

**Open Letter Regarding
Recent West Coast Cloudbusting Operations**
30 September 2016

TO: Conny Huthsteiner, MD, Roberto Maglione, MS,
Stephen Simonian, MD

FROM: CORE Network Senior Operators: Theirrie Cook, BA,
James DeMeo, PhD, Thomas DiFerdinando, BFA, Joseph Heckman, PhD,
Stephen S. Nagy, MD, and Matthew Ryan

A full copy of this Open Letter is also posted here:

<http://www.orgonelab.org/2016OpenLetterButtonwillowOROP.pdf>

Dear Dr. Huthsteiner, Mr. Maglione, and Dr. Simonian,

We read your Report at the psychorgone.com website with much interest, describing your efforts to mitigate the Southern California air pollution and drought. ("Using the Reich cloudbuster as a tool to combat atmospheric pollution, and improve the probability of precipitation in Southern California", 31 August 2016.)

As you know, members of CORE Network are long-time workers in orgonomy, with senior leaders having decades of experience with the cloudbusting methods, including considerable work on the West Coast USA, dating back to the 1970s. You also know about our work and publications across several classical disciplines, and our dedication to orgonomic science, going back over that same period.

Based upon our experience and responsibilities, we are obliged to point out serious problems in your Report. These problems primarily fall into five major categories:

- * Problems in scientific methodology;
- * A limited knowledge of the history of cloudbusting research, and orgone energy functions in weather and climate generally, and for the Pacific Coast USA particularly;
- * Confused presentation of orgonomic concepts such as DOR;
- * The exclusion in your report of CORE Net operations that occurred concurrent with your own operation;

* Problems of professional ethics in your decisions and procedures, such as omitting all reference to prior published ergonomic scientific research, opting instead to cite an emotional plague character and short-time pretender in ergonomics.

1. Problems of Scientific Methodology in Rainfall Event Analysis

a) Use of inadequate proxy data in lieu of rainfall totals

Your Report references satellite images, daily weather forecast graphics and graphed daily air pollution data, which superficially appear as a robust confirmation of your efforts. However, those forms of documentation are at best *proxy estimates* for actual rainfall measures. Satellite images and even rainfall estimates extrapolated from satellite images are no substitute for actual measured rains, captured in rain-gauges. Also, weather forecasts more than 48 hours out have a low reliability, even less reliability during changing weather conditions. Within the initial 48-hours, forecasts are often based upon persistence models or historical projections only. Forecasted estimates further lose value during drought episodes, which tend to slow down or block anticipated frontal movements due to the presence of atmospheric DOR, a parameter which is not appreciated by conventional meteorology, nor included in computer forecasting models.

Weather forecasts also are additionally less reliable for identifying the progress of Pacific storms approaching the West Coast under drought conditions. Over the last several years of drought, the forecasts for Pacific storm arrivals at the coastline have typically been chronically revised to reflect increasingly delayed landfall.

By contrast to your Report's use of infrared satellite images, and rain maps which presented *estimated* rainfall amounts only (constructed from similar satellite images), radar maps which detect falling rains are more reliable in this regard. However, in drylands of very low humidity, as exists across the current Southern California drought region, radar-rains can often be merely *virga*, falling raindrops that evaporate before even wetting the ground. At the end of the day, *actual measured rainfall "in the bucket" has no substitute*. Even a time-line of daily *measured* relative humidity would be more revealing of your results than the rainfall "guesstimates" in the 10-day Wunderground forecasts.

Without measured rainfall data to rely upon, or related humidity and percent cloud cover data, the claims made in your Report based upon infrared satellite images, rainfall reconstructions from those satellite images, and "forecasted rain", reveal a serious weakness, and can only be viewed as *suggestive* of the actual consequences of your efforts.

All of these are understood points of atmospheric science, rather basic stuff, and are characteristic of published CORE reports over many years. So we are puzzled why the more reliable measured rainfall, humidity and cloud-cover data, and radar maps were not included in your analysis.

