A Note
On Dayton Miller's Supposed Discovery Of an Aether Drift

by
Paulo Correa, M.Sc., Ph.D.

ISBN 1-894840-50-X

Published in Canada by
AKRONOS Publishing @ Aetherometry.com

AETHEROMETRIC THEORY OF SYNCHRONICITY (AToS)

VOLUME I

Interferometric Aetherometry (7) -

A NOTE ON DAYTON MILLER'S

SUPPOSED DISCOVERY OF AETHER DRIFT

By

Paulo N. Correa,[1]

[1] *Aurora Biophysics Research Institute, Vaughan, Ontario, Canada*

ABRI Monograph Series AS3-I.7

Aetherom Theor Synchron **1**, 7: 1-16 (2002, 2008)

A note on Dayton Miller's supposed discovery of Aether drift

Paulo N. Correa, MSc, PhD
Aurora Biophysics Research Institute, Concord, Ontario Canada

ABSTRACT

Dayton Miller's claims to have measured an aether drift and the absolute velocity of the Solar System, are succinctly compared with the currently accepted values of astrophysical velocities and those predicted by Aetherometry. Miller's model of the Aether is also contrasted to Wilhelm Reich's 'orgonomic cosmology' and the aetherometric model of a dynamic Aether.

COMMUNICATION

1. Relativity and the reaction against the demise of the luminiferous Aether

With the release of our papers on Relativity [1-2], Special and General, that were extracted from the first volume of Aetherometry (originally entitled "Aether wars in XXth century Physics"), we drew the attention of careful readers to the fact that, for Physics to move forward at the dawn of the XXth century, it had to discard indeed the confabulations of a static luminiferous and electromagnetic Aether. Einstein's courage is, on this respect, to be admired - he showed how 'the king went naked'. And so is his ability to discern the likelihood of existence of a nonelectromagnetic dynamic Aether, which he originally envisaged as being of a gravitational nature [3]. Our aetherometric science has been methodically led to disagree from the notion that the nature of the Aether is gravitational - even if the 'gravitational field' is nothing short of a specific manifestation of existence of Aether energy 'ontologically' and 'cosmologically' affected to mass-energy. Moreover, as our papers on Relativity demonstrate over and over again, Einstein growingly fell prey to a geometrism of fields, to a mathematical metaphysics devoid of energetic basis. One might argue that this was inevitable the moment Einstein recuperated or co-opted Lorentz's transformations and electrodynamics, given that, for instance, the spatialization of Time is already inherent in Lorentz's hypothesis. Be all this as it may, Tesla first and then Reich drew the attention to the existence of a massfree longitudinal form

of electric radiation that was not reducible to electromagnetic fields, waves or energy - which they viewed as a fundamental manifestation of Aether energy [4-5]. Neither one regarded the null result of the Michelson-Morley-type experiments as any form of an impediment to a theory of a dynamic Aether.

The reaction to Einstein's affirmation of the null result was, as is well known, one that crystallized originally in what its proponents called "Aryan Physics". Its most outspoken representative, Lenard, strenuously objected to "the abolition of the Aether" - yet managed somehow to accept relativity as a principle that applied to gravitation, while he theoretized about an "Ur-Aether". Today, of course, most have forgotten that there was another current of Physics within (that's right) National Socialism - one that defended the validity of the procedures of both Special Relativity and Quantum Mechanics, spearheaded by Planck and Heisenberg. Whereas Lenard, Stark and their acolytes had, in the 1920's, denounced Heisenberg as "spirit of Einstein's spirit", Heisenberg eventually got his revanche, in 1937, when Rosenberg and Himmler chose to support him over the Lenard tendency - and came to regard party ideology as being independent from "dogmas on cosmophysics". The Nazis, of course, were rewarded with all the efforts Heisenberg made to build atomic piles and develop a fission bomb. Post-war American Physics has denazified or cleaned up the Heisenberg image - so that no one would perceive the political implications of his scientific thinking. Instead, to this day, the dominance of probabilism in physics is regarded as apolitical...

In a very real sense, the mathematical probabilism of Heisenberg is far more responsible for the present derangement of science than Einstein's Relativity ever was. Einstein himself perceived this fact [6]. To the public and the political and scientific establishment, however, a rehabilitated Heisenberg had once again become the "spirit of Einstein's spirit", no matter how revulsed Einstein was at such notion.

