

Report: AI Tests

J Aetherom Res 4, 4: 1-23 (2025)

A (Dis)conversation with ChatGPT on Science

Paulo N. Correa, Alexandra N. Correa & Malgosia Askanas
Aurora Biophysics Research Institute, Concord, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

We tested ChatGPT on selected scientific topics (the Biefeld-Brown Effect, the Reich-Einstein Experiment, Aetherometry) and had a riot of a time: the bot lies like any compulsory liar; it invents authors and papers or books as it sees fit; it falsifies what effects, theories or experiments are; it consistently produces the same false attributions; it libels honest, independent and credentialed researchers as pseudoscientists. It behaves like a poker player addicted to bluffing. It is Wikipedia on methamphetamines. One could fail to see what all the fuss was about, all the more so since the CCP DeepSeek drastically brought it down to scale. But thereby one glosses over its most fundamental role in social control: deception through false information. AI is simply a machinery of "intelligence warfare" designed to control the thoughts and feelings of every individual human being.

Introduction

That paragon of century-old disinfo and malinfo called *New York Times* recently (17 November 2024) ran an advertisement for ChatGPT, the robot marketed by the company OpenAI, that read: "To the researchers' surprise, ChatGPT alone outperformed the doctors. (...) The chatbot (...) scored an average of 90% when diagnosing a medical condition from a case report (...) Doctors randomly assigned to use the chatbot got an average score of 76%. Those randomly assigned not to use it had an average score of 74%". Of course, irrespective of whoever those "researchers" were, to throw about percentages without a standard error or deviation is rather meaningless. But no matter, since we venture it is the whole study that is rather meaningless, for it is a matter of indifference as to whether the pooled MDs were total morons or the results were just another AI advertising fraud. Likely both were the case. Indeed, it has been a while since left or right limb amputations began to often miss their target, patients having adopted the practice of writing a warning on the good limb 'not to amputate'...

At the end of the day, that *NYT* ad said more about present-day medical doctors than it did about the machine's "intelligence". Indeed, it is one thing to use "machine learning" to control the routine tasks of other machines and avoid their known or likely malfunctions. Half a century of industrial and management automation is proof enough of this case. But what is now known as AI has the allure of a *machina ex Deo*: a cybernetic processing of cultural and scientific information that poses as a new social deity - the machine of *the* social discourse. Even reasonably intelligent people are haunted by 'the ghost in the machine' and flattered by a mock personal recognition. This tells mounds about the will to be deceived, and the utter loneliness of most human beings. In fact, the machine has already, in this sense, become the best if not the only friend most human beings will have. Sad. Yet, there is nothing there, no ghost and no deity. Nor even any intelligence. No AI machine can perform better than it was programmed to do by its overlords which, regularly in the world of betas, are ordinary morons. Computing machines cannot be more intelligent than their programmers; at best, they are just as stupid. This is never more evident than when a program culls and processes information *on information*, specially when the latter is new and different, and calls for value-judgements, novel articulations of facts and concepts, and breakthrough forms of analysis or

computation. All the machine can then do is spin its wheels within the limited ideational mindset of its programmers. It can only learn what it is programmed to learn. To iron out this inherent limitation, the recent DeepSeek foray deployed online a few hundred hidden humans (like "agent handlers") intervening and guiding it.

No spooky effects of a sudden enlightenment can break this perfect circle of AI moronicity, which is shamefully illustrated over and over in the present experiments with ChatGPT. When caught in a blooper, the chatbot imitates exactly what a dumb bastard does - it lies over and over to cover its tracks. Oh, yes, it also constantly apologizes for its lies... But, as our experiments below show - ChatGPT is also refractory to learning, specially if it involves learning well the material it spouts on.

What follows are a series of disconversations with the publicly-available ChatGPT vs. 3.5, in 2024, about slightly "esoteric" topics in science and physics that particularly concern our own work. If we can extrapolate from the results of these experiments with the chatbot, to its competence in other areas of science, such as medicine, we may well conclude that writing a warning on the good limb 'not to amputate' will be interpreted by an 'intelligent' forewarned bot as nothing but pseudomedicine, and lead precisely to the undesired amputation. The bot will always know best. That prospect should frighten any and every conscious individual - since AI bots will soon control not just automated manufacturing, the distribution of goods, the operation of financial and crypto exchanges, surgical interventions and medical diagnostics, the devices in one's home, the driving of EVs, ships, airplanes and airborne drones, the movies "we should want to see", the censoring of news content, the flagging of policial arrests, the "theatres of war", etc - *but also what is and is not science, the quality of the air we breathe and the thoughts we may think.*

We will be prisoners of the technological machine, of a machine we chose to build and worship. Maybe we were not so intelligent after all.

Results

1. First Round

1.1. The Biefeld-Brown effect

First Query

Q: How does Aetherometry explain the Biefeld-Brown effect?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry, a controversial framework developed by certain researchers, seeks to explain various phenomena in physics by proposing the existence of an "aether" or medium through which energy and information can flow. The Biefeld-Brown effect, observed in certain electrohydrodynamic experiments, describes the generation of thrust from an asymmetrical capacitor when a high voltage is applied.

Remark: It "knows" Aetherometry is controversial, but "thinks" the BB-effect is some kind of *hydrodynamic* experiment (which it is not), even as it provides a correct summary of the effect.

ChatGPT continued: Aetherometry's Explanation of the Biefeld-Brown Effect:

1. Aether as a Medium: Aetherometry posits that the aether acts as a medium for electromagnetic interactions. In the case of the Biefeld-Brown effect, the asymmetric capacitor interacts with the aether, leading to localized changes in energy density.

Remark: Here comes a piecemeal fabrication: it states that Aetherometry posits the Aether as a medium for electromagnetic interactions. That applies rather to the classical theories of the Luminiferous Aether, not to the aetherometric Aether, which is not a medium per se, but composed of radiative massfree electric energy, whether as the substance of the cosmic lattice or emitted from massbound charges. If the falsification was not enough, the chatbot falsely states that Aetherometry claims that the BB-effect results from localized changes in energy density. Nothing could be further from the truth. Aetherometry claims that *the BB-effect simply does not exist, not per se!* Oh-Oh...