Further, your Figure 4, which reproduced the weather Wunderground forecast for Buttonwillow on the morning of January 1st, six hours before your operation commenced, already included predictions for storminess and rainfall over a 3-day period, to commence on January 5th. This is significant, indicating you were in fact operating at a time when weather forecasts, no matter how potentially inaccurate for 3 days out, had predicted an extended rainfall event. This becomes doubly significant, as we will discuss below, given that *CORE Net operations were taking place only two days earlier, over December 29-30 of 2015.*

But most alarming was the mis-use of *forecasted* rainfall "quantities" dominating your Report, *as if they were something real, something more than the forecaster's guesses.* The casual reader may not even realize these were *NOT* measured rainfall amounts. And even the forecasted "amounts" included in your Report often were for periods 3 or more days out, when only the most general patterns could be anticipated by the forecasters.

It could be, the actual measured rainfall data would confirm those forecasts, but they also might not confirm them at all. There is no way to know using only the proxy rainfall indicators you presented. We are forced to ask, if even one rain gauge or measuring bucket existed at your operations site, to determine the local results, much less over a larger area of Southern California?

b) Failure to document pre-operations conditions

In the analysis of cloudbusting operations, it is necessary to insure that the operator was not working on an already-amplifying weather situation, with

an on-coming weather event, or during a natural pulsation wave where operations commenced at the minima between wave-peaks. This requires that *the pre-operations conditions must be documented in one's analytic procedures, and in any weather data graphs.*

Your air pollution graphs from nearby Bakersfield are the only measured data presented in your Report, but they did not include any significant number of days before your operations, to see what the overall patterns were prior to the onset of your operations. To be accurate, your Report should have included air pollution data graphs that began around December 15th of 2015, and then run through January 17, thereby presenting an equal number of days before your operations commenced, and after they were completed. That kind of data would have removed any doubts about the pre-existing trends and conditions, allowing any inflection points in the data stream to be contrasted to the actual operational dates. This procedure should have been done alongside measured rainfalls and wind directions, both of which also affect air pollution parameters. As it stands, with your air pollution data graphs starting only *one day prior to onset of operations*, your claims to have mitigated against air pollution are not convincing nor scientifically defensible.

Overall, these were sloppy and unscientific procedures showing a lack of understanding of basic meteorology and scientific methodology, much of which could have been gotten with a simple review of the large body of preexisting ergonomic research on the subject.

2. The Nature of Pacific Coast Winter Storm Patterns

From the descriptions in your report, it appears a basic synoptic feature of West Coast weather was either ignored or unknown. By the natural pattern, Pacific Ocean storms firstly move on-shore carrying the greater part of their energy and moisture within their superimposing core regions, which preferentially make landfall along the northerly parts of the USA coastline. Then, depending upon their strength, the *tails* of those storm fronts descend into more southerly latitudes *in proportion to the strength of their northerly cyclonic core regions*. It is through the south-trending tails of those more energetic Pacific Storms that Southern California gets most of its wintertime rains.

After your operations commenced, the Pacific storm system you identified and worked on appeared on the satellite images, at its most southerly end, as *shredded and diminished*, possibly by your over-drawing as it approached the West Coast. By your own published satellite images, your work appeared to successfully "grab the tail" of that approaching cyclonic storm, prematurely pulling some of its energy into Southern California, but thereby stretching it out into a thin layer. The draw was too much, too fast. The overall coherence of the larger cyclonic storm was thereby disrupted. Meanwhile, the Northerly portion of that storm remained intact, and brought good rains across both Northern and Central California. Some higher elevations and coastal regions of Southern California also experienced good rains, but it hardly affected your low elevation region in the Southern Central Valley. As the actual measured rainfall shows, which we present below, rains basically ended on the 10th of January for Southern California, even while Northern and Central California benefited from a series of three additional well-organized Pacific Storms that also already existed before your operations began. This erodes your claims of effectiveness. By our observations, natural atmospheric pulsation had been restored for the West Coast over nearly all of December 2015, with regular storm pulses moving across the Pacific, and with only a small bit of work necessary in late December, undertaken at only one of the CORE Net draw sites, as is detailed below.