2. Miller's findings and claims

In the US, one of the most skeptical of physicists opposed to Relativity was Dayton Miller. Lenard had made a variety of claims regarding demonstration of an Aether with modified reproductions of the MM experiment. And Miller, as well as Michelson, were still convinced that a static electromagnetic or luminiferous Aether would be demonstrated sooner or later. After the 1921 Mt. Wilson experiments, Miller was nearly ready to abandon the pursuit - but with the encouragement of Lorentz, he re-engaged the work that would lead him to the "Ether Drift experiments" of 1925-1926 performed with a much improved interferometer. Ever since then, those who seek to re-establish the old notion of a static Aether that can be detected by its supposed drift, have taken recourse to Miller's results, pushing them to the forefront as if they were a repressed of Physics that betrayed the "truth of an electromagnetic Aether:". However, Miller never fully satisfied a demonstration that the borderline periodic displacements he observed could not be related to sensible and latent heat lag

effects derived from solar ambipolar radiation [7]. And none of this rules out the possible existence of nonrandom, systematic and periodic effects in Miller's data [7].

On the other hand, Miller himself eventually acknowledged that there were thermal effects at work. Since he wanted his apparatus to be as exposed to the elements as possible, I am convinced that it would invariably detect a diurnal variation in the start-up calibration (that sunlight might have caused spurious peaks is of an observation of little use, if complete diurnal atmospheric records were not taken; for instance, Miller should have taken systematic control temperatures of the room, instrument, walls and roof, which apparently he did not, or only erratically and partially [7]). Nowhere does Miller seem to have controlled for this diurnal variation of climacteric factors in a systematic fashion. Then and again, it is not just the heating effect of the sun upon the atmosphere that one should consider (even if it happened only once, which is totally unlikely...), but equally the cooling effect of nighttime. We have seen these effects in ORACs and studied their lags, and so we can easily suppose that they will affect such a sensitive interferometer as Miller's.

More disturbing is that the data Miller obtained - with his final and improved interferometer - yielded two very different reports of the direction of the aether drift: in 1926 he reported in *Science* [8] that the *absolute motion* of the earth was towards the head of Draco, 17h RA, +65° North Decl., in the Northern Celestial Hemisphere, whereas by 1933, the motion was made in the opposite direction towards Dorado in the Southern celestial Hemisphere (4.9h RA, -71° Decl.), 180° off [9]. Yet, the value of the drift remained at ca 200 km/sec, and the drag lowered it to the same 9 or 10 km/sec at ca 1.8 km altitude.

3. Miller's model of the Aether vs Wilhelm Reich's Orgone cosmology

How do the Miller experiments relate to that other line of an eccentric physics that Tesla and Reich stood for - the incipient science of a dynamic Aether? Reichians in general tend to quote the residuals of the Michelson-Morley (MM), Morley-Miller and Miller experiments as evidence for a conspiracy to deny existence to the Aether (the irrationalism of those that keep clinging to this view is, at bottom, part of the same reaction that once branded Einstein's work "Jewish Physics"...). If they were correct, then the Aether would be stationary, a frame at rest in some substantival space, as is still claimed to be the case to this day by the die-hard adherents of the luminiferous Aether. But, therefore, the Aether these (neo)Reichians speak of is certainly not the Aether of Tesla or the ORgone of Reich; it is rather more like the *Meta-Aether* of Lenard - an electromagnetic fiction of a disembodied reality. Another essence without existence...

Indeed, Reich himself overtly disputed [10-11] the validity of the two premises of the MM experiment which Miller sought to extend and confirm: that the Aether is at rest [10], and that light travels through Space [11]. Hence, this 'territorialization' or 'fixation' of Reichianism on the Morley-Miller and Miller experiments in particular *is not the result of Reich's own thought*, but rather the result

of the impotence of Reich's followers *in following* his thought. Reich was evidently aware of the MM experiment and subsequent reproductions by Morley, Miller and others. His own experiments had demonstrated to him that there existed a massfree energy, an 'ORgone Aether' - and that its existence did not require, in any way shape or form, the presence of an electromagnetic Aether drag.

