

[return to updates](#)

80% of Light Missing?

No, just more proof of my charge field



by Miles Mathis

First published July 10, 2014

[The worldwide press today reported](#) that 80% of the light in the universe appears to be missing. This was from a press release from physicists studying data from the Hubble telescope, first reported in *Astrophysical Journal Letters*. As usual, the method of reporting this in the mainstream was confused and garbled, since the light is not missing at all. Or, it is not missing from the universe, it is missing only from the equations and the computer models. The physicists had predicted x amount of light and data was telling them 5x.

Although the various data sets aren't ever compiled for you in these mainstream articles, we saw [very similar math and data](#) just a little over a year ago from the International Space Station's Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer. In those reports, we were told 80% of the matter in the universe was missing. Do you think it is a coincidence that the number in both articles was 80%? The mainstream physicists would have to tell you it *is* just a coincidence, since one is a light deficit and one is a mass deficit. In their equations, light has no mass. Light may have a mass equivalence due to energy, but they don't think this mass acts gravitationally. Therefore they have no way to link up these two deficit problems.

But both sets of data are straight confirmation of my charge field and of my theory of the past decade. I have shown the mainstream how and where they are misreading their own equations. That's right. I haven't even had to write my own equations in many cases, since their equations are often correct. All I have to do is circle something in one of their own longstanding equations, reminding them what it has always meant. For instance, in this problem, I did that with this pair of equations:

$$e = 1.602 \times 10^{-19} \text{ C}$$

$$C = 2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ kg/s (see definition of Ampere to find this number in the mainstream)}$$

Those are mainstream equations that have been around for decades. C stands for Coulomb. If we

combine them, we get this equation:

$$e = 3.204 \times 10^{-26} \text{ kg/s}$$

That tells us that the charged proton is recycling that amount of charge every second, which is 19 times its own mass. So combining those two equations allowed me to weigh the charge field. Obviously, it weighs a lot more than we thought.

Furthermore, my theory shows us why charge *can* act gravitationally. Currently, it is thought that only nucleons or collections of nucleons could act gravitationally. By the reading of the current equations, gravity is thought to be negligible at the quantum level, so the mass equivalence of photons was never included in the mass of the universe. However, if nucleons are actually recycling photons through their bodies as charge, then those photons will be *inside* the nucleons for some real amount of time. If they are inside the nucleons, then they are inside whatever we are calling ponderable or massive, so they *would* act gravitationally. In this way, we see that a charged body is actually more massive than an uncharged body, due to the real photons moving through that body.

It has been clear to my readers how that solves [the dark matter problem](#) neatly and completely. But it also solves this light problem, since the same equations that are failing to predict the amount of mass are also failing to predict the amount of light. If you read these mainstream articles, you see they trying to assign this missing light to ultraviolet; but they should be assigning it to infrared, which is charge. Why are they making that mistake? Well, those who have read my papers will know why: more bad mainstream equations and assumptions. [I have shown](#) the way they assign wavelength to light is actually upside-down. The current method gets the energy of light correct, but reverses the frequency and wavelength. This is because the current wavelength variable is assigned to the wrong thing. It should be assigned to the radius of the photon scaled up by c^2 , but it is actually assigned to the length of a sine wave manufactured in the data. If we make that simple correction, the wavelength of charge photons then appears to be in the band that we now call ultraviolet, with a length of about 250nm.

So once again we have proof the extra 80% of light they are seeing is actually charge. It wasn't in their equations or computer models only because they have never included charge as either light or mass. This makes both their light and mass equations fail by that amount.

But why 80%? Shouldn't we be seeing a failure of 95%, as in the dark matter problem? Well, you have to remember that they have a whole raft of bad equations they can go to in order to try to solve these problems. Just as with this light deficit, we have seen an array of deficits claimed in the dark matter problem, from 80 to 95%, and even less. But if you study the way they try to fit their equations to data, you see that it really depends on what data they are trying to fit. If they are calculating a universal deficit they get a different number than if they are calculating a galactic deficit, and that is because the hole in their data is different. With the universe, they have a 95% hole, but with something like the galactic rotation problem, they only find an 80% hole. So they push their equations to match the data at hand.