There are other significant aspects of Pacific storms and West Coast climatology which were ignored in your Report, suggesting confusions about what Reich and subsequent CORE workers have discovered, but which would require too much space other than the brief sketch mentioned here. Notable was the emphasis in your Report about *not* engaging the jet streams, which are functionally driven by orgone energy streams moving down from cosmic space into the upper troposphere, where they move the air into fast jet-stream currents, form superimpositions, and guide, steer and energize the Pacific storms. It would be impossible to affect any large Pacific cyclonic storm system without also *a-priori* eliciting changes in the jet streams, either with cautious deliberation or inadvertently. Another major omission was the failure to mention the existence of the very large *Pacific DOR-layer*, which was discovered 70 years ago as one of several major oceanic dry zones by the mainstream climatologist Köppen, but quickly forgotten by mainstream climatology. It was resurrected to mainstream attention and organomic significance by DeMeo, who developed the first global land-ocean *Desert-Drought Map*, and described its

expressions over the vast region between Hawaii and Baja/S. California. This extensive oceanic DOR-layer can be directly observed along the West Coast shoreline, and also appears on satellite images as a semi-permanent dry-zone. Reich described some aspects of it during his Tucson work, and it has always been *the major climate feature suppressing and affecting rainfall patterns in Southern California and the American Southwest*. It is hardly possible a Southern California drought could be seriously mitigated without recognizing such factors as these, and specifically addressing them in CORE operations.

(J. DeMeo: "The Desert-Drought Map and its Implications", 90th Conference, *Assoc. American Geographers*, San Francisco, California, 29 March - 2 April, 1994, Abstracts, p.81; "Global Desert Haze/Dust Transport: An Interconnecting Common Denominator for Deserts, Droughts and El Niño?" WSSA 37th Annual Conference, Special Session on El Niño and Climate Change, *Association for Arid Lands Studies*, 1995; "Desert Expansion and Drought: Environmental Crisis", *Jf Orgonomy*, Vol.23, No.1, 1989, pp.15-26; "The Desert-Drought Map", *Pulse of the Planet* 2:82-83 Fall 1989. "CORE Report #26: California Drought of 1990-1991", *J. Orgonomy*, 26(1):49-71, 1992.)

3. CORE Net Operations of Dec. 29-30, and Preliminary Data Analysis for Dec. 2015 and Jan. 2016.

Another flaw in your paper was the failure to factor into your analysis the fact that CORE Net was working concurrently on the same problem you were. In case you did not see it, here is a weblink to a preliminary report on operations undertaken in California and Oregon over approximately the same period of time, by the CORE-Network USA, published widely via internet in March of this year, 2016, five months before the publication of your own Report.

CORE Network Success: "Miracle March II" West Coast Rains & Snow - Preliminary Report Released: 27 March 2016
<https://obrlnews.wordpress.com/2016/03/30/core-network-success-miracle-march-ii-west-coast-rains-snow-preliminary-report/>

This CORE Net Report covers the excellent results experienced in mostly North-Central California, Oregon and San Diego, following cloudbusting operations in those regions.

According to our own analysis of archived rainfall maps derived from radar determinations, more reliable and comprehensive than what you have presented, there were, as mentioned above, significant rainfall episodes already occurring across the USA West Coast in the days leading up to your early January operations. Here is a summary of the situation over all days of December 2015 and January 2016, divided into three major climate zones.