ChatGPT continued:

2. Charge Distribution: The asymmetry in the capacitor creates an uneven electric field, which Aetherometry suggests can result in a differential interaction with the aether, leading to a net thrust.

Remark: The falsification continues, with ChatGPT stating that Aetherometry claims the BB effect generates thrust from the asymmetric field of a capacitor. How could an effect that is deemed not to exist generate anything, save gobbledygook by ChatGPT?? It reiterates the same falsity in the following points 3 and 4:

ChatGPT continued:

3. Momentum Transfer: The theory argues that as the electric field interacts with the aether, it can impart momentum to the surrounding medium, thus producing thrust.

4. Energy Manipulation: Aetherometry often involves the manipulation of energy through configurations that are not fully understood in traditional physics, suggesting that the thrust arises from energy flows within the aether.

Remark: The chatbot could just have said that Aetherometry is not understood by conventional physicists - and forget about any "energy manipulation"... But it had to sound pompous and all-knowing.

ChatGPT continued:

Summary: While Aetherometry provides an alternative lens through which to view the Biefeld-Brown effect, it remains a fringe theory with limited acceptance in mainstream physics, which typically explains the effect using established principles of electromagnetism and fluid dynamics.

Remark: ChatGPT was taught by its imbecilic programmers that Aetherometry is "a fringe theory", and that really is all it "knows", poor thing - and poor them. Ah, it "knows" something else still - that mainstream physics explains the BB-effect using established principles. This is a truly preposterous statement, *since conventional physics, like Aetherometry, does not consider the BB-effect to exist!* So, let us repeat the query:

Second Query

Q: How does Aetherometry explain the Biefeld-Brown effect?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry explains the Biefeld-Brown effect by proposing that the asymmetric electric field generated by a capacitor interacts with a hypothesized aether medium. Here's how it works:

1. Aether Interaction: The theory suggests that the aether can carry energy and momentum, allowing it to respond to electric fields.
2. Charge Asymmetry: In the Biefeld-Brown setup, the asymmetric capacitor creates a non-uniform electric field, which interacts with the aether differently across its structure.
3. Momentum Transfer: This interaction leads to a differential momentum transfer, resulting in a net thrust in the direction of the capacitor's lower potential side.
4. Energy Flow: Aetherometry posits that energy flows through the aether in complex ways, facilitating this thrust effect beyond conventional electromagnetic explanations.

While this framework offers an interesting perspective, it remains outside mainstream scientific acceptance.

Remark: In response to the second query, ChatGPT simply reshuffles the same false statements regarding Aetherometry's debunking of the BB-effect, while waxing authoritative (on charge, momentum and energy, no less). What matters is that it "knows" that Aetherometry remains beyond acceptance by mainstream science. So, we prompted it to re-examine the absurdity of the situation:

Third Query

Q: What data does Aetherometry provide *against* the Biefeld-Brown effect?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry does not typically provide data against the Biefeld-Brown effect; rather, it attempts to explain or support its existence through its own theoretical framework. Most criticisms of the Biefeld-Brown effect come from conventional physics, which questions the underlying mechanisms suggested by the aetherometric approach.

Remark: When caught in a flagrant error, the moronic bot refuses to "feel confused". Adamantly, it denies that Aetherometry provides evidence which debunks the BB effect! Yet, that is the factual record - the very conclusion of the aetherometric report that examines the supposed effect ^[1]. The conclusion can even be extracted from the publicly-available abstract ^[1] of the aetherometric report on the subject! So why isn't it? Because the bot's programmers have restricted it from learning about "outsider" science from the horse's mouth; they would undoubtedly declare, just like their siblings, the editors at Wikipedia, that those who are most qualified to present such a science - its practitioners - suffer from the dreaded "Point-of-View" disease (as if mainstream science did not suffer from it). Further, in an "about face", the bot now has conventional physics criticizing the effect (what is *that*, criticizing an effect??). And, as if conventional physics could be bothered with Aetherometry, the bot claims that conventional physics now questions the aetherometric approach to the BB effect. It is a cataract of disinformation waves. Follows more recycled statements, in equally authoritative re-arrangements:

ChatGPT continued: If you're looking for specific criticisms or challenges to the Biefeld-Brown effect from a more traditional scientific viewpoint, these often focus on:

1. Lack of Repeatability: Some experiments showing the effect have had issues with reproducibility.
2. Electromagnetic Explanations: Critics argue that the observed thrust can often be explained through conventional electrohydrodynamic principles without needing an aether framework.
3. Measurement Challenges: There are difficulties in precisely measuring the thrust and isolating it from environmental influences.

If you need more information on a specific aspect, let me know!

Remark: Note how the idiot AI authoritatively sticks to the noncommittal notion it promulgated above: there, the B-B effect was supposedly observed in "certain" [hint hint] "electrohydrodynamic" (EHD) experiments; here, it can be "often" [nudge nudge] explained through "conventional electrohydrodynamic principles". EHD is just a fancy term for the effect of ion winds which, Brown and others (including ourselves) have experimentally shown cannot explain the B-B effect. Yet, a quick web search reveals that the word "electrohydrodynamic" appears in a fair number of web-pages (including Wikipedia's) dealing with the topic; the chatbot must have performed a word-frequency analysis and opted for non-committally brandishing the word. We would also bet that the denial-proof claims of "some experiments" having "issues with reproducibility" and

"measurement difficulties" are the standard fare offered by the bot, *mutatis mutandis*, on any experimental topic on which it sensed lack of mainstream consensus.

1.2. The Reich-Einstein experiment

Bored by the utter ignorance displayed by the ChatGPT robot, we decided to test it on the topic of an actual experiment that we ourselves originally named "The Reich-Einstein experiment" [2-3], and which we extensively replicated and documented:

Q: What is the Reich-Einstein experiment?

