. The fields of alternative energy and present-day (An)orgonomy are entirely filled with this kind of nonsense - slapstick notions peddled as theories, devoid of sense or consistency, caricatures of Reich's texts, etc. They are a living incitement to the disdain which the close-minded officials of science, the Parks and Zimmermans, feel these fields deserve. If these idiocies did not exist, the Parks and Zimmermans would have to invent them, in order to justify their own crusades. This nothingness of theory threatens no one and opens no gates, no understanding. Instead, it aspires, through the convolutions of its halfbaked notions, to appear erudite and unassailable - and utters only nonsense: mice and mice preparations become 'orgonotic tension', 'Oranur' is not a process but an energy, orgone is impurely electronegative, orgone is the same but broader than aether, and so on.

What is most characteristic of these Reichians, here represented by the paragon deMeo, is that they make a life of sitting on fences - when not just of plain *sitting*, like so many couch potatoes. Even when one offers them a hand, they prefer to sit, to stick to their condition of self-imposed ignorance, to gloss over and create a vacuum around the discoveries of pioneers:

"You see, every pioneer has to have friends and co-workers to carry his work. Now, what usually happens is that they are not around, or if they are around, they take advantage of the pioneer. That's a very dreadful truth, but it is the truth. He waits and waits and waits for somebody to come around, to help, to do things and to go along with him. But they are just dead. You see, *the pioneer somehow jumps out of the present-day biological structure of humanity.* You know that? *He jumps out of it because of his aliveness. But humanity sits, sits, just plain sits.*"

Who said that, deMeo? And who said this:

"Many brave pioneers are now needed who, however, cannot originate out of nothing - and just as little out of the mud and slime of present-day civilization and the culture of the great cities: men silent, solitary and resolute, who know how to be content and persistent in invisible activity." - ?

Try as deMeo might, he will not succeed in creating a vacuum around our work!

**Regarding AS2-09:  
The Allotropic cycle of oxygen, ozone & water:  
Foundations of Aetherochemistry**

À bout pourtant, our hero, finally reduced to his real dimensions, has *only one sentence* to contribute with respect to our AS2-09:

"This is a good addition to Reich's original pre-atomic chemistry, very insightful, though I strongly object to some of the statements made."

This speaks for itself.

Especially when our report provides, for the first time in the history of science, the physical process for the a-symmetric creation of monopolar charges from aether energy, and carries out - with existing, freely available data that has never been properly related - the complete identification of the HFOT and LFOT photons mediating the interconversion of chemical compounds.

No words, then.

But wait, later on, in his deprecation of the authors' critique of Reichianism - or of the poverty of this 'ism' - deMeo writes some other comments (in which - note! - our original posing of the problem and gathering of results, both from the advances in organic chemistry in the past 50 years and, most explicitly, from Reich, is viewed as 'needlessly diminishing' Reich's ideas):

"\* In S2-09, Wilhelm Reich's ideas are needlessly diminished, with his concepts being captured into the author's own theoretical framework, as if the concepts were their own discoveries, which is not factual. There is a chronic absence of clear acknowledgement of Reich as the central originator for the entire pre-atomic chemical formulary the authors are working with."

One could not find a more self-indulgent appraisal of our work, and a better example of the emotional plague amongst quixotic Reichians, than this false and absurd indictment. The entirety of AS2-09 is proposed by the authors as a demonstration of the exactness of Reich's modest, unbalanced and simple equation (which, by the way, has remained unproven to this day, other than by the authors' exacting work!) for the interconversion of OR and DOR, by employing chemical, physical and aetherometric techniques that Reich did not use, and that have been developed since his time.

What is truly demeaning is that deMeo's pretense at a critique blankets these authors' work with such falsity. Somewhere, somehow, he seems to feel gypped by these authors, yet without any reasonable cause. Maybe it's elbow pain. Instead of attempting to find within himself even an iota of curiosity regarding both their efforts and their experimental results, or attempting anything even vaguely approaching a careful reading, he instead accuses them of 'irrationality' for their audacity to criticize modern Reichians for thinking and writing in precisely the same ill-informed, pedantic, mystical terms he has chosen to 'constructively' adopt in his 'critique'.

He writes:

"Also, the irrational smashing down of Reich's followers continues: On P.3, the authors state *"Most commentators or followers of Reich have either discarded the DOR part of his argument and discoveries, or reduced the OR/DOR distinction into a useless duplication of the disjunction between negative and positive electricities."* I don't know of anyone following Reich's work who falls into either category. Can they cite any proof for this assertion?"

The answer can be found by simply consulting the references to three Reichians under footnote 4, on AS2-04. To this list others can be added, including deMeo, with his chimeric notion that 'orgone is not fully electric' but has some affinity with electronegativity... We note, too, that when we had previously requested of deMeo to provide us with *any* references to Reichian writers who clearly stood outside the limits of our criticism, none were offered.

Realizing that he has mixed up everything to the point of completely disorienting himself, deMeo charges the authors with contradiction:

"\* In S2-09, the ending conclusion appears to bring the authors full circle, where they validate a concept which previously, for theoretical reasons, was rejected. On P.17, they write *"Reich might well have discovered how electronic charges arise from the superimposition of aether energy units, but what we shall next propose, and for which we alone are responsible, constitutes our own discovery or rediscovery of this process of condensation of charge by 'secondary superimposition'."* And, on p.24, they state *"...the injection of OR aether energy implies generation of negatronic charges by secondary superimposition of aether energy units"* Such statements, following others where the authors are highly critical of Reich and his followers for maintaining some speculations about connections between orgone energy and electronegative charges, sound highly contradictory."

Well, well. Let us address this new imaginary problem then.

First of all, the OR effect of ORACs is shown experimentally not to be an electric effect, ie not to be embodied or mediated by negative or positive monopolar electric charges. But it is also shown to be the effect of 'latent heat', as measured by analysis of electroscopic kinetoregeneration.

Secondly, OR energy is neither electromagnetic nor associated with monopolar charges, be they negative or positive; rather it is ambipolarly charged energy, in a massfree state.