Pacific NW (including Washington, Oregon, and Northern California): Significant rainfall episodes (>0.01" estimated over more than half the region)

2015 December 2-26, 28-30

2016 January 4-10, 12-25 and 27-31

Central California: Significant rainfall episodes (>0.01" estimated over more than half the region)

2015: December 2-14, 17-25, 28-31

2016 January 4-10, 12-20, 22-25, 28-31

Southern California: All Rainfall episodes

2015 December 11-12, 14, 20, 22-23, 25, 29

2016 January 5-8, 10, 31

Precipitation was excellent across most of the West Coast on nearly every day in December 2015, with only a few days of dryness. January 2016 also had excellent pulsating rainfall episodes in the Pacific NW, Northern and Central California. For Southern California, rains fell in the mountains and coastal regions, but not significantly so within the Southern Central Valley. Your region went fully dry after January 10th through the 31st. While December saw around six different significant rainy episodes sweeping all the way south down to the San Diego region, there were only three of such significant rainfall pulsations in January, on Jan. 5-8th, 10th and 31st. From Jan. 10th through end of the month, in contrast to December, Southern California went dry. Northern and Central California did not dry out.


What you did not know, however, was that CORE Net operations were active over the prior periods of October-November 2015, as well as in *both early and late December 2015 (specifically at our Mt. Shasta site, Mr. Matthew Ryan operating, on Dec. 1-2, 3-4 and Dec. 29-30)*. Our operations in October-November 2015 had been so successful in restoring very good

rains and snow across the Western coastal states, by early December only one of our West Coast draw-stations was operative. The most northerly station in Oregon was swamped with *four feet of snow*, the cloudbusters immobilized under a thick snow blanket, and could not be moved or operated. The Ukiah station's location had received such excellent rains that no further operations were necessary for that region. San Diego station's portable equipment was having break-downs and difficulty finding an adequate draw location, and was in any case benefiting from the tails of the cyclonic Pacific storms that were regularly coming on-shore. This left only our station near Mt. Shasta, which also had gotten excellent good rains and snow, but was still in operation under direction of senior CORE Net member Ryan, who undertook all the helpful December operations alone.

The cooperative CORE-Net operations had, by early December, basically restored natural rainfall pulsations over the entire West Coast, and so operations ceased after December 4th. Natural pulsation of storms and rains continued with a short cessation in late December, when an operation was again undertaken by Ryan at the Shasta site. No operations were undertaken by CORE Net in January 2016, for similar reasons of good natural pulsation with rain/snow across the Pacific NW and Central California. Our San Diego site remained out of commission. With our own limitations in time and resources, and nearly no funding to draw upon, Southern California was beyond our capacities.

Below is Figure 1, a satellite image taken on January 1st at 20:00 Zulu (UTC), which is 1:00PM Pacific Time, about a day *after* the CORE Net operations in California ended, and 90 minutes *before* your Jan.1-2 operation began. It shows, a major frontal system is standing offshore of the West Coast, slowly moving inland. Other Pacific storm systems were lined up offshore, out in the Pacific Ocean, but are not readily visible in this particular satellite image. Rains and snow from this system would take from 2 to 4 more days to arrive, fulfilling the approximate forecast expectations given in your Figure 4 Wunderground forecast chart, reproduced below.






Figure 1 http://www.orgonelab.org/CORENetData/16010120_gwir.gif



Most recently, we procured and graphed out measured daily rainfall data for selected West Coast weather stations, for the entire period of December 2015 and January 2016. Below in Figure 2 we present rainfall data graphs summarizing those data. The weather stations were selected due to their closest proximity to CORE Network draw sites, plus one for Bakersfield, close to your draw site in Buttonwillow. From this Figure, you can see the correlated patterns of rains across the entire West Coast region. The red bars mark the dates of cloudbuster operations at the respective Shasta and Buttonwillow sites.

Figure 2

<http://www.orgonelab.org/CORENetData/WestCoastPrecipGraphAll.jpg>



What can be concluded from these data and other facts?

a) While we have not yet completed our own data analysis for the full 2015-2016 rainy season, this limited analysis of Dec.-Jan. indicates that *whatever atmospheric benefits came from your operation of Jan.1-2, they were occurring on the coat-tails of CORE Net operations on Dec.29-30, with only a one-day gap in between.* A very real pulsation of natural rains had already been established over much of the West Coast prior to the onset of your operation.