The reason we find around 80% in both these recent problems is that they are seeing a hole in the near field, not the universal field. In the galactic rotation problem, the hole is limited to our own galaxy; and in this new light deficit problem, the hole is again in the galactic field. They are studying hydrogen tendrils, and the good data from these tendrils is fairly nearby, on the galactic scale, not the universal scale. Since we have more matter in galaxies than out of them, we would expect the percentage of matter to be higher there. If that is true, then charge in galaxies must be less, as a fraction of the

whole.

We can even use these numbers to quickly calculate how much of the universe must be filled by galaxies. If galaxies are 20% matter and the universe is 5% matter, then 25% of the universe must be filled by galactic-like concentrations of matter.

The last major question I need to answer is this: “How can you get the *universal* ratio of matter to charge just by looking at *local* current and the fundamental charge? Some have said your math must be a coincidence, and if we look closely at this, we seem to have confirmation of that. Even if we accept your idea of charge channeling by nucleons, there doesn't seem to be any reason local rates of charge recycling would tell us the universal average.”

Those who think this is a coincidence just aren't looking closely enough. Unable to see how it would work at a glance, they give up and call it a coincidence. But it isn't. First of all, the fundamental charge is not a local number. It isn't the local rate of anything. It is a universal, and would apply anywhere you went in the universe. Second, the equation for the Coulomb is also not telling us a local current or charge flow. That equation is simply telling us a *relationship* between three of our chosen dimensions: Coulomb, kilogram, and second. It is a dimensional analysis, or dimensional equivalence. So it too would apply universally.

The reason the fundamental charge e by itself tells us the universal relationship of matter to charge is that it is the relationship of matter to charge that determines e . In other words, the proton recycles the amount of charge it does because the proton is *created* by the charge field. [I have shown you](#) that the proton is a spun-up photon in a field of photons, so all the proton's characteristics must be fully determined by the charge field. Beyond that, protons aren't created in local fields. You can't create a proton just anywhere. Protons aren't even created in stars. My assumption is they are created in galactic cores, where they are spun up from photons. If that is true, it would explain directly why the ratio of charge to matter is set where it is. It must be the universal charge density that determines the density of galaxies and the density *within* galaxies, and that density then determines how protons are created in galactic cores. Since all these densities are functions of one another, the fundamental charge can't help but tell us the universal ratio of charge to matter.

Look at it this way: say the proton could recycle *more* than 95% its own mass in charge. That would mean that matter had been created by the charge field that could recycle more charge than is ever in the field. In that way, Nature would have created an engine that was more efficient than it ever needed to be. Why would She do that? More to the point, *how* could She do that? To say it another way, how could a field create a particle that was more powerful than itself, as a matter of density or efficiency? By the law of conservation of energy, it couldn't. No field can generate more power out than it puts in. If no charge field would ever be going *in* a nucleon at over 95%, that nucleon could not possibly emit a charge field at over 95%. Therefore, the maximum recycling of the proton must tell you the maximum relative density of the charge field. And that maximum relative density will also tell you the universal average, since both numbers are the limit as we approach 100% of the field.

Now that you see what is going on here, you should be astonished that mainstream physicists continue to miss the obvious, and that they continue to ignore my straightforward answers. I have been telling them that their dark matter is just light, and here they have data confirming that in the most direct manner imaginable. Their light deficit matches their matter deficit, but they refuse to connect the two data sets. In the mainstream reports, they are telling us this light deficit indicates an exotic new source of light.

To be fair, some have seen the connection, and they are now proposing that the missing light comes from decaying dark matter. But I hope you can see that is almost as pathetic. The light isn't from decaying dark matter, it *is* dark matter. **This is the light they have left out of their mass equations!**