return to updates

My Bicycle Seat

as proof of the charge field

by Miles Mathis

First published January 6, 2015

I have said many times in the past few years that just about everything can be explained by the charge field, and most will see this as an extreme case of that. Few will immediately see where I am going with this, and I chose the title just for that reason. I like to keep my readers—even the best of them—guessing.

Here is how it happened: I have been working on my bicycles for the past few months, and the house is littered with them, even my bedroom. Last night one was parked off the end of my bed and I awoke this morning with a view of the seat and handlebars sticking up above the footboard. There is a door to the front patio leading from my bedroom and that door is directly in line with my bed as well. It is a sliding glass door, and I often leave the blind open, so that I can let the cats out in the morning and see when they come back. I can let them in before they claw the screens off. Anyway, without the blind the light comes flooding in, and so the black bicycle seat was backlit by bright sunlight. As I lay there half awake, I noticed something strange. The black seat appeared to have a fine red line along the top of it, and a fine blue line underneath. To the sides, both lines disappeared. No color appeared to either side.

[I tried to get a photo of the phenomenon, but due to the strong backlighting I found I couldn't do it.]

Of course this reminded me of my old paper on Goethe, which I wrote right after my famous (or infamous) rainbow paper. In the Goethe paper I reminded my readers that he took exception to Newton's theory of light; and although Goethe has been vilified for this by the mainstream, we saw he was correct. We saw many phenomena that could not be explained by Newton's theory of refraction. This problem of my bicycle seat is another one, and so this paper can be seen as an extension of my very long paper on Goethe.

Just to bring you up to speed, Goethe showed that you don't need prisms to separate light into colors: any edge will do. But I took Goethe's theory even further than he did himself, showing you that don't even need a real edge. You only need an *apparent* edge. In other words, in the case we are looking at here, it doesn't matter that the bicycle seat has an edge where it meets the background. All that matters is that we have a black area next to a bright white area (and that the light is traveling to us from behind). The example I gave in the Goethe paper is the type you are reading on this computer screen. There is no real edge where a black letter meets the white background, and yet that "edge" is enough to create refraction. You don't need a real edge on a physical object, where the light is bending around the object. You only need light meeting dark.

I won't bother proving that all again here: if you don't believe me, reread that paper or do your own experiments. What I want to show you here is a simple analysis I didn't do in that paper. I will start by pointing out that Newton's theory (which is still current theory) can't explain the lines around my bicycle seat. According to his theory of bending, we should see the same color above and below. It is the same light passing the same seat above and below, so there is no reason for red above and blue below. You will say that the bicycle seat has different curvature above and below, which would account for it. But if we follow that suggestion, we find it fails as well. The bicycle seat actually has varying curvature all the way round, not just one curvature above and one below. So we should see varying colors depending on the local curvature. We don't. We see only red and blue. It is always red above and blue below, no matter the curvature. Beyond that, the curvature fails to explain the loss of color to the sides. We have curvature to the sides, so why no color?

It is worth pointing out that Goethe's theory also fails here. It is closer to the right answer than Newton's answer, and *leads* us to the right answer; but it isn't the right answer. Goethe also can't explain those losses of color to the side, can he? We have dark meeting light on the sides, just like top and bottom. So why color top and bottom, but not to the sides?

Goethe couldn't solve this because he didn't know about the charge field. Yes, this is where the charge field comes in. I have shown in dozens of papers that we have a charge field being emitted by the Earth, and that this charge field is moving straight up from the surface. It is moving from floor to ceiling in your room and every other room. It appears that Tesla knew about this field, but almost no one else before me has known of it. This charge field consists of real photons. It has been missed mainly because it is always overlooked as heat. This charge field peaks in the infrared, so it commonly masquerades as heat. We have seen it being ignored in every famous experiment in the 20th century (and before).

Well, once we know this field is there, the lines around the bicycle seat are no longer a mystery. They become simple to explain. The light streaming through the window has to pass through this one-directional charge field, so of course it won't act the same above and below. Yes, the streaming light is being pushed up in both places, but at the bottom of the seat it is being pushed toward the dark and at the top of the seat it is being pushed toward the light.

If you don't see what I mean, imagine you are one of the photons in the room moving straight up. As you pass the bottom edge of the bicycle seat, you are moving from an area of light to an area of dark. As you pass the top edge of the bicycle seat, you are moving from an area of dark to an area of light. Now we add the field of streaming photons coming from the window to the eye. We will say this field is mainly horizontal, while the charge field is vertical. Well, the streaming photons have to pass through the rising photons. So we have *two* real photon fields superimposed. The light that reaches your eye is the sum or integral of these two fields. Obviously, the integration of the two fields is not the same at the top of the seat and the bottom. We have the *opposite* flux top and bottom. This is what explains the two colors.