The rainfall event starting on Jan.4th, following both Ryan's CORE Net operation and your operation, firstly made landfall along the Pacific NW and the Northern-Central California coastline on the 4th, pushing south into Southern California afterwards, on the 5th. Your exact locations in Bakersfield and Buttonwillow did get some rains starting on Jan.5th, but otherwise remained dry until the end of the month. However, the CORE Net operations of late December nevertheless color whatever claims you might make for your own operation in early January, even if you had used measured rainfall or other more robust forms of analysis.

We have other rainfall data and graphics under preparation, and hope to have a completed analysis for the full 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 West Coast winter rainy seasons at some point down the line. For now, the existing analysis will have to suffice.

b) Whatever benefits were brought by your operation of Jan.1-2, they *did not in fact restore natural pulsation of rains to your region* as your report claims.

As noted above, three rainfall pulses were recorded for Southern California over January 2016, starting on Jan.4th, 10th and 31st. Every one of them occurred as the consequence of southerly frontal extensions from strong Pacific storm cores that firstly and more strongly moved on-shore in Northern California or the Pacific NW. Those southerly frontal extensions presented an opportunity for your group efforts which was not exploited, or if so, attempted incompetently, given the lack of any training of your group members by those with solid adherence to Reich's original and largely unpublished CORE methods.

4. Confusions About DOR and Air Pollution, and Citation Deficits

To clarify, DOR is an energetic condition of the orgone energy continuum. The qualitative shift from OR to DOR provides a substrate by which chemical and particulate air pollution is made to become more noticeable, to accumulate to higher levels, but *DOR is not the same thing as the air pollution itself*, as suggested several times in your Report. Air pollution also has no identified role in creation of droughts or deserts.

Your Report also cited Trevor Constable as if he were an important reference in cloudbusting, as if he were a noteworthy expert within organomic science. That is an entirely false premise, and is discussed in more detail below, in point 5. Your Report wrongly stated, "The only efforts [on air pollution] carried out in the past, reported in the literature, were those recorded by Constable..." This is simply *not true*, and further exposed a fundamental disregard for the history of organomy and its published literature, and of classical atmospheric science, as well as a misunderstanding of DOR.

In all the published accounts on cloudbusting going back to Reich, including those published by CORE Net members (and the unpublished ones), the problem of atmospheric DOR was centrally identified and described as a specific qualitative disturbance of the orgone energy continuum. It is identified by its opaque and irritating nature, its unusual concentrations within deserts or drought regions, and its stagnating, blocking characteristics. The relationship between DOR and chemical or aerosol pollution also has been discussed within the organomic literature, repeatedly so, especially in publications by CORE Net members. *But it was Reich, and later William Moise, Charles Kelley, Richard Blasband and Jerome Eden, not Trevor Constable, who were the first to write about such problems* as the increased haziness, opacity, immobilized stagnating character, acidification and ozonation that defines the presence of DOR, *all of which can exist without any anthropogenic air pollutants*. Also, Reich wrote on the crumbling of rocks and dying trees, coated with black material precipitating out of a DORish atmosphere (ie, melanor). He observed and described such things about 10 years before classical atmospheric science mechanistically (and often incoherently) identified and wrote about *DOR aspects*, such as atmospheric haze, stagnating inversions, acid rain and ozone, and the blackening of open rock and tree surfaces, with consequent forest-death.

For other more recent specific examples, aside from Reich:

* Blasband wrote about air-pollution problems in much greater detail than Constable ever did, as in his "CORE Progress Report #2" which appeared in the same issue of the *Journal of Orgonomy* that printed Constable's "Operation Kooler" report. (R. Blasband, *J. Orgonomy*, 6(2):72-79, 1972)

* DeMeo published an experimental report on "Reduction of Rainwater Acidity Following the End of the 1986 Drought: An Effect of Cloudbusting?", (*J. Orgonomy*, 21(2):249-251, 1987.)

* DeMeo also directed a *multi-year project* hosted by interested professionals in Berlin, from 1990 through 1993, aimed at *reducing severe air pollution over Berlin and surroundings*, "CORE Research and Field Operations Overseas: Germany 1989-1990 *Orgonomische Projekt Waldheilung*." (*Pulse of the Planet* 3:110-117 1991.)