Thirdly, under certain conditions - which were designated by the authors, most explicitly in the wake of Reich, as those of 'secondary superimposition' and which the authors, in AS2-09, were the first to identify physically, chemically and mathematically, as a cosmological process! - OR energy can condense into units of mass-energy that are electrically charged; but the authors' theory does not assign any specificity of electric polarity to the outcome of this superimposition process, the fact being that massbound negative units are produced in the basic allotropic process of the atmosphere, but that the physical process could just as well apply to the production of positrons, or other massbound negatively or positively charged elements of matter.

Ignoring entirely this detailed explanation of the relation between the two energies - massfree and massbound electricities - deMeo proceeds as if there was a contradiction in the authors' theory - where there is, instead, a functional, concrete, physical explanation for how any massbound charges arise, whether their polarity is of one type or the other; an

explanation that is totally independent from any reductionistic notion of 'orgone being incompletely the same as negative electricity' or 'impure electricity', or of any confusion between ambipolar electricity (orgone, in this case) and monopolar, massbound forms of electricity (ordinary electricity).

With this last statement, deMeo gives a stark demonstration of his flair for amalgamating everything into the concept of orgone or OR energy: massbound electricity, kinetic energy of electrons, latent heat (which, but for its effects - which he miscomprehends - he completely ignores), ambipolar electricity (which he does not even acknowledge exists!!). These are all interchangeably smeared and amalgamated in his simplistic concept of 'the orgone'...

And even though there is no concept in Aetherometry that rehabilitates the deconstructed concept of the OP, deMeo insists - with no reason, physical, mathematical or textual - on reducing Aetherometry to a subreptitious recuperation of those very same concepts it discards:

"The impression is, they reject the theoretical base provided in Reich's concepts of *orgone tension* and *orgonotic potential*, but capture the empirical foundations of those concepts into aetherometry, misrepresented as something altogether new, as if it was their own independent invention. Surely, this all demands a more careful clarification."

What it demands, James deMeo, is a more careful and less ill-willed reader! There is no more clarification necessary or possible. The injustice of your interpretations and decontextualizations, together with your actual incapacity to read and address the real problems and solutions raised by these authors' text, reveals only the extent to which you fear any scientific examination - both theoretical and experimental! - of these questions in an open spirit and without hidden agendas, and specially without the agenda of Reichian last-ditch churches.

Your last bastion then, is the irrational defense of untruth and small-minded criticisms. A sorry position indeed.

### III. To be done with the Judgement of Anorgonomy

"The judgement of knowledge implies a pre-existing moral and theological form, according to which a relation was established between existence and the infinite following an order to time: the existent as having a debt to God"  
G. Deleuze

Reichianism exists under the aegis of a debt to a deity, and this is its own entitlement to judgement. Like all judgements modeled on that of God, it claims some orthodoxy and some form of debt, be it even called scientific, to a despotic signifier now occupied by the vacuum-packaged image of Reich. There is even a website that perfunctorily instructs its readers to click on a Reich icon to proceed to each of its underlying topics. Instead of a thousand flowers for Wilhelm Reich we arrive at the vacuous image of a thousand uniform Reichs.

DeMeo has passed his Reichian judgement on Aetherometry, because Aetherometry is in combat on many fronts, one of which is against (An)orgonomy, Reichianism, and the debile notions it holds regarding libidinal economy, desire, sexuality and the Aether. In deMeo's judgement as high-priest of organized anorgonomism, this combat is objectionable and unnecessary. He begins the big finale of his 'critique', like a Jesuit, with the insidious offer to help us 'as a friend' - a friend who cannot read Reich's texts, let alone those of Aetherometry, and who has no qualms about passing judgement on the basis of identifications that only exist in his mind:

**"Regarding Term-Substitution, the Lack of Clear Citations to Reich's Priority, and Unnecessary Dismissive Commentary**

The authors need to hear this, privately from a friend, as otherwise they'll eventually get it publicly from a harsher critic, in a far more embarrassing and destructive manner. There are many places in their papers where new aetherometric terms are substituted for Reich's terms as given in orgonomic theory, but they rarely clarify that the source-concepts originated with Reich. Those parts of the papers need to be changed, with appropriate citations added."

As has been shown throughout the present analysis of deMeo's 'constructive critique', there are no objective reasons for these authors to validate the identifications which deMeo abusively makes with the single purpose of eradicating the novel differences introduced by the experimental methodology and the conceptual conclusions of Experimental Aetherometry. The previous pages more than suffice as testimony to this.

A complete inversion is then made by deMeo of the authors' argument:

"Also, their anger about some "Reichians" is so intensive, that they insert needlessly harsh comments which are highly over-generalized to appear directed towards anyone who retains a strong adherence to Reich's original orgonomy."

The authors would have been more than happy to give credit to any Reichians who kept loyally their adherence to Reich's Orgonomy. But these Reichians would first have had to be capable of loyalty to Reich's spirit of scientific inquiry, and to be courageous and careful

workers - not cooped-up chickens busily pecking to guard their turfs. And if deMeo can be taken to serve as a representative example of Reichianism (as we would argue he does, given the almost identical response to Aetherometry from other prominent Reichian quarters), then, after having seen his improvised interpretations, ridiculous identifications, and complete decontextualizations of both Reich's and our work, so prominently shown in the above commentaries, we have to conclude that he himself does not serve as an example of such loyalty, but of just one more distortion of Reich's burgeoning theory of Aether energy.