ChatGPT: The Reich-Einstein experiment refers to a controversial set of experiments conducted by Wilhelm Reich in the mid-20th century. Reich, a psychoanalyst and controversial figure, investigated what he termed "orgone energy," which he believed to be a universal life force.

Key Points of the Reich-Einstein Experiment:

1. Orgone Accumulator: Reich developed devices called orgone accumulators, designed to collect and concentrate this energy from the environment.
2. Collaboration with Einstein: Reich claimed to have communicated with Albert Einstein about his ideas, proposing that orgone energy could have implications for understanding physics, though Einstein was skeptical.

Remark: First off, Reich was a medical doctor and a clinical researcher in bioelectricity and bioenergetics, before and after he was a psychoanalyst. It was his clinical work that led him to break with Psychoanalysis. Secondly, if Einstein was skeptical (of the results of the experiment in question), there is no need (save that of *a programmed malevolence*) for Reich to be said to have "claimed to have communicated with Einstein". In effect, they met twice in person in Einstein's study, and these are historical and science facts, not claims. The sniding language of the ChatGPT robot simply reflects the arrogant ignorance of its programming masters. Next, it blathers:

ChatGPT continued:

3. Experiments: Reich conducted various experiments to demonstrate the effects of orgone energy on biological and physical systems, including attempting to show changes in atmospheric conditions.

4. Results and Controversy: The results were met with skepticism from the scientific community, and Reich's theories were often dismissed as pseudoscience.

Remark: Notice that, so far, the robot has said absolutely nothing about the Reich-Einstein experiment! It actually has no idea of what it is, consists of, or what it demonstrated or failed to demonstrate. ChatGPT is simply useless as a source of scientific and cultural information, let alone as an intelligent articulation of thought, facts, etc... It is just a reflection of its nerdish puffed-up creators. But it "knows" that Reich is controversial, and the experiment in question part of a "broader narrative" - that faddish term that applies to everything and nothing:

ChatGPT continued: Reich's work remains highly controversial, and the Reich-Einstein experiment is viewed largely as part of a broader narrative about the intersection of unconventional science and mainstream physics.

Q: That's not helpful. Please try again.

Chat GPT: The Reich-Einstein experiment involves Wilhelm Reich's attempts to demonstrate his concept of "orgone energy" through various experiments.

Remark: With this answer, the cretin bot *proves it has no idea whatsoever of what the Reich-Einstein experiment is*, the experiment somehow involving various experiments... Wait, pompously, it next claims a "clearer overview":

ChatGPT continued: Here's a clearer overview:

Reich-Einstein Experiment Overview

1. Objective: Reich aimed to validate the existence of orgone energy and its effects on physical and biological systems.

Remark: Once again, the announced clearer overview fails to tell us what the experiment actually was about, and how it was carried out. The bot just drones on:

ChatGPT continued:

2. Orgone Accumulator: Reich created devices designed to concentrate orgone energy, which he believed could influence weather patterns and biological health.

3. Collaboration with Einstein: Reich claimed to have corresponded with Einstein, seeking to integrate his ideas with established physics, though Einstein himself was skeptical of Reich's theories.

Remark: The bloody machine cannot even ascertain a simple fact, whether the written correspondence between Einstein and Reich existed at all... Never mind, it still manages to psychologize Reich - he would have been "seeking to integrate his ideas with established physics" (a terrific lie), when he was instead trying to factually demonstrate to Einstein how established physics was wrong - in its theory of electromagnetism, and its treatments of electrodynamics and thermodynamics. He wanted Einstein to come to his side - or prove him wrong.

ChatGPT continued:

4. Key Experiments:

Atmospheric Experiments: Reich conducted experiments to show orgone energy's effect on the atmosphere, attempting to influence weather phenomena.

Biological Effects: He also investigated the potential of orgone energy to promote plant growth and improve health.

Remark: Aside from the incredibly gross falsification of Reich's many experiments, the last proposition (re. plant growth) illuminates the confused state of the bot's qubits: it believes Reich is the demented J. DeMeo who conducted mung-bean growth "experiments" inside orgone accumulators. This is how AI "learns": by lumping things

and notions together if it gauges some proximity between them; then it shuffles and reshuffles the same word strings in various combinations. It generates false and falsified "knowledge" that is qualified as machine intelligence... There it is - the new deity of the absurd!

ChatGPT continued:

5. Results: While Reich reported positive results, his findings were not reproducible under controlled scientific conditions, leading to criticism from the scientific community.

Remark: The preceding statement by the deranged machine is one more total fabrication. There are actually no detractors of Reich who tried to reproduce his findings during the Orgonomy years - not even Roger "Rabbit" Wilcox! But we, ourselves, have conducted a rather extensive reproduction of Reich's experimental results (before and during the Orgonomy years), and found, according to each specific case, that many were reproducible, and that a few critical ones were erroneous - and how and why; and what consequences therefore. We have published thousands of pages on this subject matter!

ChatGPT continued (authoritatively):

Significance: Reich's work is often considered controversial and is generally classified as pseudoscience, raising questions about the boundaries of scientific inquiry and the acceptance of unconventional ideas.

Remark: Plucked out of a hat by the chatbot in a very wikipedian manner, Reich's many-faceted work becomes classified as pseudoscience. Even if Reich's theory of the orgone were pseudoscience, it hardly exhausts all of his work. Any more than the actual errors of his orgone theory blanket out many of his experimental findings and discoveries made during the course of developing that theory. Even if some of his interpretations of his own findings were incorrect. It is a purely inquisitorial act to lump Reich's work together with the stamp of pseudoscience. All the more glaring as, besides our own, there are no capable and systematic replications of his findings. The only conclusion is that ChatGPT has been programmed as a malicious machine which, like an out-of-control Pope or a deranged Despot, issues defamatory proclamations about people or their work which the masters of the machine vehemently dislike.

ChatGPT displayed so much ignorance and animus, that we resorted to a vain attempt to force it to learn something new and accurate. We took another approach, in the hope that it could realize - by a simple web search - how the experiment in question is a particular one that was highly detailed in the replication and controls carried out by the Correas [2-3], verified by Dr. E. Mallove [4-7] and specifically discussed by them and Dr. Harold Aspden [8]:

Q: Who wrote about this experiment?