To better understand the differences between these very different approaches to the problem of an Aether - the Relativists on one side, the classical Aether adherents on another, and Tesla and Reich on still some other side - let us summarily systematize the alternative Aether models whose confrontation Relativity has now obscured:

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

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

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

Now, what to one's mind is confusing with Miller's notion of an Aether Drift is that, at the end of the day, it appears to have little in common with the aether drag (rotary or translatory) models - since it suggests that Miller's measurements consisted of a detection of a cosmological aether drift that carries the Earth along with the solar system. But Miller argues that he detected this 'translational' drift at altitude, as a much slower velocity of the Aether due to what is effectively an aether drag model of the aetherosphere (otherwise the displacement fringes would have to be substantial - and they were not), and so he is obliged to construe an arbitrary procedure that seemingly permits him to deduce the speed of absolute motion to be ~200 km/sec from the claim to detect a drift of 9-10 km/sec at altitude.

What is common to both models above is the old metaphysical notion of an "unmoved mover" (Aristotle). If we consider it, then it is not difficult to immediately perceive the way out of the paralogical dilemma posed by these two models: to consider a "moving mover", which is exactly the case with the third or next model.

3. There is another way to construe an Aether model that fits both the null result of the MM-type experiments and the results of the Sagnac-type experiments. In this model, it would not be the Earth that would entrain a stationary Aether, but instead a *consistent motion* of the Aether - of a *non-stationary dynamic* Aether - that would propel forward the Earth, the Solar System and even the entire Galaxy or the Local Group. It is the ordered motion of the Aether that propels these astrophysical bodies or systems in their coordinated displacements. To again employ Reich's words, 'the analogy is that of a ball rolling on water waves more slowly than the waves'. There would still be an aetherosphere, created not by dragging a stationary Aether, but by a consistent aether spin (the result of the superimposition of multiple such spins, at a cosmic, galactic, solar and planetarian levels) propelling at once both the rotary and translatory motions of the Earth. Outside of the aetherosphere, a much faster aether flux should therefore be detectable, but the aether impulses would impart angular momentum to the planet by curving in along finite cycloidal paths towards the planet's surface, their energy being partially absorbed to drive the Earth's motions, as the wave impulses slow down to near the Earth's speed of rotary motion. With my coworkers, we explored this model of an Aether-propelled Earth and the gravitational field-induced velocity vector gradient in two monographs of the next volume of AToS [12-13].

This third model fit in with the notion that the MM-type experiments should yield a null result (at least until and unless their resolution approached measurement of that slightly faster mean rotation of the aetherosphere, on the order of 50-100 or so m/sec faster than the local terrestrial speed of rotation); a similar null result should be observed in the Ives-Stilwell type experiments [14]. And the same model would also fit in with the notion that Sagnac-type experiments should be able to measure the rotary motion of the interferometer (and when conducted as a planetarian Sagnac with sufficient precision, should yield a faster motion of the atmosphere from West to East, in the same direction as the rotation of the planet) [15]. It follows that only the third hypothesis fits the experimental findings, and remains 'unbothered' by the small MM residuals. Moreover, unlike the previous two models of the stationary Aether (undragged and dragged), the third model proposes a dynamic Aether that itself explains the nearly-perpetual motions of the planet - motions which, therefore, are not treated as simply 'given', but functionally treated without recourse to metaphysical-geometric concepts, such as the invocation of a substantival space. The motion of the Earth is then seen clearly as the result of the motion of this dynamic Aether.

One might mistakenly call this aether-flux model, an 'aether drift model' - where the Earth,

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

In accordance with the third model, one should indeed be also able to detect greater motion of satellites near the shear zone when the aether impulses slow down [12]. This is an old question that goes back to the work of Newton. And it is indeed true that, beginning at an equatorial geostationary distance of 35,862 km above the Earth, when the translatory speed of a satellite around the Earth's axis is ca 3 km/sec, satellite speed increases steadily to a value of 7.8 km/sec at ca 100 Km above the Earth, and to some slightly higher value at a slightly lower altitude still; but then, instead of continuing to increase to a theoretical 7.9 km/sec at the Earth's surface, the satellite is dragged down, suddenly decelerated, such that at tropospheric altitudes, the speed of the flux holding an imaginary satellite afloat in a trajectory parallel to the earth would not be any faster than the variable speed (0.01 to 0.1 km/sec) of the jet stream with respect to the Earth [12]. Note also that it is along the ridges and troughs of the jet stream that cyclonic and anticyclonic systems couple themselves, much as eddy currents counter-couple themselves on the surface of a drag-cup. A suitable approximation would be ca 0.5 km/sec at altitudes of ca 10 Km, in temperate latitudes. This abrupt slowing down of the inner concentric layers of the spinning aetherosphere below 100 Km results precisely from the atmospheric and terrestrial absorption of the impulses of the 'aether stream' - and causes, of course, the illusion that free fall is a motion along the vertical.

