# TIMESCAPE

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published May 10, 2025*

I see that astronomers are now noticing that the percentage of dark matter in the early universe wasn't the same as it is now. They are flummoxed by this, rushing to come up with wild and ridiculous explanations for it—see Timescape cosmology, which uses variable time to explain it. But since they don't know what dark matter is to start with, and have no unified field, it is not surprising they have no rational explanation here, and feel compelled to divert into the usual time dilation garbage—using Einstein to fudge a very ugly answer while at the same time claiming the new findings prove Einstein wrong. Contradictory, isn't it? Einstein was wrong about everything but this Hollywood use of time dilation, I guess.

But since my readers know dark matter is just charge, they see the simple answer immediately. Charge is real photons, and matter is spun-up charge, so you need charge to create matter. Therefore, the more matter you have, the less charge. So if we go back in time, you will find more charge and *less* matter. And if you go back far enough, you find everything was charge.

In the beginning the universe was light and nothing else. But if we propose the universe wasn't perfectly homogeneous, it will develop density variations and those variations will tend to increase locally. At some point you will get enough density for non-trivial photon collisions, and they will spin one another up. But if we have a spin speed limit at c, at some point the photon will not be able to stack on any more speed in that rotation, and the only way it can continue is to spin on a higher level: end-over-end instead of axial. That process continues until the photon spin radius gets so large it can no longer maintain a linear velocity of c. It is simply too big and suffers too many collisions, so it slows down, becoming an lepton. The lepton stacks on another spin and becomes a meson, then a baryon, and so on. The baryon is very stable, for reasons I give elsewhere, so you tend to get a lot of them, and then the baryon and lepton start recycling charge, allowing for the building of larger structures.

What mainstream physicists and astronomers don't understand is that although the early universe had fewer galaxies and less structure, it actually had more charge, since less charge had coalesced into matter. So although those early galaxies had less large-scale structure, they actually MORE small-scale structure, meaning stronger charge linkages at the atomic and stellar level. Once that is taken into account, the data starts to make sense. Those big early galaxies aren't like big galaxies now, since they were less dense as regards matter. But being MORE dense as regards charge, they held together just as well. Therefore, we shouldn't be surprised to see large early galaxies, since size isn't a function of cosmic age. It is a function of how rich that local area was from the start.

What I mean by "at the stellar level" there is that even the stars were different then, having less matter and more charge. But since I have shown how charge has a mass equivalence, it doesn't mean the stars were less massive or less bright. It just means the percentages were different. Would such a star be more bright or less bright than a modern star? Probably more bright, since charge is photons and photons is what we see.

At minute 1:33 in this video we hear the astronomer lady on the panel with Neil Degrasse Tyson (I don't know who she is) say

**We live in one universe right and these numbers are not matching, they should match. It could be that there is something missing in our model—the standard model that has the dark energy and dark matter that we have been talking about—and that there is another physical something that we have not yet discovered and this might point to that.**

Except that "we" have discovered it, you just aren't listening to me, lady. If you could get your head out of your mainstream cocoon you would know I solved this almost two decades ago. That something you are missing is the real charge field: Maxwell's D field, which has been sitting physically unassigned in your equations for over a century and a half. You forget to give it any real presence in the field, or any mass equivalence, so you don't realize dark matter is just charge. Charge has always been 95% of the energy field, but mainstream equations were so garbled from the beginning no one saw that until I came along and unwound it for them. Physics and astronomy has been existing since the time of Newton and Galileo without the largest player in the field. It was buried in Newton's G, in Coulomb's k, in Maxwell's D, and in the misdefined Lagrangian, and I have dug it out at last, brushed it off, and given it to you on a silver platter.