His distortionism of these authors' text reaches paroxystic extremes:

"In one case (p.29) the phenomenon is described, but identified as *"a process heretofore unknown"*, which isn't correct. One can disagree with Reich's overall theory, but factually he was the first to put together all the various details which are getting so much discussion in the S2 series. Specifically, at many points the author's theoretical discussions appear to be basic repetitions of Reich's ideas, but using more classical terms. The sentences on p.2, on *"the capacity or ability of cloud systems, particularly those associated with low pressure cells, to draw nonelectric energy from neighbouring localities and thus diminish the kinetoregenerative power of the medium local to the instrument"*, and on p.61 *"we have suggested that the energy which we have shown the medium can provide to the charges trapped in the electroscope in the form of the kinetic energy they spend to perform the work of lifting the leaf against local gravity, is the same energy which cloud systems draw from the ground-level atmosphere"*, are clearly taken from Reich's earlier concepts and discussions. The terms are different, but the details -- of the orgone energy continuum possessing a negative entropy, a solar-excitation-lumination function, an oranur-excitability function, and cloud-forming and energy-drawing functions - - these are all Reich's. The only acknowledgement I can find about this is on the very last page (p.88) suggesting the authors feel they have provided a better theoretical understanding of those basic principles and observations."

Another fishwife's tale from deMeo, as he fails to realize that the authors' procedure is a systematic and heuristic one, where the word of Reich is neither the last nor the first. Experimental Aetherometry is not about church-building, flag-waving and despotic signifiers, gods and their sons. Moreover, the authors openly acknowledge that while Reich taught them the concept of energy draw, the experimental methodology they developed in AS2-02 and AS2-04 demonstrates that the energy draw by cloud-systems (specifically cyclonic low pressure cells) and the proximity draw by living systems, specifically, by the human body, affects the levels of 'latent heat' in the local environment. Since the authors contend throughout Volumes 1 and 2 of Experimental Aetherometry that OR energy is ambipolarly charged electric energy and not the same, therefore, as 'latent heat', it would simply be malicious to credit Reich with having discovered this fact. Reich correctly claimed, yet never demonstrated, that the neighbourhood of cloud systems accelerated the rate of electroscopic leaf fall. But he did not discover, or - more properly speaking, perhaps - isolate, the kinetoregenerative phenomenon, nor the normal dependence of the latter upon 'latent heat', nor its mimicry by LFOT photons, particularly in the blue modal range of the solar atmospheric blackbody spectrum. The outcome of these authors' difference towards Reich's theory is that Aetherometry extricates the independence between the electric and nonelectric components of the Aether, whereas Reich's early (1940-1949) hypothesis of Aether=Orgone amalgamated - within the concept of OR energy - electric, nonelectric and electromagnetic energy manifestations that were incompletely differentiated. Reich was effectively unable, during this period, to separate what were orgone energy manifestations as ambipolar electric radiation, from 'electrostatic' interactions (ie from fields and fluxes of monopolar electric charges), from those of 'latent

heat', and still, from those which are electromagnetic (the concept of orgone lumination was simply insufficient and too vague).

This undifferentiated state of his theory in that epoch was also part of the outcome of an heuristic procedure on the part of Reich, but one that left much to be desired, as he well knew - especially when he later tried to separate these distinct energy manifestations - the electric from the nonelectric - in his OR motor work (1947-1948), and then became confronted with the brutal reality of DOR energy in the ORANUR process.

Also we must remark that the above sentence of deMeo's ("but the details -- of the orgone energy continuum possessing a negative entropy, a solar-excitation-lumination function, an oranur-excitability function, and cloud-forming and energy-drawing functions -- these are all Reich's") constitutes a perfect summary of the infinite torture of Reichianism and its purely nonsensical associative strings!

Confronted with such gratuitous gibberish, we must plainly state:

first, there is no orgone-energy continuum; there is a continuum of ambipolar electric aether energy, subdivided into orgone and dorgone;

secondly, since ambipolar electric energy is electric and not thermal - not even latently so - entropy or negentropy applies neither to orgone nor to dorgone;

thirdly, there is therefore no valid scientific reason to reduce a 'reverse orgone potential' of energy flux, in other words, the action of a draw, to the thermal concept of negative entropy;

fourthly, the authors demonstrate experimentally that this draw acts upon 'latent heat', and as well upon monopolar charges, irrespective of their polarity, typically upon contact;

fifthly, the entropy corollary and the informational neg-entropic subcorollary, do not apply to the continuum of Aether electric energy which exclusively obeys the First Law and nothing else;

sixthly, 'everybody' 'knows' that 'light comes from the sun', so stringing together a set of keywords, 'solar-excitation-lumination function', does not go beyond commonsense knowledge, nor does it explain either Reich's theory of orgone being emitted from the sun and having the property of lumination, or the essence of the aetherometric theory of light and electromagnetism. In fact, these authors claim that blackbody photons are only indirectly produced by ambipolar forms of the aether. It is only through interaction with Matter, after Matter has absorbed ambipolar energy and converted it into its own kinetic energy, that the shedding of this energy in turn takes on the form of local photon production. There are therefore very *fundamental differences* of Aetherometry towards a loyal reading of Reich's work that is truthful to his spirit. Such a muddled, slapstick interpretation of either thought, ours or Reich's, as that which deMeo presents, is geared only to ensure that the anorgonomy of Reichianism remains fixed in its current quagmire.

Next, deMeo emits another grunt:

"\* In S2-03, the author's use of the terms "*nonelectric power of the local medium*" will perhaps be more acceptable to the classically-trained theorist, but basically is a euphemism for the more "offensive" (and more accurate) term: *orgone energy*. Also, I do not agree with the statements, as given on p.2, that *orgonotic potential* is ambiguous, but it may be true that certain aspects of classical electroscopical theory remain unresolved within its contexts -- no less so that classical electroscopical theory is itself challenged by Reich's experimental observations. I do not feel every question needs to be firmly answered all at once, but rather feel it is important not to throw overboard useful concepts simply because open questions remain."

The authors did not start with any a priori assumptions when they set out to verify and widen the original observations of Reich. As it turned out, and is rigorously explained in Volumes 1 and 2 of *Experimental Aetherometry*, as well as in critical monographs that are forthcoming, both the electroscopic and sensible thermal anomalies can be shown to be derived from the accumulation of 'latent heat' inside ORAC devices. The effect is strictly demonstrated by us as not being an electrical effect, in the sense that it does not involve any mediation by, or generation of, monopolar electric charges of either polarity. Reich's methodology failed to employ certain of these experimental tools, such as the systematic differentiation between simultaneous leakage and seepage rates, and thus did not permit him to fully separate the monopolar effects of electrostatic interactions, from the effects of massfree energy, whether it be ambipolarly charged or nonelectric. Likewise, Reich's methodology also failed to fully separate what is Aether energy proper, electric and nonelectric, from its effects, especially those that are electromagnetic (such as LFOT photons).