4. How unlikely are Miller's claims of an aether drift

The question then arises as to whether Miller could have detected the aether motion that he claimed he did, once the Aether slowed down and encircled the planet at a slightly faster rate of motion than the motion of the surface or the rotation of the planet. At ca 1.8 km altitude, and in light of the preceding section, it seems unlikely that the value of an aether drift at 9 to 10 km/sec could ever be real.

If Miller was detecting an aether drift involving some (ultimate) translational component of the Earth's motion, and if this drift motion was distorted because, above all, the rotation of the Earth through an Aether entrained the latter and dragged down its speed past the Earth, then by any drag model this implies a *slip* of the Aether at the surface of the rotating body. Hence Miller's idea of

conducting the experiment at altitude. But since the experiment never indicated the full slip to be expected from the Earth's translation about the Sun (only a third, at best), it affords no real empirical reason to hold on to the classical view of a stationary Aether with a surface slip. An effective slip of the Aether at the surface of the Earth should translate either into a fixed aetherosphere at, or near, the surface, or into a slip with apparent E to W motion, that could explain the residuals. Therefore any test for altered propagation in the rotational plane of the Earth (planetarian Sagnac and MGP) should be able to confirm either the absence of any alteration, or an apparent E to W motion, and that is not the case. To my understanding, this means that what has been effectively *ruled out* from all these various experiments (MM-type, Sagnac and MGP) is precisely the notion that, in moving through Space, the Earth entrains the Aether.

Were the speed of the drifting Aether dragged down by the rotary motion of the Earth, one should expect that one might observe a cosmic variation when the light path is at 90° to the path of the Earth's orbit around the Sun, over a suitably long period of observations, just as Miller did. However, as has been pointed out, his data is far from being convincing . Moreover, one is hard put to see how a body rotating with surface speeds no greater than 0.46 km/sec (at the equator) would slow down a drift of ~200 km/sec to ca 10 km/sec at 1.8 km altitude. It is simply an act of faith to hold onto an entrained aether model and at the same time hold onto the view that, within the troposphere, there is an aether motion at 10 km/sec pointing to somewhere along the arc joining Draco and Dorado. For this aether motion in any aether drag model would have to represent a slip with respect to the earth's rotation at such low altitudes that would be, for all purposes, nearly parallel to the surface.

Model #3 from the preceding section (the "moving mover") is therefore the only one consistent with all the other *facts* of physics: the Earth neither moves through the Aether, nor is it impelled by some cosmic Big-Bang or a Hand of God in a vacuum of Space, by some "unmoved mover". Rather, it is the Aether that moves the Earth, because the Aether is in a perpetual state of ordered motion. The terrestrial atmospheric laminar flows and main shear zone(s) arise from the Aether flux slowing down as a function of imparting angular momentum to the planet and to the mass rotating in that atmosphere.

5. Miller's findings in light of current official physics

When comparing Miller's results (early and later) for his claim(s) of detection of an aether drift and determination of the absolute velocity of the Earth, with the measurements accepted currently in astronomy, the following conclusions result:

1. With respect to the Solar Apex:

DeMeo [16] sees some sort of significance in the fact that Miller's original northern apex is close to

the Solar Apex (in Hercules, 18.1h RA, +34° dec) with respect to local stars (it's 35° away [7]). However, the accepted solar system's velocity towards this apex is only 19.7 km/s, *not* 200-208 km/s and it is easily swamped by the solar system's velocity around the galactic center, so only the RA values are reasonably close - *not the declination nor the speed*. Therefore, Miller's apex does not coincide with the accepted Solar Apex.

2. With respect to the Galactic Apex:
The officially accepted value of the galactic velocity is 220-300 +/- 20 km/s, and the apex in the direction of Cygnus (~21h RA, +45° decl). With such a wide range of values, Miller's speed value can fall within the accepted determination of the Galactic Apex, but neither the direction of the earlier of Miller's results (17h RA, +65° decl), or *a fortiori* that of his later determination (RA 4.9 h RA, -71° decl) agrees with it. In fact, "Miller's preferred southern apex lies, of course, at the opposite end of the heavens!" [7] Thus Miller's apex also does not coincide with the accepted Galactic Apex.

