return to updates

The Magnus Effect, Lift, and Charge

by Miles Mathis

First published May 16, 2018

A reader requested in the current party that I look at the Magnus Effect as it relates to my charge field. I agreed to do so, since it is an interesting topic I haven't hit. I am writing this as I chat with fans (and non-fans) over at *Cutting through the Fog*.

Although I think he thought the Magnus Effect had something to do with charge, I don't think it does (yet). Not in normal circumstances. The Magnus Effect is just a name for the force that causes a spinning ball to move sideways in a particulate field such as air or water. It is what allows for a curve ball in baseball or a bending soccer ball or topspin in tennis. What causes it is quite simple, and is fairly well understood by the mainstream. The ball is moving forward while spinning, which sets up a vortex behind the ball. A low pressure area, if you like. In this area, the spin causes air (say) to move in some direction. If the ball is spinning left on its front edge, for instance, it will be spinning right on the back edge, which will cause the air to move right back there. The air moving right causes a high pressure area to the right, which will force the ball to move left. It is just a matter of particle densities, you see.

Which is why I say it doesn't rely on charge. Since the ball itself is spinning, it doesn't require a spinning field. It just requires a field of real particles. So we don't need the air to be charged or magnetized. The air can be magnetically neutral and we would still have a Magnus Effect.

However, under normal circumstances the Magnus Effect wouldn't work in vacuum. The ball has to have something to spin against. We need some friction with the field, you see. I say under normal circumstances, because in rare cases you *could* see a Magnus Effect in vacuum. Say we create a vacuum. What does that mean? Well, for us it means an ion vacuum, not a charge vacuum. There is no such thing as a charge vacuum. When we create a vacuum, we get rid of all the ions in the field, so the charge has nothing to spin up. Normally, on Earth, this also gets rid of the E/M field, because the E/M field is an ion field. However, if we went close to the galactic core, for instance, where the charge fields were very dense, we might find or be able to create an ion vacuum where the charge field itself was dense enough to be our frictional field. In that case, the photons could turn our ball without the help of ions.

And that example tells us that if we make our ball small enough, less dense photons fields will be able to turn it, using the Magnus Effect. In that case, the charge field alone could turn the ball, with no ions present. Scientists have actually witnessed that, of course, since that is what is happening whenever subatomic particles like electrons are being turned by charge fields. In that case, the photons are the frictional field. The electrons aren't being turned by other ions, they are being turned by the photons themselves.

But why I am really here today is to point out something a bit more interesting and innovative. It is admitted that "the overall behavior [of the Magnus Effect] is similar to that around an aerofoil" [Wiki]. Which links us to my paper Lift on a Wing. There, I show that lift requires a rising charge field, emitted straight up by the Earth. But although the mainstream sees the analogy between lift and the Magnus Effect, it is not able to explain *why* the behavior is so similar. Nothing about the wing is spinning is it, and yet we can see that this must be a spin effect of some sort. Yes, a rotating cylinder at the front of a wing will add to lift, but planes fly very well without that. Why? Well, the wing doesn't need to spin *if the field itself is spinning*, right? Yes, the similarity between lift on a wing and the Magnus Effect is just more proof my theory of lift is correct. And it also gives us another source of lift I didn't see in my original paper. The charge field isn't just rising at the speed of c, it is also spinning at that rate. You will say its spin isn't coherent, so that won't help us. Photons would be just as likely to be spinning CW as CCW, right? NO! In fact, as I have shown in many previous papers, the local field here isn't balanced. Photons outnumber antiphotons about 2 to 1 in the vicinity of the Earth. That already gives us a large amount of coherence. However, it is even better than that, since the Earth also sorts photons from antiphotons. Due to the given potentials and vortices, the photons are sent to the south pole and the antiphotons are sent to the north pole. They then cycle through the Earth in defined streams, so at any given point on the Earth, there is actually a very high degree of coherence in the emitted field. This is what creates the known magnetic field at the surface of the Earth. And the faster you move through this field, the stronger it gets. This would greatly increase the lift from the rising charge field, and might even double it.

But if that is the mechanism, wouldn't lift fail or decrease in the southern hemisphere? If the photons are antiphotons down there, they have to be spinning the other way, which should interfere with lift, right? No, though I can see why the question is asked. If the photons or antiphotons were all rising *into the same field*, that would be the case, obviously. If the antiphotons were rising into an ambient field in the south with the same chirality as the ambient field in the north, then yes, we would expect a reversed reaction, and a loss of lift. But that isn't the case. The ambient field itself is different in the south, since it was created by previous antiphotons. For this reason, the antiphotons aren't coming up there and meeting a reversed field. So we should *not* expect a loss of lift. We should expect the same thing in the south as in the north.

Yes, we would expect to see some reverses, and we do. We see a reversed Coriolus effect, with drains spinning the other way. But drains in the south don't drain up, do they? For the same reason, we wouldn't expect to see a loss of lift.

Next I will be told that according to my theory, reversing direction in the field turns a photon into an antiphoton. If that is the case, then planes should only get lift in one direction. If you run the plane in the reverse direction down the runway, it should fail to achieve lift. Again, that looks somewhat clever at a glance, but it is also false. A plane is not a photon, and isn't spinning. So it won't act like a photon. It won't become an anti-plane when you reverse its direction in the field. Yes, if we reversed the direction of the photons, having them go down instead of up, we would kill the lift. But that was obvious from the start, even without spin.

Now, if we take this back to the Magnus Effect on sports balls, we *might* find an increased effect there as well. Yes, the Magnus Effect would work even in a neutral field, but the Earth's field is not neutral. We have just seen it is highly coherent. Therefore, it might add somewhat to the Magnus Effect even on large, relatively slow-moving spheres like sports balls. However, in this case, we would expect to find a reversed effect on a reversed bend. If the ambient field has chirality, it should be easier to bend a

ball left than right. Or, it *would*, except for one thing: **the bend is in the wrong plane**. Left/right here is orthogonal to the z-spin of the photons, so they can't effect the bend. Again, the photons are moving straight up, and are spinning left or right on their front edge. But that left/right isn't the same as the ball's left/right, is it? The photons are spinning in the z-plane, while the ball is spinning in the x-plane. Therefore, we would *not* expect a charge effect in most cases. I say in most cases, because sometimes the ball will be spinning in the z-plane. In the case of topspin in tennis, the ball *is* spinning in the z-plane, or in line with the motion and spin of the photons. So in that case we might predict a small increased effect due to charge.