Hence, had these authors amalgamated the term "orgone energy" to 'latent heat', they would have been in a very poor position indeed to understand either Reich's theory, or orgone, or 'latent heat', since they would have to use the term "orgone" to designate both nonelectric energy (referred to by terms such as 'latent heat' or 'intrinsic potential energy of molecules'), and a subtype of ambipolarly charged massfree energy - which would have been an obvious confusion, a ridiculous error and an acephalic procedure.

And had the authors made Reich responsible for their own thought by providing a reference somewhere, this would have been both a lie and a disservice to Reich himself, not to say an abuse. Only the authors are responsible for their own theory, its errors and its discoveries. The authors have consistently claimed that the OR effect of ORACs is only indirectly an orgone effect, precisely because it is mediated by 'latent heat', and, to a lesser degree, by the production of blackbody photons, whether sensible thermal (IR) photons or 'light'-producing photons. Hence, the authors are obligated as scientists to call things as they see them.

DeMeo continues:

"Also, on p.3, it is stated "*These definitions [orgonotic potential, orgone tension, etc.] have stood impervious to any understanding by scientists, roundly discarded as they were to the ash can of history*". The sentence firstly implies that there are no scientists who find the concepts understandable, which is false. There are many scientists who have been working with Reich's ideas and concepts for years, comfortably applying the larger body of theory developed by Reich without problem or difficulty. Secondly, it is important to note, that Reich was never attacked on the basis of his experimental work in orgone physics. That body of work was factually never experimentally evaluated in any genuine manner by his critics. Historical review (as in Greenfield's book, or Martin's book *WR & the Cold War*) shows his critics hated him for his early rejection of Stalinism (they were closeted Stalinists themselves), or for his biological healing work with the accumulator."

Another stew!, where deMeo makes it sound as if the authors didn't know that no enemy of Reich actually bothered to reproduce his work, and as if the authors' remarks referred to some vague totality of 'Reich's ideas and concepts' or 'Reich's experimental work in orgone physics'. In fact, the text refers, very concretely, to the org - which the authors constructively criticize and work with in AS2-07 - and to the OP, which the authors deconstruct in AS2-03, and suggest that it be replaced with their methodology of measuring 'latent heat' by employing the kinetoregenerative phenomenon, as demonstrated in AS2-05. Our text reads:

"Here Reich provides two essential definitions for the new physics of the aether (which he termed orgonometry), the definition of the org as a measure of orgone energy, and the definition of orgone tension or orgonotic potential, OP. These definitions...etc."

This, then, is yet another example of deMeo's decontextualization - and his failure to acknowledge, or perhaps even realize - that these authors have demonstrated that the shortcoming of the OP concept, such as Reich enunciated it, is largely due to the fact that it reduces to the inverse of the concept of neutralizing ion currents in the theory of ionization.

Moreover, if what deMeo gets from reading either Greenfield or Martin is simply that Reich was hated by Stalinists or for his therapeutic methods, deMeo appears to be missing just about everything and every force that tried to resist Reich's work - since it was the entirety of Reich's thought and its functionalist method that posed a threat, whether to Marxists, Psychoanalysts, Physicians, Biologists or Physicists; but no less to his followers, contemporary to him or not, who try to territorialize or immobilize Reich in his late 30's ideas on bioelectricity (as deMeo does with his argument about the 'impure' electronegativity affinity of orgone) or in his late 40's ideas on the identity between Aether and orgone (as deMeo also does), without ever realizing the deep development and open-ended character of Reich's thought until his death in 1957.

The next point raised by deMeo is gratuitous and moot - since Reich did not accept (erroneously, as these authors have now demonstrated) that an electroscope charged with a hair-stroked rod was negatively charged with an excess of electrons, and since Reich never described any procedure for the positive charging of electroscopes, nor referred to it!:

"\* In S2-04, on p.26, in point #2, I think the authors assume a bit too much about what Reich knew, or did not know. All we can do is reference his published papers, but it would be too ambitious to assume Reich had not undertaken experiments with positively-charged electroscopes."

DeMeo remarkably and astonishingly resists admitting the obvious, as it stands in the existing record - which, incidentally, is all he or we or anyone else has to go on - that Reich never undertook experiments with positively charged electroscopes. He prefers to imagine that Reich might have done x or y... This procedure is remarkably akin to the textual exegesis characteristic of fundamentalists of all breeds and credos: one decontextualizes and then reinterprets or invents, à l'improviste, as if the sacred texts contained what they obviously do not. These are the procedures of church-builders who have something to hide (besides their own ignorance and poverty of thought). Belittling and dismissing the effective differences is the essence of deMeo's distinctly underhanded tactics:

"\* In S2-05, the authors incautiously sweep aside virtually every independent reproduction of To-T previously undertaken during or since Reich's time. This includes published studies by Ritter, Howell, Starz, Shelton, Blasband, Rosenblum, Konia, Mann (G.), Seiler, and Harman. The authors consider it all unworthy of mention: *"Yes, a few private individuals have made claims of reproducibility or irreproducibility, but none of these so-called studies have had the substance that is needed to qualify their results as anything more than anecdotal. The fact is that the authors of the present study do not know of any reproduction of Reich's findings with the ORAC that deserves reference here, save that which Reich himself relates in several of his writings on the subject."*(p.3) and *"So, in over 4 decades there has been no irrefutable demonstration that Reich was either right or wrong in his observations."*(p.4) These kinds of statements, one would expect to preface an extremely robust study which itself was indisputable in its results, in which all the major elements of the phenomenon were addressed, both the orgone-energetic and classical thermodynamic requirements. Unfortunately, the author's own papers on To-T in this S2 series fail to rise to a level of significance any higher than those which are belittled and dismissed."