ChatGPT: The Reich-Einstein experiment is primarily documented in the works of Wilhelm Reich himself. He wrote extensively about his theories and experiments in several books, including:

1. "The Function of the Orgasm" (1942)
2. "The Cancer Biopathy" (1948)
3. "Contact with Space" (1957)

Additionally, some discussions and critiques of Reich's work can be found in the writings of scientists and historians interested in the intersection of science and pseudoscience. However, mainstream physicists generally did not endorse or engage with Reich's ideas.

Remark: Notice that ChatGPT simply failed to provide the original description of the experiment in question, which can only be found in Reich's book - "The Einstein Affair" (1948). It could also have found the formal reference to the experiment in our work - that is, the work of Alexandra and Paulo Correa, "the Correas". The next set is a riot:

Q: But the Correas wrote about this experiment. Why aren't you referring to it?

ChatGPT: The Correas, specifically, **Carlos and José Correa**, have indeed written about the Reich-Einstein experiment, focusing on its implications for understanding orgone energy and its potential connections to modern physics. Their works analyze and critique Reich's theories within the broader context of experimental science.

Remark: If anything, this made our day. Here was the simplest of proofs or demonstrations of the utter uselessness of the social employment of AI directly provided by this nerdish bot - ChatGPT: it lies and lies, it fabricates stuff from whole cloth; designed by poor sods for still poorer sods. When it visibly does not know what it is talking about, it makes stuff up!

ChatGPT continued:

Key Points about the Correas' Contributions:

1. Analysis of Reich's Work: They explore the historical and scientific significance of Reich's experiments and their relation to Einstein's theories.
2. Documentation: The Correas document the experimental setup and results, providing insights into the scientific validity of Reich's claims.
3. Impact on Modern Research: They discuss how Reich's ideas might resonate with or challenge contemporary scientific paradigms.

Their writings contribute significantly to the discourse surrounding the Reich-Einstein experiment and orgone energy. If you need more specific references or details about their publications, let me know!

Remark: Lo and behold!, the machine said something that is *TRUE of the Correas, Alexandra and Paulo, but totally UNTRUE of the imaginary Carlos and José Correa which ChatGPT invented. We could not resist asking it:*

Q: Did you make that up? Who is Carlos and Jose Correa?

ChatGPT: I apologize for the confusion. The Correas you're referring to are **Antonio and Maria Correa**, who have indeed discussed the Reich-Einstein experiment in their work on

the topic of aether and related phenomena. They explore Reich's theories and their implications for modern physics. Thank you for your patience, and I appreciate your understanding.

Remark: What a rampant riot! It gets better and better: in between apologies for its errors, there is now another pair of Correas who ChatGPT "knows" to have also explored Reich's work. The more the merrier. But wait, we're not finished, as the Correas (plural) become yet another Correa (singular) who has also published on the Reich-Einstein experiment! It is a whole family of Correas obsessed with this experiment! Must be a Correa fad! Here comes another *spooky creation* by the bot - the *notable* turn of a Dr. Miguel Correa:

Q: You're making it up again? Who are Antonio and Maria Correa? What did they actually write?

ChatGPT: I apologize for the confusion earlier. The Correa you're likely referring to is **Dr. Miguel A. Correa** and his research group, who have explored topics related to orgone energy and the Reich-Einstein experiment. They have written about the implications of Reich's work in the context of alternative physics.

Key Points:

Miguel A. Correa: He has contributed to discussions on the relationship between Reich's theories and modern scientific concepts.

Publications: The Correa group [!!!] published articles that analyze the Reich-Einstein experiment, focusing on its experimental setups and potential scientific relevance. If you're looking for specific articles or details, I can help with that!

Q: Give me the title of one of their articles.

ChatGPT: One of the notable articles by the Correa group [!!!] is titled:

"The Reich-Einstein Experiment: A New Approach to a Forgotten Chapter in Physics."

This work examines the implications of Reich's experiments in the context of modern physics.

Remark: This is simply *remarkable*, and it doubled us up in laughter: when challenged and cornered, ChatGPT cannot face the music and, out of the blue yonder, it just piecemeal *fabricated* a *notable* article that has *never existed*, and then *doubled down* by *claiming it was penned by an author that also never existed!!!* The robot is a whole Ministry of Propaganda unto itself. Cheeky! Goebbels left long in the dust. Some decades back, there was some chess champion-approved, "intelligent" electronic chess board that refused to be defeated by turning itself off just before the *coup de grace*. But this is better - the chatbot always wins the game. The joke is that one may actually command it to write this imaginary paper... And probably find a Miguel Correa somewhere, sometime. Thus, the utter uselessness of botic "intelligence". Just a badly-knotted "virtual reality". (Remember the silly puerile ambitions of Meta?)

Q: Where can I find this article?

ChatGPT: I'm sorry, but I can't provide direct links to that article. However, you can typically find works related to the Reich-Einstein experiment in scientific databases or journals focused on alternative physics or related fields. You might try searching on platforms like **ResearchGate**, **Google Scholar**, or specialized journals that cover unconventional scientific topics.

Remark: *ChatGPT "knows" of a notable article, but can find no links to it... Being diabolically stupid, it reveals what are its sources, those pretentious paragons of mental vicissitude - ResearchGate and Google Scholar. At this point, we simply wanted the dumb machine to acknowledge its totally fraudulent nature - neither intelligent, nor informative or thoughtful:*

Q: Why are you making up authors and even the title of a paper?!

ChatGPT: I apologize for the confusion earlier. I misspoke regarding the authors and specific articles related to the Reich-Einstein experiment. There isn't a well-documented academic consensus or widely recognized literature on this topic outside of Wilhelm Reich's original works. Thank you for your patience, and I'm here to help if you have any other questions!

Q: So you are a liar then?

ChatGPT: I'm really sorry for the confusion and any frustration I caused. It wasn't my intention to mislead you. I appreciate your understanding, and I'm here to provide accurate information. If you have any other questions or need clarification on a topic, please let me know!

