

[return to updates](#)

# Mystic Symbolism

*and the Charge Field*



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published March 18, 2013*

[**Added April 22, 2024:** My readers have alerted me to yet another project apparently being run against me, which is why I have toplisted this paper this week. Actor Terrence Howard is now being sold (at Youtube and elsewhere) as some sort of amateur physicist, promoting a theory of the flower of life and various other things. As you see, this paper came out eleven years ago, but Howard is not mentioning me or it, of course. Instead he is acting as a parallel, hitting some of my talking points but then spinning them off. I watched the first half of the video and he doesn't mention the nucleus, charge, or photons. He doesn't hit anything solid, just claiming he has solved a 6000-year-old problem but then giving us nothing. The only thing of substance he says is that there are no straight lines, but that idea has been around since the 1820s, see Riemann, Bolyai, Lobachevsky, Gauss, etc. I think my readers are right, since with a bit more research I discovered Howard is very unpopular right now, both in Hollywood and out of it, so if you wanted to blackwash a subject you could hardly find a better person to do it. He also seems to go out of his way to look ridiculous in the video, wearing some strange wig. Many have commented on it. It is like he has been paid to undercut himself, and through him, me. I think this will backfire on them, as usual, since the mud is failing to stick. My readers are using this opportunity to send his audience to me for the real thing, so my numbers will just continue to rise. I guess I should send Hollywood and Langley a thank you card.]

I normally stay away from topics in mysticism, since although I am interested in almost everything, it

is never the mystical qualities that interest me. You may remember that in my papers on the [Golden Ratio](#), I said I had no interest in the topic as numerology. Until I had something scientific to say, I was not going to say anything. In other words, I wanted a sensible and mechanical explanation, and until I had it I wasn't going to publish anything. It is easy to dabble in mysticism, and a lot of people do. It is easy to make squishy links between various things, and a lot of people do. But that doesn't interest me. I want to know how things work, and squishy answers just leave me with an empty feeling.


So until recently, I had nothing much to say on hexagrams, mandalas, or the flower of life. I have never had anything against them, and I find them as intriguing as most people. But since the given explanations all seemed rather flighty, I had no interest in repeating them or expanding on them. And since I had no better explanation, I had no reason to publish anything. But now I do. My charge field has allowed me to explain many things in physics sensibly, and it also allows me to explain many things in “metaphysics” or the paranormal sensibly. Besides my papers on *phi*, my readers have also seen this in my recent paper on “[Sheldrake and the Skeptics](#)”, where I proposed charge as the real field mediating various unexplained phenomena. Here I will show the (probable) mechanical cause of several well-known mystical diagrams.

We will start with the flower of life.




Thanks to Tariq Sabur for this lovely image

That is the larger version, but it is made up of a basic flower like this:




thanks to Robert Rawson for that beautiful tile mosaic

As you see, it is simply a flower with six petals, with each leaf opposite another. It doesn't seem very provocative at first, perhaps, but it has been around for thousands of years and has some intriguing mathematical and design properties. We see some of these in the larger figure, which was found in the notebooks of Leonardo, among other places:



The circles and leaves can be made to intertwine, creating a perfect fractal. A similar figure—both mathematically and as a matter of design—is the hexagram.




Some will link this to Judaism, David, or Solomon, but the hexagram predates even the Old Testament, and it can be found in mandalas in India that have nothing to do with Judaism.




That second figure represents the heart chakra anahata. Again, we have the six points opposite one another, inside a circle. The only difference is that here we have an angular or geometrical representation rather than a petalled representation as in the flower of life. Since I am not Jewish, Hindu, Wiccan or Satanist, these figures never meant much to me. . . that is until I compared them to my diagram of the nucleus:

*Mercury*



If we study the configuration of the fourth nuclear level (represented here by the red disks), we find a match. I call the vertical disks the axial level of the nucleus, and the four red disks in the middle are the carousel level—since they rotate like a carousel around the axis. The flower of life is clearly a 2D representation of the outer level of this 3D structure, and once you see this you understand that the hexagram is as well. We can also see this from Max Born's model of the 4f atomic shell, which I have previously shown matches my nuclear model.



You can see my carousel level very clearly there, with the four central petals extending out from the middle. The other two petals going up and down match my axial level.

Also curious is that I chose to draw my protons as disks, to represent their planar emission of charge. I was modeling not the body of the proton, but its charge field, you see. Then, to make these disks easier to diagram in 2D, I compressed them, so that we are looking at them from an angle. This made them look very much like the petals in the flower of life. If we round the corners of the petals in the flower of life, we have a perfect match.

I say this is curious because when I was creating my nuclear diagrams, I had none of this in mind. Not only was I not trying to match Born's 4f diagram, I was not trying to match any mystical diagrams, either. I was following mechanical hunches based only on charge recycling, and all of these diagram matches are coincidental and after-the-fact. In both cases, it required my readers sending me emails and telling me I was “accidentally” matching these things.