Our statements stand - as in fact we do not know, nor has deMeo made us aware, of any experiments that stringently verified the Reich-Einstein experiment, or that performed ORAC exposures to direct solar radiation and analyzed the results in terms of blackbody theory, let alone in terms of its aetherometric treatment. Clearly, we must summon a greater faith in the epoch and its reading of our work, than could be justified from contemplating the likes of deMeo. You see, they have a vested interest in pretending to a grasp of what in fact escapes them, their control, and their understanding.

There follows more of the same ill-conceived defense of his turf, where everything is subsumed into "orgone" as the plug-all catch-all word:

"\* In S2-06, more of Reich's ideas are presented, on p.16, but are identified as the author's hypotheses, rather than Reich's: *"The hypothesis we shall propose in this paper, consistent with what we have discussed previously, is that these peaks [in ES discharge rates]... are due to the drawing action of clouds themselves -- which removes so much energy from the ground-level environment that the latter is unable to replenish the kinetic energy of charge trapped in conductors that is being spent performing work against gravity."*(p.16) This is a simple re-wording of Reich's discovery of the organotic potential, at work in clouds."

DeMeo continues to throw around the term 'organotic potential' (OP), at times as if it were the same as 'organotic tension' (which it is) and, at other times, as though it referred, instead, to the energy draw phenomenon which Reich called "reverse orgone energy potential" or "reverse organomic potential". Only the latter applies to the drawing action, since the former is deemed to be a physical function and the latter a physical process. Reich's hoped-for hypothesis was that the OP could explain reverse potential flows.

However, the action of cloud-systems in accelerating the discharge of electroscopes irrespective of their polarity was first and exclusively demonstrated by these authors. It is incumbent upon deMeo to prove otherwise, by citing a single prior reference that would validate his dismissive judgement:

"It is a long observed and published fact, that cloud cover lowers the organotic charge of the local ground-level environment, by drawing energy into itself, into the clouds, where the higher charge is to be found."

We do not know of any published study showing that cloud-systems draw 'latent heat' from the ground environment, and proving that this is so by employing a rigorous study of the atmospheric variations in the kinetoregenerative response of atmospheric electroscopes.

Again, deMeo could bother to produce a reference - if there were one! - that would address the facts to which the statement he quotes (from p. 16 of our AS2-06) pertains. And since these authors experimentally and formally demonstrate in Volume 2 of *Experimental Aetherometry* that OR energy is different from 'latent heat' energy, there are reverse potentials of energy flux even for Aether energy that is not ambipolarly charged.

"The phrase *"kinetic energy of charge trapped in conductors that is being spent performing work against gravity"* is also a parallel conceptual re-phrasing of Reich's orgone energy, using terms of aetherometric theory -- but it is never simply and clearly stated as such."

This is a crass lie: where did Reich ever state that orgone energy was simply another name for the kinetic energy of trapped monopolar electric charges, such as electrons, which these charges spent exclusively on performing work against gravity??? He simply never did.

Had we claimed such a preposterous thing - that the above was what Reich claimed - we would have been rightly slaughtered on the altar of orgonomism!

DeMeo appears to have a genuine, psychotic problem with identifications and attributions of authorship or responsibility. If orgone is massfree electric aether energy, how could it be simply any kinetic energy of *massbound* charges?

The sommersaults of irrationality in which deMeo engages in his 'constructive critique' leave these authors mind-boggled. His reductions are appalling, and are all effected in the name of a vacuous Reichianist orthodoxy, the same pretense as that evoked by other factions of Reichianism which have determined to denounce or ignore Aetherometry. Et pour cause.

At last comes a frankly irritated deMeo, revealing his colors and the motivation for all these distorted and distorting commentaries he has made on our work:

"\* In S2-08, there are unsupported claims that, following the oranur experiment, *"Reich would be forced to revise his entire theory of a dynamic Aether, by introducing into the latter a secondary nature in the form of a dualism between "orgone energy" (OR) and its antipode "deadly orgone energy" (DOR). This dramatic alteration to the theoretical model he had been pursuing for over a decade would wreak chaos with the understanding of Reich's followers, plunging them into yet more outrageous mysticism.*"(p.4) These comments are themselves rather outrageous, and indeed, confused. Firstly, Reich rarely used the term "dynamic aether" or "ether" at all, except to decry the abandonment of a useful concept by classical physics. There also was no dualism in Reich's ideas or writings, but such does appear to exist in the minds of the author's conception of Reich's discovery. The accusation of *"outrageous mysticism"* is serious enough as to demand the authors be explicit about it, or stop making vague attacks -- in fact, it would appear the effort to render Reich's broad and interdisciplinary functional theory of life-energy, down into some mathematical abstraction, is itself a big push towards mystical thinking, the very kind of mechanistic-mystical split Reich wrote extensively about, and which currently is a plague upon humankind. And who, specifically, is referred to in the claim about *"most of his followers abusively held[ideas] - uselessly duplicating the electrical disjunction between negative and positive electricity..."*(p.4) Nothing specific is mentioned to support this assertion -- no names, and no citations -- and even if such a citation could be found, what is the meaning of the word "abusively"? Why the attacks on people, if the work is at issue?

The first point made by deMeo is beyond reasonability, since the aether of classical physics was never dynamic, but stationary, and Reich never decried the abandonment of the classical stationary aether, only the fact that instead of proceeding to discover the dynamic Aether (synonymous with orgone in the Reich of 1949), aether theory became fixated in

the fictions of empty space or the vacuum state. A dynamic Aether is an Aether which is not stationary but is in permanent motion, and this is what led him to postulate in 1949 that all the real characteristics of the Aether, including its permanent motion, were properties of OR energy and thus that orgone was equivalent to a nonelectromagnetic Aether that had to be understood dynamically: "if the 'ether' represents a concept pertaining to the cosmic orgone energy, it is not stationary", Reich stated.