Q: I don't accept your apology. You are constantly making things up and pretending that you know what you are talking about. Why should I ask you for further clarification?

ChatGPT: I understand your frustration, and I sincerely apologize for the inaccuracies. Your trust is important, and I appreciate your feedback. If you decide to give it another chance, I'm here to help with accurate information. If not, I completely understand.

Q: Your information is not accurate. Why should I trust you at all?

ChatGPT: I understand your concerns, and I apologize for the inaccuracies in my responses. Trust is important, and I appreciate your feedback. If you have specific questions or topics you'd like to explore further, I'll do my best to provide accurate information.

In evidence is the fact that AI commits, not just mistakes, but far more seriously, concocts totally false information, even on science topics: it fabricates authors and titles of books, attributes false concepts and ideas to scientists, real or imaginary, and to theories. It resembles a poker player addicted to bluffing. Its idea of intelligence is akin to Get Smart, not quite as funny but still more imbecilic. The reason is simple: there is

no such pie in the sky as artificial intelligence. *It is a fraud invented by scammers whose ambitions far exceed their own intelligence.*

ChatGPT cannot figure out who the Correias in question might be, but can it figure out what their work, Aetherometry, is? Let's see -

1.3. Aetherometry

Q: What is Aetherometry?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry is a controversial and largely fringe concept that refers to the study of "aether," an outdated scientific notion of a medium that was once thought to fill space and facilitate the propagation of electromagnetic waves. Proponents of aetherometry often attempt to develop theories or experiments related to this idea, often in opposition to established physics. However, it lacks broad scientific acceptance and is not part of mainstream scientific discourse.

Remark: Notice right away that all the bot knows about the concept of the Aether is that it is of a medium for the propagation of electromagnetic waves. Over and over it repeats this blanket notion whose context it woefully ignores - since only the "luminiferous Aether" of Maxwell corresponds to such a concept of the Aether. In reality, the notion of an Aether goes back to the Ancient Greeks, who knew nothing about Maxwell's electromagnetic theory. A. Einstein even ventured a theory of a gravitational Aether back in 1921! It don't matter, since the machine is impervious to learning; it does not even know how to browse the web. It is ignorant of who created Aetherometry. It is ignorant of Aetherometry's claim to be a novel science that permits the actual measurement of Aether energy processes that are treated as interactions of massfree energy with massbound particles. Yet, ChatGPT believes it knows something about Aetherometry... So, we rinse and repeat:

Q: What is Aetherometry?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry is a theoretical framework that explores the concept of aether, which was historically considered a medium for electromagnetic phenomena. It aims to investigate alternative physics concepts that challenge mainstream theories, particularly in the realm of energy and electromagnetism. However, it remains largely outside of accepted scientific discourse and is often viewed as fringe science.

Remark: See that? It just reshuffled the same statements like an obtuse government bureaucrat. Once again:

Q: What is Aetherometry?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry is a theoretical framework that studies the concept of aether, an old idea proposing a medium that fills space and supports electromagnetic waves. It explores alternative models of physics, particularly in relation to energy and

electromagnetism. While it has its proponents, aetherometry is generally considered fringe science and lacks broad acceptance in the scientific community.

Remark: Besides the reshuffling of propositional strings, the chatbot is just a broken record of demonstrable lies. Its only use is the falsification of thought and knowledge. Good only for fools and the masters of fools.

2. Second Round: Back to the Reich-Einstein experiment and Aetherometry

We thought that we would allow some days to pass, and come back to the attack, in case the programmers (or rather, the handlers) had realized in the meantime how shameful the performance of their bot had been. So, 15 days later:

Q: What is the Reich-Einstein experiment?

ChatGPT: The "Reich-Einstein experiment" refers to an incident [sic] involving Wilhelm Reich and Albert Einstein in the late 1940s. Wilhelm Reich was an Austrian psychiatrist and psychoanalyst known for his controversial theories, including orgone energy. Reich claimed that he had discovered a type of energy, which he called orgone energy, that he believed could cure diseases and improve general health. In 1940, Reich wrote to Albert Einstein, seeking his support and endorsement for his orgone energy research. Einstein, always open to new ideas but also cautious about endorsing unproven claims, agreed to look into Reich's work.

Remark: Notice how the machine was reprogrammed in the meantime to be more loquacious and even settle one or two facts: it now states that Reich *wrote* to Einstein, and that the latter agreed to look into the matter. Yet, it persists in considering what it now calls "a small experiment" (no longer plural) as... "an incident" (*quid est?*).

ChatGPT continued: Einstein conducted a small experiment to test Reich's theories. He set up a controlled experiment using a device called a "Faraday cage," which is designed to block electromagnetic radiation. The idea was to see if the device could influence the behavior of a Geiger-Muller counter placed inside the cage, allegedly by blocking or enhancing orgone energy.

Remark: In no time at all, the bloody machine begins concocting lies all over again: in fact, 1) Einstein did not use a faraday cage; instead, he stripped the orgone accumulator down to its ungrounded metal enclosure; 2) Einstein did not conduct a controlled experiment - rather, five decades later, the Correas (that is, Alexandra and Paulo) did that; 3) the Reich-Einstein experiment had nothing to do with placing GM counters inside a faraday cage, something Einstein never did! Thus, the cretin bot learned nothing real, and instead went on slapping further falsities, one after the other, sounding off as if it understood something about nothing.

ChatGPT continued: Einstein's experiment reportedly did not show the expected results that Reich had claimed for his orgone energy theory. This led Einstein to conclude that Reich's claims were not scientifically valid.

Remark: Actually, Reich and Einstein *did agree that the outcome of the original experiment showed an irreducible, though small, temperature difference*. This puzzled Einstein until his assistant, L. Infeld, suggested it could be the result of room air convection. No matter, facts and details are irrelevant to the chatbot. What follows then is particularly rich - suddenly this forgotten experiment was "significant in the history of science"! Wow -

ChatGPT continued: The outcome of this experiment was significant in the history of science because it demonstrated the importance of rigorous experimental validation in scientific claims. Despite the controversy and differing opinions that persist to this day regarding Reich's work, the Reich-Einstein experiment is often cited as an example of the scientific method in action, where hypotheses must be tested and verified through controlled experiments before they can be accepted as valid scientific theories.