* DeMeo also reviewed Reich's findings from the 1950s on air pollution factors related to DOR, in a published article (J. DeMeo: "Cloudbusting: Growing Evidence for a New Method of Ending Drought and Greening Deserts", *AIBC Newsletter* No.20, American Institute for Biomedical Climatology, 1996, p.1-4.)

Your failure-to-cite these published scientific studies could not have been due to ignorance, as these same published studies on air pollution factors are discussed and cited in Maglione's own book on the cloudbusting subject, *Healing of Atmospheres* (see citation 17 on p.57, citations 6, 31 and 34 on pp.90-93).

Your Report also did not cite even one of the numerous published scientific accounts in the organomic literature of successful cloudbusting projects ending West Coast droughts, such as the papers by Eden, Blasband, C. Baker or DeMeo. CORE Network also has many successful *unpublished* West Coast drought-breaking projects, as directed by Matthew Ryan, Theirrie Cook, and Stephen Nagy, and a few East Coast CORE projects by Tom DiFerdinando and Joseph Heckman. Why were none of the published West Coast efforts referenced? You all know most of us personally, and the work that we have done and published. The publications are not secret

material. Any one of them is more accurate and scientifically supported than the totality of what Constable wrote.

5. Trevor Constable's Mystic Confusions and Emotional Plague Conduct

Constable did reasonable work over the few short years of his association with and oversight by the American College of Orgonomy, with two papers published in the *Journal of Orgonomy* in 1971-1972. Shortly thereafter, he abandoned Reich's scientific approach in favor of the mystical approach of Rudolf Steiner, making very large but unsupported claims for rain-making or pollution-reduction in different parts of the world. He also applied deeply flawed analytical methods similar to the problems we have pointed out in your own Report, such as the use of substandard data and the failure to mention *before-operations* conditions.

Constable's writings on DOR were mystified and incoherent, revealed most clearly in his later ineffective and unscientifically presented "Steinerian" post-Reich period of work (Constable, *Cosmic Pulse of Life*, 1976). He began blaming mystic "Ahrimanic" forces or demons as the cause of atmospheric stagnation, and claimed the cloudbuster operator had to appeal to "angelic" forces to overcome the "demonic" ones. He made infrared photographs of what he claimed were "invisible bio-forms" in the atmosphere, reinforcing his mystical claims. However, his "bio-form" claim was fully disproven by Mr. Andrew Collins who experimentally demonstrated these were *film artifacts occurring inside the camera*. (A. Collins, *Alien Energy*, 1994, p.197. Also see DeMeo, Editor, *Heretic's Notebook*, "Negative Finding on T. Constable's 'Bioforms'", p.250, 2002.)

Long-time workers in orgonomy who knew Constable, such as Jerome Eden and Dr. Eva Reich, considered him to be *power-drunk*, with a mystic sadism that revealed itself in his cloudbusting work. This was the reason why the ACO eventually broke contact with him once it became known. A most clear example of Constable's mystic sadism was revealed in a boasting 1971 letter he wrote to Eden, stating: "*Take the Orgone by the balls and it will talk. Any other approach and it laughs at you!*" (Letter from T. Constable to J. Eden, 1 Sept.1971, quoted in Eden, *CORE Manual* 1986, p.26). That sadistic element was further exposed when his cloudbusting methods abandoned the use of the very effective "ordinary" cloudbuster, which

requires operator focus, contact and patience. Instead, he began applying incredible numbers of pipes and "cloudbusting" devices, multiple dozens of them, suggestive of incompetence, all aiming to "drag" and "force" or "*make*" the life-energy do his will. This typically resulted in no scientifically defensible results, or only out-of-season thunderstorms spitting out tremendous lightning bolts that injured people, but about which he boasted with megalomania.