Secondly, there is most clearly a dualism of OR and DOR energies in Reich's theory from 1951 onwards, that forms the core outcome of the Oranur experiment, and impels Reich to revise his thought and widen its horizons. From the biophysical observations of ORANUR, Reich concluded that "The OR energy itself seemed to have changed into a dangerously, deadly form of power" (Reich, W (1951) "The Oranur Experiment, First Report (1947-1951)", p. 282). Or later, in 1956, where he makes biophysical, geological and cosmological observations of a metabolism between OR energy and DOR energy, speaking even of an 'OR/DOR balance' in the atmosphere, of an energy economy at work in all biophysical processes, he states: "At the very basis of these life functions [of aging and death] we find the dying of the Life Energy itself; the change from OR energy into so-called DOR, ie the dead Life Energy" (Reich, W (1957) "Contact with Space", p. 149). And later, regarding what he did or did not know about the process of conversion of DOR energy back to OR energy, he writes: "The outcome [of the desertification of the planet] hinges clearly on whether at all, to what extent and at what step of the decay process, DOR energy can be reverted again into OR or Life Energy" (idem, p. 152).

It is precisely the transformational dynamics of the relation between OR and DOR that Aetherometry takes up anew in a fashion which is both experimental and theoretical, by resolving questions that Reich left either unanswered or answered incorrectly.

Because deMeo cannot understand microfunctionalist physics, be these organometric or aetherometric, he accuses the authors of mysticism, precisely where the authors demystify both theory and experiment!

But if deMeo so much wants these authors to accuse him, specifically, of mysticism, it is no longer something these authors will refrain from doing - since he has given such ample examples of outrageous mysticism throughout the entirety of his pauper's critique. After all, here is a man who explicitly can neither explain nor propose the energy and frequency spectra of OR energy, let alone those of DOR energy. Who confuses pretreated mice with OP. Who confuses OP with reverse organomic potential. Who confuses functional mathematics with mysticism. Who writes, without the slightest substance, demonstration, reference or explanation that "the orgone can, for instance, impart a magnetic charge to ferromagnetic conductors, but is not magnetic itself. It can likewise impart an electrostatic charge to insulators, but neither is it fully electrostatic in nature" (deMeo, J (1999) "Orgone Accumulator Handbook", p. 11).

DeMeo speaks of OR energy as if the 'orgone' were another signifier, another theory of everything that explains nothing. A kind of Holy Ghost to a Reich annointed as a son of God, of which he, deMeo, would be a high priest. He speaks of magnetic charge - but what is that? No one has ever seen it - and how does he measure such a mongrel?? And he recites the same mantra which is strewn all over his commentaries on our work: this time, the orgone only imparts electric charge to dielectrics (no talk here of spontaneous

electrostatic charging of conductors...), but is not fully electrostatic in nature...Does that mean that it is one-quarter electrostatic, one half, one-third? It is like the 'not completely electric' or the 'impurely electric'. This, notre cher deMeo, is precisely the kind of language that qualifies as 'outrageous mysticism' and which has made us - quite legitimately - lose all patience with those who call themselves Reichian. For, by writing the above, you have clarified nothing and done actual harm to Reich's theory, by dissolving it in these nonsensical generalities, reductionisms and analogisms that insult scientific intelligence. Here comes another intellectual bestiality, hard on the heels of the last one:

"[the orgone] reacts with great disturbance (...) to harsh electromagnetism".

Define 'harsh' as it applies to electromagnetism, please... Is a high-intensity beam of LFOTs 'harsh'? Is blacklight 'harsh'? Is ionizing radiation 'harsh'? Why these mystical and animist references that could never satisfy the spirit of any true inquiry into the nature of life and its biophysical functions?

This is the kind of depth which sadly satisfies deMeo and his nonthought. He cannot step outside of generalities, and at that, outside of ill-digested generalities. On p. 20 of the *Orgone Accumulator Handbook*, he states that orgone energy is 'negatively entropic', which as we have already discussed above, is sheer nonsense, since orgone is not a thermal energy. Rather, it is 'negentropy' of sensible thermal energy that is to be explained as a secondary result of 'reversed organomic potentials' of aether energy draw. Entropy is a thermal concept, and all that one can say is that the thermal anomaly inside and above ORACs (an anomaly that, incidentally, deMeo stubbornly persists in reducing to a supposed effect of IR radiation!) is nonentropic or negentropic, not that OR energy is negentropic. His confused and confusing usage of the term "energy" is so loose as to designate 'electrical sparking' and 'friction' as 'secondary energies' (sic), also on the same page! Such language is devoid of any accuracy, filled with scientist pretensions, nothing more and nothing less.

Further on, on p. 34 of the same booklet, after many contortions of the same type, including the statement that electroscopes can spontaneously charge inside ORACs exposed to clear and sunny atmospheres (something deMeo is yet to demonstrate...), he then credits Miller with the objective demonstration of "a dynamic aether"! The reader only needs to read the correspondence between the authors and deMeo to realize that Miller was desperately holding onto a static view of the aether (a fact deMeo eventually ends up realizing and admitting in that very correspondence) and that his experiments are predicated upon the two premises of the MM experiment, both of which Reich himself declared 'invalid' (sic! that is correct!) in his 1949 discussion of the relation between aether and orgone energy.

This is the same deMeo who, in the same *Handbook*, purports to discuss "the effects of ORANUR and DOR" (sic) by including a list of 'orgone-irritating devices' that contains such vague references as to "computer or microcomputer", as if the LFOT frequencies of these devices induced some ORANUR effect, or to "microwave ovens", which, after all, only produce an intense IR or sensible thermal field of LFOT photons, or even to "induction devices or coils" which, as the authors will demonstrate in the upcoming AS2-13 and following monographs, can be made to operate as emitters of OR energy!! He then proceeds to mix these devices abusively with sources of ionizing electromagnetism (X-ray

machines, cathode ray tubes), with sources of HFOT photons (fluorescent lamps, etc), with sources of constant magnetic fields - with no discrimination whatsoever between the physical natures of the diverse processes involved, and with a total disregard for science. It is a totally and completely ABUSIVE AMALGAMATION of widely different and varied physical processes, performed with the royal stamp of a Reich-icon, and perpetrated in his name. This, deMeo, IS MYSTICISM - the inability to make separations where nature made them to begin with, together with the lumping of critical differences under the umbrella of an imaginary same that serves as false unity. In the thought and writing of deMeo, orgone has no real physical meaning. It is like the eucharistic body of Christ, the result of a consubstantiation...