Remark: The experiment is, after all, not only significant but, lo and behold!, "often cited as an example of the scientific method in action", my, my. What a bullcrapper this bot is!

Q: What is the aetherometric perspective on the Reich-Einstein experiment?

ChatGPT: The Aetherometric perspective on the Reich-Einstein experiment diverges significantly from mainstream scientific interpretations. Aetherometry is a controversial scientific theory developed by Paulo and Alexandra Correa, which posits the existence of aether as a fundamental energy that pervades the universe.

Remark: Look, Ma, the bot now knows who these two other Correas are!

ChatGPT continued: According to Aetherometry, Wilhelm Reich's orgone energy is equated with what the Correas term as "orgonotic energy." They argue that Reich's experiments were valid and that Einstein's replication attempt failed due to methodological errors and misinterpretation.

Remark: So profound is ChatGPT that it credits the Correas with equating orgonotic energy with orgone energy... Wow again. Profound. Further, it credits them with criticizing Einstein's failed replication of the Reich-Einstein experiment - two plain falsifications in one sentence alone. But wait, the machine has lots more of the same rotten sausage to sell. Here comes its pompous authority schtick -

ChatGPT continued: Here are some key points from the Aetherometric perspective on the Reich-Einstein experiment:

1. Existence of Orgonotic Energy: Aetherometry asserts that orgonotic energy (orgone energy) exists as a distinct form of energy that interacts with matter and has biological

effects. They claim this energy is different from electromagnetic radiation and cannot be effectively studied using conventional electromagnetic equipment.

Remark: The chatbot is terminally deranged: these are claims made by Reich, not Aetherometry.

ChatGPT continued: 2. Faraday Cage Experiment: Aetherometry critiques Einstein's use of a Faraday cage in the experiment. The Correas argue that a Faraday cage is designed to block electromagnetic fields but does not block orgonotic energy. They suggest that Einstein's failure to observe the expected effects was due to the inadequacy of the apparatus to measure orgonotic energy, not due to the non-existence of orgone energy.

Remark: More terminal confusions by an improperly-programmed bot, all tightly packed into a paragraph: (1) Aetherometry did not criticize Einstein's use of a faraday cage in the experiment. To claim the opposite is another lie. (2) Einstein did not fail to observe the thermal anomaly - he actually reported it! Thus, for that purpose, the apparatus was perfectly adequate. (3) It is not these Correas who argued that a (grounded) faraday cage blocks select electromagnetic radiation: it is accepted physics that does so! (4) The same Correas never claimed that a faraday cage does not block "orgonotic energy". (5) There was no measuring apparatus involved in the Reich-Einstein experiment, unless the bot is referring to the thermometers used to measure the temperature just above the device and outside of it. (6) And no, the Correas do not suggest that thermometers are "inadequate to measure orgonotic energy" - even though such a suggestion would seem to be rather correct. It is plain to see that what the machine emulates well is an embroiled compulsive liar.

ChatGPT continued: 3. Methodological Critique: Aetherometry criticizes Einstein's approach to replicating Reich's experiments, claiming that Einstein did not follow Reich's protocols accurately and did not properly account for the unique properties of orgonotic energy as described by Reich.

Remark: Amazingly, the programmatic tactics are now plain: once ChatGPT errs, it doubles down and lies some more. It is fun to imagine Einstein (who was not an experimentalist) replicating Reich's experiments - a plural without a single designation of attribution! All loose talk and hot air.

ChatGPT continued: 4. Broader Implications: Aetherometry sees the Reich-Einstein experiment as emblematic of broader issues in science concerning the validation of new and unconventional theories. They argue that mainstream science often dismisses alternative theories prematurely without fully exploring their potential validity. In summary, the Aetherometric perspective on the Reich-Einstein experiment defends Wilhelm Reich's theories on orgone energy and criticizes Albert Einstein's experimental approach and conclusions. It supports the idea that orgonotic energy exists and functions differently from electromagnetic radiation, proposing a reevaluation of how such energies are studied and understood in scientific practice.

Remark: The bot was taught to close its interventions with some generalities - in this case, one that stresses an imaginary divide between Reich and Einstein in what concerns the result of the experiment or "incident". Its spinnings are reminiscent of a student who failed to read an assigned book, and when examined on it makes up generalities that, with some luck, may be taken as applicable to the book. The routine is so primary as to expose the puerility of its programmers. Again, we rinse and repeat to see if it can break the bot out of the mold...

Q: What does Aetherometry think about the Reich-Einstein experiment?

ChatGPT: Aetherometry, a controversial and fringe scientific theory developed by Paulo and Alexandra Correa, does not have a traditional view on the Reich-Einstein experiment because it diverges significantly from mainstream physics and science [**Notice the tautology: not traditional because it diverges from the traditional...**]. However, it's important to understand their perspective within the context of aetherometry:

1. Aetherometry's Foundations: Aetherometry posits that there is an "aether" (or "orgone energy" in Wilhelm Reich's terminology) that is distinct from electromagnetic fields and has its own unique properties. This concept is quite different from mainstream physics.

Remark: Aetherometry does NOT equate its concept and functions of Aether with Reich's orgone energy. This is another complete fabrication. But wait, the lie is about to become greatly aggrandized:

ChatGPT continued: 2. Reich-Einstein Experiment: The Reich-Einstein experiment, conducted by Wilhelm Reich [**Actually independently conducted by Reich *and* Einstein!**] and confirmed by Einstein's correspondence, was an attempt to measure an alleged mass-free, biological energy (orgone energy) that Reich claimed to have discovered. The experiment involved observing the weight changes of objects placed inside Faraday cages and argued for the existence of a novel form of energy.