3. With respect to the "net motion relative to the mCBR anisotropy":
The official value of the net motion of the solar system relative to the anisotropy of the New Aether, the mCBR, is 373±15 km/s, 11h RA, 0° to +13° decl, towards the star Regulus in the Leo constellation [17-18]. Here, *no commonality at all is found with Miller's values* - both his speed and apex are at odds with the the mCBR-relative "net motion". Thus, crucially, Miller's apex also is not the apex of net motion.

4. With respect to the so-called "peculiar motion":
The accepted value [17, 19] is 620±20 km/s, 10.4h RA, -18° to -26° decl., and again no commonality is found with Miller's values: the speed is totally different and so are the direction coordinates.

5. With respect to the Local Group Apex:
The official value of speed ranges from 40 to 170 km/s [20], so it is not inconceivable that Miller's value of 200-208 km/s could also be a possible one. However, the accepted apex lies at 0.5h RA, +40° decl, and so it is totally different from Miller's.

It has been apparent for some time (since the 1950's at least) that Miller's apex could be neither the Solar or the Galactic Apex. Most critically, therefore, was the possibility that he had measured a drift with respect to the mCBR. According to the official treatment of the mCBR, that is not the case either.

When we couple these conclusions regarding the apparent invalidity of Miller's claims in light of the current values of astrophysics, to the measurement limitations that have been found to be

intrinsic to the methods of interferometry such as Miller practiced it [7, 21], the obvious suggestion is that Miller's measurements were null and likely of zero speed on the plane of the interferometer [7].

6. Miller's claims in light of Aetherometry

The comparison of Miller's claims to the 'cosmological' (for lack of a better term) predictions of Aetherometry is somewhat premature because Alexandra and I have not yet a chance to revise and publish volume VI of the Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity, where a properly aetherometric model of astrophysical relations is proposed. (Whenever possible, I will reference statements below to material that has been already published.) Accordingly, the following is a preliminary comparison, shown here for purposes of demonstrating how any theory of a dragged Aether, like Miller's, is incompatible with Aetherometry.

1. With respect to the Solar Apex:
Aetherometry proposes a proof that the Solar Apex motion is K-compliant, responsible for the sunspot periodicity, the mean solar year and the Great Platonic Year [22]. It agrees with the accepted direction of the Solar Apex (near the border of Hercules with Lyre, at Hercules' elbow, RA 18.1h dec +36.5°, not +34°), but claims to demonstrate how the velocity is not 19.5 km/s, but 13.55 km/s.

So, the question arises: could Miller have detected this velocity in his earlier experiments, before he reinterpreted drifts of 8 to 10 km/s as indications of speeds on the order of 208 km/s? It is highly unlikely, given the fact that his experiments typically would have had to consistently detect velocities greater than some 8-12.5 km/s [7] (or far more, >27 km/s according to the different methods employed by T. Roberts in his recent analysis [23]) and did not - and that the direction of the apex, even though nearly sharing the RA, is 35° away [7].

2. With respect to the Galactic Apex:
Aetherometry places the galactic speed at 256 to 269 km/s, RA 19h dec +62°. This disagrees slightly with the accepted values regarding the apex (RA 20.6 to 21.2 h; dec +45° to +48°), and lies within the official range of 220-300 km/s. The aetherometric model is based on a confluence of several characteristic approaches (to the determination of galactic mass, position of the solar system, ambipolar galactic emission, harmonic time periodicities, etc).

It is curious that a comparison of the aetherometric values of the Galactic Apex with Miller's results shows that the speeds are different, likely significantly so, but the aetherometric galactic apex is very close indeed to Miller's earlier northern apex, particularly in declination (the two differ by ~3°, and by 1.5h in RA). It is therefore possible to entertain the notion that, had Miller employed an

interferometer with higher resolution, the residuals that one can argue are compatible with his results might yet prove to be slightly greater, and accurate detections of the aetherometric Galactic Apex. This possibility is opposite to the conclusion that DeMeo erroneously obtained regarding Miller's results as identifying the Solar Apex, which they do *not*. However, against the possibility that they might identify instead the aetherometric Galactic Apex, stands not only the fact that the speeds are different (256-269 vs 208 km/s), but that the way Miller obtained that 208 km/s speed is also illegitimate. Moreover, to safeguard the latter, he later changed the apex to a direction that is also antipodal to the aetherometric determination of the Galactic Apex.