It gets worse. Constable's mystic sadism drove him to embrace neo-Nazi authors and ideas, even as he mouthed a claimed adherence to the anti-Nazi of Jewish heritage, Wilhelm Reich. Reich's name and orgonomic science were thereby dragged into the gutter. He could mask with a deadly charm, something typical of emotional plague characters, most notably revealed in his several books *glorifying Nazi Luftwaffe pilots*, and by associations with, and publishing one of his alarming letters and two of his military-history articles in *the primary neo-Nazi publication in the USA*, the *Journal of Historical Review* (JHR). In his JHR letter, Constable was effusive with praise for neo-Nazi authors, following his invitation to speak at one of their conferences. The citations, weblinks and astonishing direct quotes from his submissions to the JHR were summarized by DeMeo in a separate document, as early as 2002, later made publicly available.

Letter from James DeMeo to a Trevor Constable Enthusiast

<http://www.orgonelab.org/demeopubsPDFs/2002DeMeoOnConstable.pdf>

Read it and decide for yourself.

Had your Report merely cited Constable's early work, and not lifted him up as an expert in orgonomy, nor provided support to his later unscientific claims, this would not be an issue. But your Report did so, and additionally made the false claim that nobody but Constable had studied or worked against air-pollution parameters.

Related to this, we also observed with great alarm, how several members of your team, publicly on internet posts or in private emails, referenced and/or endorsed the slandering liar and plague character Joel Carlinsky as some kind of "expert" in orgonomy and cloudbusting. Members of your team promoted Carlinsky, ignoring our private objections, warnings and documentation, something nobody in the history of orgonomy had previously succumbed to. In case you have forgotten, CORE Net members

DiFerdinando (in 2011) and DeMeo (in 2015), presented you with documentation weblinks about Carlinsky's dangerous and criminal conduct. We documented his harassment, public slanders of Reich and nearly every other serious cloudbuster operator, his burglary activities (for which he was caught and imprisoned) and *threats to commit additional burglary or even murder, against five present or past CORE Net members*: C. Baker, R. Blasband, T. Cook, J. DeMeo, M. Ryan. Your group flippantly dismissed the serious problems with Carlinsky, irrationally and dangerously ignoring our concerns.

<http://www.orgonelab.org/carlinskyletter.htm>

6. "Chemtrails"?

Your Report also made ill-considered statements about jet aircraft exhaust as a cause for the California drought, suggesting your group endorses the unscientific and mystical ideas about "chemtrails", but without fully and openly admitting to it. We are also informed from other sources that at least one member of your group is a "chemtrail" enthusiast. This is disturbing, and we hope it is a misunderstanding, as *anyone who entertains such false ideas should not be doing CORE work*. It is hardly any different than Constable blaming drought on invisible "Ahrimanic demons". Or a physician who might blame disease upon "demons". Those doing cloudbusting work should know enough about atmospheric processes, jet contrails and ordinary air pollution (which is not the same as DOR) to reject such concocted and unscientific ideas.

Factually, the "chemtrail" ideas originated among adherents to the Northern California celibate cult of "Saint Germain", sometimes known as the "I AM" cult. And not incidentally, that cult also has roots in the 1930s Nazis of the German-American Bund. (see: G. Bryan: *Psychic Dictatorship in America*, 1940) Originally the "chemtrail theory" proposed "shape shifting reptilian space aliens" were "controlling the bodies and minds" of airline pilots and ground crews, who were then secretly spraying "chemtrail poison" to kill off humanity in advance of their space-ship invasions. It was a wacky idea from the get-go. Only later on, when that paranoid fantasy became the subject of public ridicule, did they conceal the "reptilian" beliefs, and dress up "chemtrails" in left-wing conspiracy theory, about evil corporations, Jews, the CIA and Mossad, spraying poisons for population control, or for geo-engineering plots. Today, the advocates of "chemtrails" who are abusing

Reich's name and work with their "chembusters" and "orgonite", have made a serious public ridicule and destruction of orgonomy, something one only has to look at the Wikipedia pages to appreciate. Is this the path your group is taking?