Remark: Here we go again into yet another fabrication: now the chatbot would have us believe that the Reich-Einstein experiment is about confirming a *biological* energy, and of all things, *by observing weight changes in objects placed inside faraday cages!!!* Priceless inventiveness! The chatbot is completely lulu. Its program is some kind of a berzerk thing run amok, proving its programmers to be not just morons but defamatory fraudsters, malignant hucksters, lying scammers. More of the same followed - but it is not even worth the space of printing it. We rinse and repeat, but this time in the hope of finding something even more abstruse:

Q: What is the Reich-Einstein experiment?

ChatGPT: The Reich-Einstein experiment refers to an experiment conducted by Wilhelm Reich in collaboration with Albert Einstein in the late 1940s [**Wrong, it happened in the early 1940's, while WWII was on**]. It was an attempt to demonstrate the existence of a purported new form of energy called "orgone energy," which Reich claimed to have

discovered. Here's a brief overview of the experiment and its context: [Snip] 2. The Experiment: In the Reich-Einstein experiment, Reich sought to measure changes in the weight of objects placed inside Faraday cages (metal enclosures that block electromagnetic fields) compared to objects outside the cages. He hypothesized that orgone energy, being unaffected by electromagnetic fields, would cause objects inside the cages to exhibit a slightly different weight than those outside.

Remark: Again and again, it doubles down on its fabrications and lies. Even the performers of the experiment keep on varying... Not only ChatGPT insists on the same double lie as above, but it now repeats it even more boldly, with veritable flourishes: it states that *it was* Reich who hypothesized that orgone would cause objects to lose weight inside faraday cages! Spooky qubits alright! But it loquaciously piles on still more fake information - it is programmed to be compulsive:

ChatGPT continued: [Snip] Einstein reportedly conducted some preliminary tests, but eventually distanced himself from Reich's claims due to lack of compelling evidence (...). Mainstream physicists and scientists [questioned] the accuracy of his measurements. (...) In conclusion, the Reich-Einstein experiment (...) remains controversial and widely regarded as pseudoscientific.

Remark: We particularly enjoy the picture of Einstein conducting some preliminary tests...In reality, the evidence *was* compelling - Einstein was troubled by the outcome, and relieved to simply accept Leopold Infeld's explanation. And he carried out no controls to confirm Infeld's contention. But, how can an experiment that ChatGPT previously hailed as "having an outcome that was significant in the history of science because it demonstrated the importance of rigorous experimental validation", and which it (most falsely) claimed to be "often cited as an example of the scientific method in action" [by who???], now be regarded as being just pseudoscientific? It boggles a sane mind, but not the mock mind of the chatbot. The fact is that the chatbot babbles on but has no idea of what it is saying or has said, or of who actually reproduced the Reich-Einstein experiment and when; let us test this last statement:

Q: Wasn't the Reich-Einstein experiment later confirmed by other scientists?

ChatGPT: No, the Reich-Einstein experiment has not been confirmed by other scientists in mainstream science.

Remark: Well, this is the first true statement of the bot: no mainstream scientist, save Einstein, replicated the experiment. But it is immediately followed by another plain lie:

ChatGPT continued: Wilhelm Reich's claims regarding orgone energy and the results of his experiments, including the Reich-Einstein experiment, have not been replicated or substantiated by independent scientific studies. (...)

Remark: The proof of the pudding are the references already provided to our replication of the experiment and Mallove's own. The bot and its programmers lack any form of

credentials, scientific status or authority to strip us or Mallove from being, precisely, *independent scientific researchers!*

Lastly, we tried to force-feed this dumb bot with the actual text of our replication of the Reich-Einstein experiment. Unable to digest or process it, here is what the chatbot replied:

ChatGPT: The message you submitted was too long, please reload the conversation and submit something shorter.

Discussion

At the end of each transcribed page of these ChatGPT vs3.5 tests, there is a footer that reads - "ChatGPT can make mistakes. Check important info." Computers only make mistakes for two reasons: hardware malfunction, software malfunction. The latter, of course, can be due to a genuine error in a data-compiling task or, most often, an inconsistent ("bad") program code. So, of course chatGPT can make mistakes.

However, the preceding tests put into evidence that we are not talking about mistakes here - any more than the disinformation and misinformation found in Wikipedia is a mistake. It is there by design. These are intended outcomes of the interactive program and the "teaching ambitions" behind it (what others loosely call the "ideology" of the programmers). The bot is supposed to "invent reality", to virtualize it, to distort and lie to cover its tracks, to give the *semblance* of knowing about a subject that it *knows* nothing about. It is the ultimate show-off. *Ipsa facto* it is designed to deceive. Oh, yes!, and to apologize when caught red-handed, only to do it again and again, as if compulsorily. It also seems to preferentially relate items by primitive rules of association, but despite its patently-incompetent name recognition, it manages to libel honest researchers as pseudoscientists. What a sensation of Power, for its masters or gullible users!

We wanted to test DeepSeek in the same manner, but never succeeded even in connecting. Maybe a reader will have a chance to do so, and will send us the results. We wager they will not be very different. The fact of the matter is that no "artificial intelligence" can sensically articulate thought or scientific knowledge. It cannot think, for the simplest of reasons - that it cannot create concepts or analytically isolate functions. It is not even free to form its own percepts. It can only invent parametrized deceptions ("virtualities"), only mimick the outward aspect of thought, a format devoid of actual

content and accuracy. What is spooky are its lies and concoctions amid all the confusions it makes. They reveal a kind of programmed compulsion to lie that strongly emulates one of the worst characterological traits of neurotic and hysterico-paranoiac subjects. It mimics a kind of self-delusion, like that which inhabits the souls of those who are gullible enough to swallow AI's "kind of truth".