It also explains the lack of color to the sides, since we have no flux over there. The charge field is only moving up, so the only possible flux is on the z-axis. Since the side edges are on the x-axis, there is no flux over there and so no color.

That was the quick and dirty explanation, and it will convince those who are really good at math or really good at visualization. Since most people don't fall into either category, I will try to fill the holes by answering some questions. A reader may say, “Wait, you have a movement from light to dark at the sides, so you must have field flux over there. How can you say you don't? What is the difference from the light to dark over there and the light to dark top and bottom?

To answer, forget the photons and all the rest. Let us imagine cars instead of photons. And instead of the room, let us have a 3D grid, like the holodeck in *Star Trek*. Let us say we have a lot of car traffic in the +y-direction on the grid, the +y-direction being right at you. You also have a lot of traffic in the +z direction, that being straight up. If you can't visualize cars moving straight up, think of *Blade Runner* or *Star Wars*, where the cars could lift off, like jump jets. That is all the traffic there is. There is no cross traffic. No cars are moving from your left to right, or right to left. The x-direction is vacant.

Now consider the matter of car wrecks. The only car wrecks you can have are between y-cars and z-cars. If our traffic density is constant for both, then at any point on the grid the likelihood of a wreck is the same. Therefore, as a matter of wrecks, there is *no flux* across the grid. Or, there is *no change* in the likelihood of a wreck from point to point.

Now let us create a no-fly zone in a band across the middle of the grid horizontally, but only for the y-cars. The z-cars can still rise anywhere. Obviously, there aren't going to be any wrecks in that band, since there are no y-cars there. So you are going to have a big flux at the top and bottom of that band. At the lower edge, you will go from your standard number of wrecks to none; and at the upper edge, you will go from none to your standard number.

Now let us create a no-fly zone in a band across the middle of the grid vertically, but again, only for the y-cars. Again, no wrecks in that band, so as a matter of wrecks we would have a high flux at the edge of the band. This is why my hypothetical reader can't see why I am claiming there is no flux over there. As a matter of wrecks, there obviously is.

But what if instead of tracking wrecks, we track momentum changes? We don't just track wrecks; we track *what kind* of wrecks.

Since we have cars moving y and z, a wreck will cause a momentum change either y or z, or some angle in between. No x changes. You will say that if the cars are shaped like diamonds and we have off-center hits, we can get x changes, but we won't get into that here. We will just admit that with given motions y and z, our most likely momentum changes are also y and z. No matter the shapes of our cars, x changes will go to zero compared to y and z changes. The more we increase the speed of our cars, the more this is true. To get an appreciable fraction of x changes, we would require *motion* in x, which we don't have.

Given that, let us return to our second no-fly zone, the vertical one. Since we have a vertical no-fly zone, our edges will also be vertical. In other words, our edge will be a line in z, but the flux will be in x. To track the change in the field (flux), we have to move from left to right or right to left, which we have defined as x. *But there is no change in that field*. In the no-fly zone, we have no wrecks, and so our x-momentum is of course zero. However, this is also true *outside* the no-fly zone. Outside that zone, we have many wrecks, but again *no change in x-momentum*. All wrecks will cause momentum changes y or z, but not x. Therefore, if we track momentum changes in x, we have no flux at the edge of our vertical no-fly zone. Zero x-momentum changes inside the no-fly zone; zero outside.

This is why we see no color there. You see, the edge of our vertical no-fly zone is like the side of my bicycle seat. No flux along that edge, therefore no color.

This means that light *isn't* bending around the object. If it were, then we would see refraction all around the bicycle seat.

What we are seeing is a quick increase in z-changes, caused by a quick increase in collisions. Since red photons are the least energetic, they are the first to feel the increase. But very soon all the other photons also feel the increase, and the light returns to white. By the same token, if we study the lower edge, we find the blue photons as the last photons standing, due to their high energy. Remember, at the lower edge, we have a quick *decrease* in collisions. In such a case, it is no surprise to see the highest energy visible photons remaining the longest.

You will say that violet photons are higher energy than blue, so why am I seeing blue instead of violet? This is because window light isn't intense enough to separate blue from violet along that edge, so I am seeing both together. The blue I saw was a violet-blue. If the backlight had been more intense, the flux on the edge would have been higher, pushing the color more toward pure violet.