3. With respect to the so-called "net motion relative to the mCBR anisotropy" :
Aetherometry demonstrates how the conventionally accepted determination of speed with respect to the mCBR anisotropy is totally bogus or in great error (even the correct temperature equation does not yield the correct net speed of the plasma flux) [24]. Aetherometry demonstrates further (unpublished observations, Vol. VI) that there is a plasma velocity differential between cosmological charge-carriers that is caused by their difference in mass and the fact that they are accelerated by a single cosmic ambipolar field; and that it is this single field with a defined radiative spectrum which is ultimately responsible for *both the isotropy* of the mCBR *and its anisotropic characteristics*, after it interacts with different cosmological charge carriers. It follows that the speed of the low-energy cosmic ambipolar radiation (ie the velocity of the primary field) is different from that of the protons and electrons that it accelerates, and aetherometrically determined at 21.18 km/s. Whereas the speeds of the plasmas of these massbound charges will be 232.2 km/s for electrons (or positrons) and 5.4 km/s for protons (or antiprotons), at the respective microwave and radio temperatures. Since they are accelerated opposite one another, in opposing directions, if they are oppositely charged, and accelerated in parallel directions if their charges are of the same polarity, there will be a net anisotropic flux of leptons (negative or positive according to the 'region of abstract space') with speeds as low as 226.8 km/s when they are combined to same charge baryons (subtract velocities), and speeds as high as 237.6 km/s when combined to opposite charge baryons (add velocities). The anisotropy is fundamentally caused by the baryon density, and the flux is otherwise isotropic, the declination of the flux is ~0°, with an oscillation of -6° to +6° (likely due to varying baryon densities), in agreement with the accepted value. However, an RA of 23h only have to apply to the more intense or faster net flux, say, that of negatively charged leptons running at the encounter of positively charged cosmological protons that, in turn, are overall moving in the opposite direction, towards RA 11h and dec ~0°, that is, in the accepted anisotropic direction (in aetherometric terms, this is the direction caused by the cosmological radio perturbation of the microwave isotropy).

The net directional flux of cosmological leptons computed aetherometrically yields a velocity much

lower than the accepted one of 373±15 km/s, but it is curious that the earliest determination of this velocity by Corey & Wilkinson, in 1976, yielded a velocity of 270±70 km/s, with the aetherometric determination falling well within that original determination, at a mean 232 km/s. Lastly, given the exact and tight range of the aetherometric determination and the totally different coordinates of the apices of the net lepton and baryons fluxes, there is nothing in common here with Miller's velocity and apex determinations.

4. With respect to the so-called "peculiar motion":
Aetherometry has a different view of the structure of galaxies, which I cannot present here.

5. With respect to the Local Group Apex:
Aetherometry preliminarily agrees with the upper range of the Local Group Apex, at 170 km/s, RA 0.5h dec +40°, the direction and speed having nothing in common with Miller's.

It is apparent that Miller's claims do not fare any better with the aetherometric predictions than they do with the established claims, or interpretations of data, of official physics. There is nothing in common between Miller's theory of an aether drift, and Aetherometry's theory of a null drift required by a dynamic Aether. And in what concerns Reich, or his 'orgonomic cosmology', it is equally apparent that, whereas Aetherometry is compatible with Orgonomy, Miller's theory is not.

REFERENCES

1. **Correa P & Correa A (2001) "Consequences of the null result of the Michelson-Morley experiment: the demise of the stationary aether, the rise of special relativity, and the heuristic concept of the photon", *Infinite Energy*, 38:47. Reprinted in *Aetherom Theor of Synchron* (2008)Vol. I, 1:1.**

2. **Correa P & Correa A (2001) "The Sagnac and Michelson-Gale-Pearson experiments: the tribulations of general relativity with respect to rotation", *Infinite Energy*, 39:32. Reprinted with corrections in *Aetherom Theor of Synchron* (2008)Vol. I, 2:1.**