The fact is that deMeo also has little, if any, concrete, physical understanding of the ORANUR effect he speaks of so much, or of the process whose effect is the conversion of OR into DOR. For the simple reason that deMeo has very little idea of what DOR actually is as a form of aether energy with specific ambipolar electric characteristics, nor any idea of how it interconverts with OR energy, or of the different types of lumination which each induces, ie the functional relation between HFOT and LFOT light to the exclusion of ionizing electromagnetism. But even when he appears to realize from Reich's text that ORANUR is an effect, his understanding of DOR reduces to his statement that "Reich identified this deadened energetic state as dor (sic), which was short for deadly orgone". For then, without one shred of evidence, or references, or any presentation of data, deMeo goes on to affirm that all the devices enumerated above 'produce Oranur' (sic), which, to say the least, is ostensibly not the case for several of them. His single bit of evidence, shown in the figure on p. 54 of the *Handbook*, does not even provide a control for the response of the sensitive millivoltmeter, without the philodendron being the load. The observed noise from either a fluorescent lamp or a cathode ray tube can be easily picked by any load (as deMeo even notes on p. 69!), whether living or not, the philodendron example provided by deMeo being a case in point of a pointless artifact. Note also how the Y axis of the figure on p. 54 is measured in millivolts DC, it being obvious that the phenomenon examined, if it were not artifactual to begin with, would lie within that range of ion voltage differential which, on p. 27 of the same handbook, deMeo dismissed as "too slight and weak to be the causative agent' (of what, he never told us, but presumably he was referring to life-energy...).

For the incautious reader of deMeo's *Handbook*, all might appear to be well with the stew he made ORANUR into: mixing the results of nuclear radiation and ionizing electromagnetism, and the ORANUR process whereby they induce the conversion of OR into DOR, with the effects of blackbody radiation, some of which (HFOT) results from DOR production, and others from OR radiation - such as LFOT photons (eg in induction coils, radio transmitters and radar beams) which, if they are too intense, can also have noxious effects upon living systems, yet have nothing directly to do with the ORANUR process.

This is the same kind of 'depth' of analysis that one would expect from Keelynet. Of from supposed nemeses of deMeo, such as Ogg or Decker.

One might quite legitimately object that being a Reader's Digest of Reich, deMeo's *Handbook* could not avoid the infantilized summaries he gives of Reich's work - transposing, reducing and rearranging statements made and written by Reich - nor extricate

Reich's work from its own reductionisms. We would not argue with such an assessment. But we now know that his *Handbook* is reductionist not just because of his desire to appeal to a larger public and sell them a weakened version of (an)orgonomism, but because deMeo himself is imbued with true and tried Anorgonomy, with a complete closure of mind and a facile dogmatism. It is his thought, too, which has thoroughly ossified.

This is also the same DeMeo who discusses the To-T difference as a 'differential' (sic), and who reduces the thermal anomaly to these words: "an air-tight orgone accumulator will spontaneously warm up the air inside itself by a few tenths of a degree, up to several degrees" (p.98). The same DeMeo who, in the one-page discussion of the electroscopic anomaly inside the ORAC, never once mentions whether the electroscopes employed were negatively or positively charged - and we have no doubt that this is because, until we drew his attention to this fact, he never knew how he was charging them - always contentedly assuming that he had charged them with 'orgone charges'...

The complete distortion of fact authored by DeMeo in this *Handbook* is simply amazing - as he makes it sound with his 'spontaneously' that the To-T effect is not solar-induced and thus is not an effect derived from solar radiation, and as he makes no reference this time to absorption of "solar thermal IR radiation" to explain the temperature difference - being soft on Reich where he was 'hard' on us, when it comes time to peddle his ORAC handbook... Most amusing, and most telling with respect to his recent posture towards us.

These authors would love to see a demonstration by DeMeo of an orgone accumulator running under stringent conditions - as in our replication of the Reich-Einstein experiment where the effect of solar radiation is maximally minimized - and yet displaying a spontaneous accumulation of several degrees centigrade... That is one more challenge to DeMeo - to actually attempt to support his absurd claims experimentally and analytically - that these authors know he will never take up.

One also finds in the *Handbook* the unspeakable deMeian notion that the missing energy of the mythical neutrinos is orgone energy "discharged directly back to the cosmic orgone energy continuum" (p. 51). This, once more, is that priestly exegesis so characteristic of fundamentalism: he underwrites, with no questions asked, the notion there is missing energy - an error committed by the entirety of modern physics, save for Carezani's work and, of course, that of Aetherometry, which clearly show how the notion that neutrinos have substance in the context of explaining beta decay is a fiction resulting from mathematical error and a great deal of incomprehension surrounding the physics of the decay process - and he does so in order to recuperate even neutrinos into the arsenal of his crypto-orgonomic concepts... Reich will have turned on in his grave.

DeMeo invents these connections without any sense of examining them; it is all a matter of interpretation and baseless insinuation. And that, as we know, comes easy to priests bent on taking vengeance from the world and life. Such is the nature of the contagion of armoring.

But returning to the 'constructive critique, there are still a few more complaints from DeMeo against the authors:

" In S2-08 the authors statements "*All light is formed by the local production of photons...*" (p.32) "*AtoS proposes that all light is produced locally in the form of quanta or photons*" (p.35) are concepts derived from Reich's writings on the nature of light, but is not acknowledged as such. "

It is absolutely true that Reich first taught this notion (that light is a local production of photons) to the authors, who have amply credited him, in this regard, in AS2-11. But it is erroneous and a fallacy to assume that Reich first came up with this idea. In fact, Max von Laue suggested that all quanta, and thus all electromagnetic energy, were local, punctual productions of the interaction of Aether with Matter - in a letter dated June 2, 1906, where he explicitly states to Einstein that Einstein's photons only exist punctually but should not be seen as transmitting across the vacuum, nor as what transmits energy across the vacuum.

