Why Gravity is not a
Function of Charge

by Miles Mathis

First published September 25, 2015

I have fielded a lot of questions and suggestions from some of my best readers over the years on this subject. Although it is possible that I will eventually admit they are right and concede that there is indeed only one main field in the universe, for now I am standing firm on my belief there are two. In my papers I have shown a lot of evidence that gravity and charge (E/M) cannot be joined. They can be *unified*, but one cannot be explained in terms of the other. I have argued that we require both fields in order to explain the balance we see not only in the equations, but in the unified field. If we tried to explain gravity as a function of charge, then we would have only one field. Although this seems to be the goal of many, and the intuition of others, and the desire of others, and the demand of others, I always argue against it because I don't see how one field can resist itself. We get into the same problem they got into in solid-state physics, where they now have E/M resisting itself in completely illogical ways.

However, I will not get into all that again. Those who have read my papers know both the general and specific arguments I have made. They can see that the unified field equations I have offered are necessarily dualistic. Against that, I am offered counter-evidence from my own papers, which show charge pressure coming in from all directions from stars, planets, and other bodies. Why cannot this pressure take the place of gravity? I have proposed gravity is a push, not a pull, so why not let this charge push stand for gravity?

In this paper I will tell you why. Everything I say here is based on my own collected and collated evidence, as well as my own intuition, and I admit it is incomplete. It is just another suggestion, make of it what you will. First of all, there is indeed charge pressure coming from all directions. I am not disputing that. My equations and papers have shown it, and I have no wish to deny it. However, in my opinion that charge pressure can in no way take the place of gravity. For two main reasons: 1) gravity is too strong to be accounted for by this pressure, 2) the main vector of the charge field in my equations —as measured on the surface of a body like the Earth—is actually *up*. Charge pressure replacing gravity requires a vector *down*. Due to charge recycling by the spinning sphere, the bulk of incoming charge is funneled into the poles of the Earth, where it is then channeled through the body and re-emitted most heavily near the equator (or 30 degrees N and S). This charge is therefore going straight up no matter where you find yourself on the surface. Not only does it *not* replace gravity, it actually tamps it down. The vectors are opposite.

But now we get to the reason I wrote this paper. There is nothing new above, but recently I thought of more evidence against the gravity-as-charge theory. This will also act as evidence against all those who have tried to explain gravity as some sort of analogue of magnetism. Although both charge and E/M have a necessary spin component, gravity does not. In other words, as these charge photons move up

through the Earth, being re-emitted at the surface and enter the atmosphere in a beeline upwards, they are spinning. All photons are always spinning. This spin causes the magnetic field, so every E/M field also has a spin component. Yes, we sometimes find fields that are magnetically pretty flat, but that is not because the photons aren't spinning, it is because we have about the same number of left spinners and right spinners. The *summed* field is flat. However, with gravity, we find nothing like that. Gravity has no spin component of that sort. Gravity has a linear component, like E, but no spin component like H or B. If gravity were a function of charge or E/M, we would expect it to have a spin component. We don't see that or anything like it.

I will be told that maybe gravity is the E component, and we assign the magnetic component separately, not realizing we are doing it. That is not a bad idea—as I tell my questioners—but in my opinion it is negative to data. Why? Well, take a heavy metal ball bearing and drop it. It will hit the ground hard, indicating a strong field. Now roll it. If you are on a hard surface, it will roll easily. There is the negative data already. If the ball were being held down to the surface of the Earth by charge or E/M, there would be strong resistance to rolling. As it is there is almost no resistance to rolling.

Spherical magnets held together strongly resist rolling against one another. This is because magnetism is caused by spin alignments. Rolling ruins those alignments, and a half turn will not only ruin the pull, it will reverse it into a push. This suggests to me that the ball bearing rolling on the Earth cannot be held by charge pressure coming down. The charge pressure coming down would be composed of spinning photons and those spinning photons would create alignments. There would be a magnetic component the ball bearing would have to align to.

Against that, I will be told that incoming charge is completely random as a matter of spin. But I have shown much evidence that isn't true, either. The magnetic field of the Earth is evidence against it, as are the unbalanced aurorae, beta decay, and so on. By compiling a lot of evidence from a lot of subfields of physics and astronomy, I have shown that charge photons coming into the Earth have a breakdown at about 2/3 to 1/3. The left spinners outnumber the right spinners by 2 to 1. That being so, it is difficult to see why the ball bearing is not forced to respond to that spin imbalance.

I have shown that the ball bearing *does* respond to it, but only in the thousandth part, where it is usually not seen. Yes, I have calculated that charge is 1000 times weaker than gravity on the surface of the Earth, and even that number is too low for our problem here. Due to the 2/3 to 1/3 split, only 1/3 of the total spin survives in the sum (the antiphotons offset half the photons), which takes the number up to 3000 for spin. We also have photons coming down (as sunlight) which offset that number even more, driving it above 10,000. So unless we have some sensitive machines, we are not going to see ball bearings respond to charge spin. We have seen it in some experiments prepared to look for it (see suppressed Chinese experiments, for instance) and in things like water drains, twists in tree trunks, and things of that nature. But if gravity were just a side-effect of incoming charge, we wouldn't see it in the fourth or fifth decimal point, we would see it as a very obvious effect of gravity—as magnetism is an effect or cohort of the electrical field. According to my calculations, we would see this spin effect as about 1/3 the strength of gravity, which would be hard to miss. It would strongly interfere with rolling, just for a start.

I will be told, "No, it wouldn't interfere with rolling, because rolling and the spin you are talking about are perpendicular phenomena. Your photons moving straight up or down would be spinning in x,y. A ball bearing rolling on the surface is rolling in z. Therefore the spins wouldn't come in contact with one another." Ingenious, but it still doesn't dodge the problem, since although the photon spins wouldn't affect the rolling by slowing it, they would affect the linear path of the ball bearing. The ball bearing

would then be forced into some sort of slow curve by the summed spin of the field. I suspect that it is, but again in the 10,000th part or so. If gravity were caused by charge directly, we should see the curve in the third part or so, which we don't.

For all these reasons, I don't think gravity can be explained by charge. I say that as someone who has pursued that possibility myself, and I still am pursuing it. I am not completely comfortable with either one of my theories of gravity, and would welcome an explanation of gravity by charge. However, at this time I have seen nothing in either the equations or the data that would recommend it. For this reason, for the time being I am sticking with my dual field, where gravity and charge are arrayed against one another.