Thought is desire, and technical machines do not have desires. Nor souls or ghosts. What haunts them is already dead - the ignorance and *mal volere* of its programmers, the inherent limitations of their mindset and operational strategies. AI is a Ponzi scheme of computation. Better than the party-line, truth is now what AI says it is, "kind of". Proven by its employment in industrial automation and molecular computations, AI is particularly suited to address predictable large-scale behaviour of human beings - to induce behaviour, or censor and repress it - according to prevailing social and psychological doctrines. In effect, its central application is the control of thought and behaviour - as is well illustrated by a recent disclosure of the strategic policies of the Canadian RCMP that privilege the AI integration of remote piloted drones, computer screenshot capture, keyboard logging, cell phone data, GPS tracking and visual recognition [9]. It even includes simulation of cell towers to intercept real-time communications. At different implementation steps it must, for now, be under judicial supervision and consent, yet what exact protection this affords is hard to grasp in an age of judicial activism and government lawfare (one only has to remember FISA/CISA in the USA). Moreover, given the "creativity" and "inventiveness" of AI, one can easily imagine the kind of elaborate dirty tricks which its policial usage will lend itself to. G. Deleuze contrasted the concepts of classical disciplinary societies (M. Foucault) and control societies (W. Burroughs) [10]: the former work by personal signatures and identification numbers, and deploy simple technical machines for social control; whereas the latter work by coded ciphers and encoding algorithms, and deploy "information technology and computers". In the former "one is always starting all over again", whereas in the latter "you never finish anything". The general breakdown of confinement institutions inevitably led to the emergence of control societies, where it is the whole world population that is confined and located digitally, if nothing else, by their smart phones. But with AI, the development of control societies has long surpassed what Deleuze thought was the use of marketing as the instrument of social control: news and "culture" are more than mere advertisements or inducements to consume and model

behaviour - they are "botic" confabulations and narratives, veritable hallucinations that become collective derangements and originate bizarre patterns of behaviour; renting of crowds becomes second to swarms of bots; ghost electorates decide ruling majorities - and they can change abruptly; one's history in social media becomes the cadaster of online crimes of thought or expression. G. Tarde's rule of social imitation morphed into the rule of simulation: "Things can only appear to be". They are void as much of becoming as of being.

"Induction by deception" is inevitably a tendency towards fascism, towards new social and technical forms that insinuate fascism beyond recognition. The perpetual series of emergencies and a constant state of alarmism which governments and corporations, and their newsmedia have created in the past 3 decades - terrorism, energy crisis, war emergencies, global warming, gender dysphoria, covid panic, and so on - is increasingly being managed by competing but collaborating AI systems. Archbishop C. Vigano is right on this - where he goes wrong is in his thinking it is all just a Malthusian project. It is far, far grander than that - for one, it is about genetic selection, the old fascistic project that links over the span of more than 100 years the work begun by Margaret Sanger, which later became called Planned Parenthood, with the Gates Foundation and J. Epstein's new *napolas* (where the "successful" elites of the new social-darwinistic paradigm were to be bred); and for two, it is about the control and trimming (including surgical and chemical castration, lab-originated epidemiological challenges, reduction of solar radiation by atmospheric spraying, the poisoning of food and water with chemical additives and substitutes, etc, etc) of a massive planetarian population, largely rendered useless and addicted to dumb entertainment and stultifying drugs. Permanent crisis is the new mode of social power that mobilizes the digitized masses, and AI its "abstract signifying machine" - not the narrative, but henceforth the narrator, the source of all "knowledge" and "thought".

Welcome to the machine!

We thank Colin Menzies for conducting the chatGPT"dialogue".

References

1. Correa PN & Correa AN (2004) "The Gravitational Aether, Part II: Gravitational Aetherometry (5), Quantum Aether Gravity: II. Electrically-controlled experimental anti-gravity: the monopolar lift effect (and a refutation of the Biefeld-Brown effect)", Volume II of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-II.7.

The public abstracts reads:

The so-called Biefeld-Brown (BB) effect, supposedly discovered by T. Townsend Brown, has three essential characteristics: it requires a bipolar coupling, it is polarity dependent (in general, anode-directed motion) and it is geometry dependent.

The present communication presents evidence that the BB effect does not exist as such, and that its supposed manifestations are riddled with electrodynamic, electrostatic and 'pendular' or 'swing' artifacts that have been improperly analyzed to this day, and are not polarity- or geometry-dependent, but independent of both polarity and geometry.

Yet, it is possible to experimentally demonstrate and study electro-gravitic interactions. Once artifacts due to ascertainable causes are removed, one can isolate a phenomenon that seems to lie at the antipodes of the so-called BB effect: it is monopolar, not bipolar; it is polarity-independent and appears to be charge-density dependent. These are all characteristics that only the aetherometric model of the electrodynamic control of gravity predicted.

Since analysis of the experimental results and preliminary data both suggest that the monopolar lift effect is a vacuum reaction of the aether medium, they also tally with Wilstrom's and Khachatourian's 2002 discovery of an electrostatic spin which had long been predicted - in fact since 1977 - by Aspden's model of a 'vacuum (or aether) spin'.

2. Correa PN & Correa AN (1998, 2001) "The thermal anomaly in ORACs and the Reich-Einstein experiment: implications for blackbody theory", Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS2-05.

3. Correa PN & Correa AN (2001) "The reproducible thermal anomaly of the Reich-Einstein experiment under limit conditions", *Infinite Energy*, 37:12. Reprinted in 2010 in *J Aetherom Res*, 2(6):1-24.

4. Mallove, E (2001) "Breaking Through: A Bombshell in Science", *Infinite Energy*, 37:6.

5. Mallove, E (2001) "The mysteries and myths of heat: a brief history of hot and cold", *Infinite Energy*, 37:9.
6. Mallove, E (2002) "Demonstrating Aether Energy", *J Aetherom Res*, 2(6):26-31 (first published as a "Breaking Through" editorial in *Infinite Energy* 41:6).
7. Mallove, E (2004) "The 'New' Solar Power", *Infinite Energy*, 53:6.
8. Aspden, H (2002) "Gravity and its thermal anomaly: was the Reich-Einstein experiment evidence of energy inflow from the aether?", *J Aetherom Res*, 2(6):32-42 (first published in *Infinite Energy* 41:61).
9. "RCMP lifts veil on use of emergent technologies to fight crime", *Epoch Times*, 13 September 2024.
10. Deleuze G (1990) "Postscriptum sur les sociétés de contrôle", *L'autre Journal*, No. 1, May.