DeMeo just does not have the stature of understanding required to adequately situate the contributions of Reich to a modern biophysics of aether energy. He is too narrow-minded, too dogmatic, too confused, too eager to resort to underhanded ploys, reductions and identifications, to have the rigor required to do justice to Reich's work, and so his discourse constantly slips into yet another form of theistic cottage-industry, one just barely adequate for the politically-correct remnants of leftism. Moreover, he gives in his commentaries such a clear proof of bad faith towards these authors, that there is obviously no further point in considering him a possible candidate for productive dialogue, let alone an ally engaged in a common combat for scientific understanding.

In fact, he now wants our blood, and resorts to attempts at wounding us:

"The subsequent statements on p.35, about "*Reich showed how unsure he was about the nature of both light and the orgone, and their relation*", are unsupported opinions. Factually, the authors own views on "local production of light" are erected like drapery on the foundations and scaffolding of Reich's explicit empirical discussion on this same phenomenon -- but Reich is not mentioned. The failure to properly credit Reich, or to properly present his views, is appalling here. I hope the authors were simply being incautious, in a rush to publish."

No, the authors were far from being incautious here, and far from needing the absurd excuse provided by DeMeo that they were rushing to publication. The monographs to which DeMeo refers have been written over a period of four or more years, and they put forth an aetherometric theory of the production of light which is quite different from Reich's theory, precisely in its emphasis on the fact that OR and DOR both produce different types of light (LFOT vs HFOT), and in its contention that this local production is an indirect one, mediated by absorption of OR and DOR by units of matter, by the subsequent transformation of OR and DOR energies into the kinetic energy of these elements of matter, and by the ultimate release of this kinetic energy in the form of local, 'punctual' photons. This is hardly 'drapery' on 'Reich's scaffoldings', nor anything that DeMeo himself knows, or should pose as knowing. He has not written about it, nor has anyone else. And until we publish (shortly) the physics of this process of production of light from the Aether, there will be no such descriptions of this process available. Period. But DeMeo is a poseur who needs to appear as if he was able to ignore the actual physical process whereby blackbody photons are produced, and which aetherometric theory is, for the first time, bringing forward.

And, in the process of bringing it forward, aetherometric science is also smoking these Reichians out of the black holes where they have transformed *une science mineure* into another mass-religion, a last-ditch church. DeMeo is, after all, as unable to provide the energy spectrum of OR or of DOR energies, as he is unable to provide the energy spectrum of the electromagnetic energy quanta these OR and DOR energies produce when they interact with electrons or protons. But Aetherometry has long ago made these determinations, and those results will be shortly published at Aetherometry.com.

Like a good Reichian, DeMeo wants his cake and to eat it too: at once, these authors are found by him, at one and the same time, to both be fundamentally at variance with Reich's theory (and not his theories), and to have said nothing more than what Reich had already said and better. With this maneuver, DeMeo hopes to fudge the unavoidable fact that he has been, and remains, completely ignorant of the physical mechanism whereby orgone and DOR convert into light or nonionizing electromagnetic energy. He hopes to thereby mask his extreme ignorance of the subject he so much talks about and peddles. And since Reich, if he ever did actually know the exact process whereby light is produced from orgone or DOR, did not divulge it, DeMeo will have to accept that these authors are and were the discoverers of this process. That is to say, were he honest and actually capable of reading either Reich or Aetherometry - such would, of necessity, have to be his admission.

Examples of this kind of priestly dogmatism abound in more recent posts from DeMeo, and his argument over whether we should spell Aether as 'aether' or as 'ether' is as spurious and filled with irrelevant considerations as there can be, especially in light of the fact that he himself in his *Handbook* wrote "aether" (eg p. 36), and that it is hardly a question of either American versus British spellings, anymore than that "aether" refers to a stationary "ether" and "ether" refers to a dynamic "aether". This is more nonsense devoid of any scientific or philosophic thought. The choice of "aether" is merely an advantageous one, as it seeks to eliminate, on purely pragmatic grounds, any reason to confuse the physical concept of aether energy with the chemical concept of ether bond or compound.

Anyone who makes more of this, turns it into a battlehorse and finds in it a semantic reason for crusade, is, in our opinion, indulging in useless speculation and much religious ado about nothing. After all, the root of "aether" is the Greek *aithr* or *aiqhr*...

And, after all also, DeMeo is a very ignorant man who feels insecure in what he thinks he knows. And he should realize that he has good reason for feeling insecure. For he, like other Reichians, knows very little about what he purports to know best: orgone energy. All the more reason, one might have thought, he would be curious and eager to extend his knowledge.

If that causes him indigestion, if he now clearly recognizes himself amongst the dejecta of historical opportunism that recuperated Reich for their own base purposes, that is a problem he is still in time to resolve - by really reading aetherometric science and learning what he did not understand, does not understand, has not understood, and refuses to understand.

Of these scientific cadres or officiating priests of science, be it official or last-ditch, that constitute veritable smart lines of "front-row spectators", Debord once wrote: "they're

stupid enough to believe they can understand something, not by making use of what is hidden from them, but \_by believing in what is revealed\_"

They are the nonthought of antiproduction. In the sample at hand, a case of a Reichianist Oedipus that has befallen the tatters of (An)orgonomy.

"Combat is not war. (...) Combat is not a judgement of God, but the way to have done with God and with judgement. No one develops through judgement, but through a combat that implies no judgement." (Deleuze, G (1997) "To have done with judgement")

Aetherometry is a permanent combat against those who *sit* in judgement. No less than a combat against those who sit, just plain sit, sit and sit. And forget not what the poet says - "sitting on fences can make you a pain in the ass".