I think we can now see that the matches, though unintended, were not accidental. My nuclear diagram ended up looking a lot like the flower of life and the hexagram because both these ancient figures are likely to be pointers to a natural structure than runs all the way down to the atomic nucleus. While it is doubtful (in my mind) that most artists and scientists of the last few thousand years understood the connection to the nucleus here, they certainly understood that this configuration was a real quality of Nature, percolating up from somewhere, in some way. Most saw this configuration as mystical, which means they admitted they didn't know precisely where it was coming from. Leonardo, for example, was both a mystic and a scientist. He knew as much about both as anyone in his time. But as far as I know he never connected these figures to the structure of an atomic nucleus.

This doesn't rule out the possibility that more modern mystical knowledge is a leftover from older scientific knowledge, and that some culture in the distant past understood the structure of the nucleus. But since I have nothing concrete to say about that, I will leave it to others to pursue.

However that may be, I think it is clear that we are seeing a connection between these mystical figures and the structure of the atomic nucleus. Since the structure of the atomic nucleus is determined by its recycling of charge, this must link these old figures to the charge field. It is patterns in the charge field that are directly creating larger patterns in Nature.


For those who haven't read my other papers on the charge field, when I say the nucleus is recycling charge, I mean that real particles of light are being channeling through the nucleus, by definite configurations of protons. These particles of light, called photons, make up the charge field. Although these photons are real—with a real radius and mass—each photon is around 6 billion times smaller than the proton. These tiny particles of light are not visible, since most of them are infrared—they are beneath the visible part of the spectrum, and we normally call them heat. But they carry real energy, both with their linear motion at  $c$  and with their spins. The larger proton (and neutron) can recycle them due to their tiny size. You may think of the larger particles as engines and the smaller particles as a sort of gas. Although the protons don't “burn” the little light particles, they do use their energy to maintain local spin. The larger proton is also spinning, and this spin along with the spherical shape of the proton creates field potentials in the regions outside the proton. These potentials draw photons in the proton's poles. The proton then re-emits these photons most heavily at its equator. This recycling creates channels through the nucleus, and the little photons must move in certain streams through and between the protons and neutrons. The existence of these streams explains why the charge doesn't blow apart the nucleus. This allows us to get rid of the strong force, a force proposed by physicists a few decades ago to explain why charge didn't cause protons to repel one another, making the nucleus unstable. With charge channeling, we no longer need the strong force.

Although we have found a match between my nuclear diagrams and these old mystical configurations, we do find some differences, and I will point out the greatest of these very briefly. The most obvious difference is found by noticing that my nucleus is always taller than it is wide, so my six petals never reside in a perfect sphere. My nucleus has a 7 to 5 ratio axis to carousel, which skews Nature to the oval somewhat. I have already shown that [we have confirmation](#) of this from nuclear experiments, so it

is not just a hypothesis. When we look at the hexa-aquacopper(II) ion, for instance, the mainstream explains its peculiar properties using degenerate orbitals and the Jahn-Teller effect. But I have shown it is a simple outcome of the 7 to 5 ratio of the nucleus itself.

We also find a divergence from the perfect field when we look at the local charge field of the Earth. We could only get our hexagram or flower of life inhabiting a perfect circle if the local charge field were perfectly balanced. But the charge field here is not balanced, as we know from many phenomena including beta decay. This is the cause of asymmetry in all sorts of quantum interactions, and it must cause asymmetry in the mystical diagrams as well. Since these diagrams are representations of charge recycling, we have to look at how protons and the nucleus actually recycle charge. As I have shown, the charge comes in at the poles, but even that has to be studied more closely. It turns out that charge itself is polar, and we can have both photons and antiphotons. Antiphotons are simply spinning the opposite way to photons, and all fields can have both spins. A field can either be balanced, in which case it has the same number of photons and antiphotons. Or it can be imbalanced, having more of one or the other. On the Earth, our distance from the Sun causes us to have about twice as many photons as antiphotons, and [we know this from experiment](#). Since we have more spins of one type than the other, the spins don't cancel and we have a field with a residual spin, which we call magnetism.

Basically, this means more charge is going in the south pole of our proton or nucleus than is going in the north pole. So if we are drawing our nucleus as a hexagram, we have to make our lower triangle twice as large as our upper. Like this:



Now, we could draw that with the blue triangle inside the red one, or in several other ways, but it doesn't really matter. Since it is a 2D representation of a 3D field, it is skewed from the start. To match the carousel level of the nucleus, the two triangles should be 90 degrees to one another. And even that would only be an approximation, since I have found no evidence that only two of the carousel level positions are fed by the south pole and two by the north. The ancient diagrams, though intriguing, and though roughly correct, leave out several variations that we will find are crucial to understanding how the charge field, and thereby Nature, works. The hexagram and the flower of life are approximations and simplifications of the the atomic nucleus, showing us the six-fold nature of the

emitted charge field. But they do not tell us everything we need to know about the nuclear structure.