From the above results one can easily see how the output of the negative ion generator is effectively equivalent to a polarized (or 'unipolarized') electric field devoid of any positive charge component, whereas the TC, precisely unlike an ion generator, presents the result we would expect if its action field functioned bipolarly. The action of the TC cannot therefore be assimilated to that of a positive ion generator. But whereas this action appears somewhat balanced at >20 cm distance from the source, at shorter distances, such as 10 cm, it exhibits a net positive unipolarization, given that a much greater potential is acquired by the positively charged capacitor C_2 than by the negatively charged capacitor C_1, ie $V_{C1} << V_{C2}$. Thus, at distances of <20 cm, within the proximal field of the coil, the full-wave divider registers an effect akin to that of a positive ionizer. This is explained schematically in **Fig. 6A** by the preferential flux of charges from the ground to the antenna, through one side of the wave divider, and then to the coil.

We cannot, of course, conclude from the negative result obtained with both LFOT and HFOT light sources, that the Tesla waves assembled by the TC are not identical to 'electromagnetic waves'. Such a conclusion can only be extracted from the experiments of **Table 1**. Given the slow recovery of existing rectifiers when compared to the frequency of the light sources employed in the experiment of **Table 2A**, one could well expect that the impinging electromagnetic light radiation would fail to become split by the full wave divider, and thus fail to charge the capacitances. In this respect, the more critical differentiating experiment between Tesla waves and 'electromagnetic' waves is that shown in **Table 1**, where the 'electromagnetic' signal of the tested sources does not undergo splitting in order to produce - or not, as is the case - electric effects. There, the photon 'light' sources did not induce any electric effects, whereas Tesla waves did.

But from **Table 2A**, we can conclude one other important distinction between the effect of Tesla waves and the action of blacklight, as in the Hallwacks photoelectric effect: not only does the action of far UV not charge either of the two capture circuits - which it should, and positively so, if its action were to eject electrons from the valence band of metallic bodies (and were not limited, as AToS proposes and we have shown in previous papers, to eject charges trapped in the conduction band of metallic bodies), but it is the TC that, proximally to it, positively charges metallic bodies! This clearly confirms our contention that blacklight, or HFOT, photons - which are commonly and erroneously assumed to ionize matter - operate instead by adding more kinetic energy to conduction band electrons than is permitted by that band, which results in their ejection. And it also suggests that, in close proximity to the coil (ie within the direct action field of, say, 20 to 30 cm from the tip of the coil) the TC is able to positively unipolarize metallic bodies, but by drawing some of their valence electrons.

We wondered whether this 'unipolarization-induction' property belongs directly to the Tesla waves of a TC, or whether it is a characteristic, instead, of the exposed metallic matter, specifically that placed across the semiconductor interface, subject to interaction with the Tesla waves. This con-