

The Mainstream is Garbling my Charge Field *almost certainly on purpose*

by Miles Mathis

October 30, 2025

I just became aware of this for the first time, when a reader sent me a copy of his conversation with AI, which is obviously just parroting mainstream (mis)conceptions, since that is what it is programmed to do. AI, including Grok and others, answered that some fringe theories (mine) were claiming that charge was mediated by real photons, but that this couldn't be true since it was known the photon was not charged.

That shocked me *why?* I didn't see that coming *why?* Because I have never said anything about the individual photon being charged, with that charge *causing* the charge of the charge field. In my theory it simply doesn't work like that, so I never even have to address the charge of the individual photon. I only talk about the real SPIN of the individual photon, which is not the same thing.

In that sense, charge is an abstraction that I have completely bypassed, you see. In my theory, charge is a field of potentials created by photon densities and spins, *not* a field of potentials created by summing the charges of individual photons in the field. I hope you see the difference, because it is fundamental. I call my primary and foundational field the charge field not because it sums individual charges on photons, but because my photon winds create what we have always called the charge field. It creates the motions toward and away, without the necessity of mysterious pulls and pushes. There are no pulls, and the pushes are just larger particles—both positive and negative—being transported by the photon wind.

You will say that can't explain the polarity of the field, with electrons moving opposite to protons in some situations, but it can because photons can spin either way, creating the polarity that way. We not only have photons, we have antiphotons. Antiphotons aren't charged opposite, they are *spinning* opposite, with real spins. They are simply upside-down. And that is just one way the polarity of the EM field can be explained. My field of real photons creates many degrees of freedom the mainstream can't, for instance with photons moving one way through the nucleus and antiphotons moving the other way, creating complex multipoles that we can track with real diagrams.

But neither AI nor the mainstream people behind it address that, because it requires not only addressing my charge field, but my nuclear diagrams. My theory is all-encompassing and of-a-piece, so it can't be addressed by some soundbite dismissal of one or two sentences, ending in “the mainstream doesn't accept it”. As you see, the only reason they give for why the mainstream doesn't accept it is that “the photon isn't charged”. But since my theory has nothing to do with that, it is just a dishonest dodge. How about explain why the mainstream doesn't accept my nuclear diagrams. I guess Grok and the rest don't want to talk about that, because they don't want you to know that the same guy that has an extensive theory of photons and charge has also [diagrammed the atomic nucleus](#), including many elements and molecules. They don't want you to know he has also achieved [unification of gravity and EM](#), [unified all the quantum particles](#), explained [superposition](#) and [entanglement](#) mechanically, solved

the [Bode series](#), [corrected Relativity](#), [redefined the calculus](#), successfully [predicted the current Solar Cycle](#) (being the only person in history to successfully predict a Cycle, including individual monthlies), [corrected the Lagrangian](#), rewritten [molecular bonding](#), explained [planetary tilts](#), solved the [Galactic Rotation Problem](#), explained [Canada's Gravity Deficit](#), solved [over-unity brightness](#) (as with Enceladus), explained the [comet tails](#), rewritten [rainbow theory](#), rewritten [color theory](#), rewritten the [Raleigh equation](#), rewritten the [Hall Effect](#), the [Stark Effect](#), the [Casimir Effect](#), the [Compton Effect](#), the [Meissner Effect](#), the [Dzhanibekov Effect](#), the [Sagnac Effect](#), the [photomolecular effect](#), the [Arago Effect](#), and the [Allais Effect](#), explained [lift and buoyancy](#), rewritten Solid State (including [Drude](#) and [Anderson](#)), redefined [transport in plants](#), rewritten [core theory](#), and published literally hundreds of other equally important papers. They don't want you to know this one guy has now published 40 books worth of groundbreaking material in physics and chemistry, or that many of these papers were and are [outranking Wikipedia and the university sites](#), including Harvard, MIT, CalTech, Stanford, Princeton, and all the others. They don't want you to know that many [new experiments are confirming his](#) theories, and that the mainstream itself admits this—without of course mentioning his name.

But you can't ask AI about any of that, because the programmers haven't allowed AI to read my papers, as is clear. They have only fed into it these pathetic soundbite mainstream responses to a few of my titles, so that it can be used as another diversion and libel.