Here is a website that goes into the science of jet contrails, exposing the myths, errors and outright lies of the "chemtrail" advocates:

<http://www.contrailscience.com>

Also please remember Reich's own words about *persisting jet contrails being a sign of a good cloud-forming atmosphere*. (Wilhelm Reich, *Contact With Space*, 1957, p.89-91) DeMeo put up his own webpage addressing the "chemtrail" claims, pointing out how the problems of atmospheric dusts and desert aerosols, currently being spread globally by natural winds, and other classically-understood factors, are being misrepresented as "chemtrails".

<http://www.orgonelab.org/chemtrails.htm>

As a point of geological history which opposes any "chemtrail-drought" theory, the cycles of American droughts go back hundreds and thousands of years, way before the invention of airplanes, or even the industrial era. Drought is nothing new to Southern California. The desert lowlands of the American Southwest and NW Mexico also have a history going back thousands of years.

7. Your cloudbusting operations being directed from overseas?

When we first learned about your project several years ago, CORE Net was informed by Maglione, on his first trip to California, that your cloudbusters would eventually be operated according to his telephone or email instructions from Italy, on how to work the device. He did this even as he asked DeMeo for instructions on "how to use" and "where to point" the cloudbuster (this was refused). CORE Net strongly objected to that contactless and dangerous procedure, informing your group how a similar long-distance approach by untrained mystics led to a serious weather disaster from an incompetently run project in Algeria.

<http://www.orgonelab.org/demeopubsPDFs/2010DeMeoCautionOnDesertGraining.pdf>

After receiving those criticisms, we were informed your group would not use that long-distance procedure, and that your central team of operators would be on-site, and know what they were doing. In your recent Report, however, the weather forecasts from the Wunderground website are presented from Italian language sources, so we must ask openly, if your group has reverted back to that original proposed method of long-distance operation?

8. Conclusion

We previously attempted to coordinate and communicate with your group on issues of efficacy and safety in this vitally important work, but in return we only received un-serious or even alarmingly hostile reactions. Now, your group takes the added step to ignore the near simultaneity of some of our operations, overstate the results of your efforts, and publicly support people and/or concepts which are fully antithetical to both ergonomics and basic natural science. This cannot stand. Given the public circulation of your report, and your past conduct and statements, we believe it is imperative to bring the issues out into the open light of day. You have put a very nice face on what has factually been a rather alarming series of events, with the pretense of great ergonomic knowledge and authority that belie the facts.

The satellite images and documentation you provided suggest to us, a minimal result at best, or general failure of the operations at worst. Your group currently has exhibited a limited textbook knowledge of ergone energy functions in weather and climate, and greatly limited operational experience. But there is great denial of those facts. Inexperience could be overcome given enough time. However, the irrational and hostile character attitudes, and the contactless avoidance of rational criticism must be addressed and eliminated, as it is your major stumbling-block, and simply too dangerous in the cloudbusting work, which can be deadly to self and others. Tough questions need to be asked, such as: "Am I helping or hindering the restoration of natural atmospheric pulsation?" As with the physician's obligation to "First Do No Harm". And also, "Do I really know what the hell I am doing with these two big cloudbusters?" Everyone we know studying cloudbusting work rationally starts with *one very small instrument*, even using one single draw pipe, and slowly gains experience, over years. But never building two giant cloudbusters as a first step. One must spend a lot of time observing, testing, observing, taking notes,

observing again and again, so as to get the feeling of things, to really understand what's going on, and in a way that if errors are made, the consequences will be limited. As physicians, *you know well the procedures and reasons for internship*, before the young physician is set loose upon the patients. What have you done in that regard, to prepare yourselves for the cloudbusting work, which can affect entire communities or regions?

Reich emphasized how training, coordination and cooperation in the cloudbusting work would eventually become a serious issue, and would be of the utmost importance to avoid weather chaos. It is regrettable that your group has ignored Reich's warnings, along with CORE Net's offers of assistance and coordination.

Sincerely,

CORE Network USA, Senior Operators:

Theirrie Cook, BA

James DeMeo, PhD

Thomas DiFerdinando, BFA

Joseph Heckman, PhD

Stephen S. Nagy, MD

Matthew Ryan