3. See our commentary on Einstein's 1920 address at the University of Leyden entitled "*Aether and the theory of Relativity*": **Correa P & Correa A (2006) "A running commentary on Einstein's *Aether and the theory of Relativity*", *J Aetherom Res*, 1, 6:1**, at:
www.aetherometry.com/Electronic_Publications/Science/aether_and_relativity_comments.php

4. **Correa, P & Correa, A (2003) "Experimental Aetherometry, Vol. IIA", Akronos Publishing, University of Toronto Press, Concord, Canada.**

5. **Correa, P & Correa, A (2003) "Experimental Aetherometry, Vol. IIB", Akronos Publishing, University of Toronto Press, Concord, Canada, in preparation.**

6. **Einstein, A, Podolsky, B, Rosen, N (1935) "Can Quantum-Mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?", *Phys Rev*, 47:777.**

7. A more stringent examination of the role of these effects, and the data and claims of Miller was recently carried out by **Correa, P, Correa, A, Pratt, D & Askanas, M (2008) "Re-examination of the experimental evidence for a nonzero aether drift. Part 1: Michelson-Morley-type experiments 1881-1930".** In preparation.

8. **Miller, D (1926) "Significance of the ether-drift experiments of 1925 at Mount Wilson", *Science*, 63:433.**

9. **Miller, D (1933) "The ether-drift experiment and the determination of the absolute motion of the earth", *Rev of Mod Phys*, 5:203.**

10. **Reich, W (1951)"Ether, god and devil", reprinted by Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, pp. 140-142, 159-160. The same reference can be found at: Reich, W (1949) "Cosmic orgone energy and 'ether'", *Org Energy Bull*, 1, Oct:143.**

11. **Reich, W (1949) "Orgonotic light functions 1: Searchlight phenomena in the orgone energy envelope of the earth", *Org Energy Bull*, 1, 1:3.**

12. **Correa, P & Correa, A (2003, 2004) "The Gravitational Aether, Part II: Gravitational Aetherometry (2), Mysteries of Inertia", Volume II of the Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Chapter 5, Akronos Publishing, Concord, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-II.4.**

13. Correa, P & Correa, A (2008) "The Gravitational Aether, Part II: Gravitational Aetherometry (9), Quantum and Subquantum Aether (Anti)Gravity; fine variation and determination of G", Volume II of the Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-II.11.

14. Correa, PN, Correa, AN, Askanas, M, Gryziecki, G, Sola-Soler, J (2008) "A test of Aetherometry vs Relativity, Special and Larmor-Lorentz: the 1938 Ives-Stilwell experiment", *Aetherom Theor of Synchron*, Vol. I, 4:1.

15. Correa, P & Correa, A (2007) "Linear and angular Doppler shifts and the Sagnac experiment", *Aetherom Theor of Synchron*, Vol. I, 3:1.

16. DeMeo, J (2002) "Reconciling Miller's ether-drift with Reich's dynamic orgone" at: www.orgonelab.org/MillerReich.htm

17. Smoot, GF *et al* (1977) "Detection of anisotropy in the cosmic blackbody radiation", *Phys Rev Lett*, 398:898.

18. Smoot, G.F *et al* (1992) "Structure in the COBE differential microwave radiometer first-year maps", *Astrophys J*, 396:L1.

19. Dale, D *et al* (1999) "Seeking the local convergence depth: the Abell cluster dipole flow to 200 h^{-1} Mpc", *Astrophys J*, 510:L11.

20. "The Cambridge atlas of astronomy" (1994) ed. by J. Audouze & G. Israël, Cambridge University Press, England, pp. 326, 358.

21. Shankland, R *et al* (1955) "New analysis of the interferometer observations of Dayton C. Miller", *Rev of Mod Phys*, 27:167.

22. Correa, P & Correa, A (2006) "The Gravitational Aether, Part II: Gravitational Aetherometry (7), Antigravity lift and exotic flight (II): critical overview of theories and technologies", Volume II of the Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Chapter 7, Akronos Publishing, Concord, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-II.9.

23. Roberts, T (2006) "An explanation of Dayton Miller's anomalous 'ether drift' result", Arxiv preprint physics/0608238, via: http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0608238

24. Correa, P & Correa, A (2000) "The cosmic background microwave radiation as evidence for cosmological creation of electrons with minimum kinetic energy and for a minimum of cosmic ambipolar massfree energy", Akronos Publishing, Concord, Canada, ABRI monograph AS2-17C.