


[return to updates](#)

## New C-orbit Asteroids can only be explained by the Unified Field



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published May 17, 2011*

Asteroid 2010 SO16, [discovered in September of 2010](#) by Apostolos Christou and David Asher at the Armagh Observatory in Northern Ireland\*, follows the C-orbit above (AKA a Horseshoe Orbit), drawn in blue-green. Of course, by the gravity-only theory, this is impossible. To divert you from this rather obvious and glaring conclusion, the mathematicians at NASA and worldwide shunt you off into Lagrange point math. That is what the green L numbers are. They are trying to convince you that the gravity field can create these field potentials (white lines), so that this orbit looks plausible. I have already shown my readers how they fudge these Lagrange point equations [in a previous paper](#), but I can show you why it is impossible very quickly.

The basic equations of gravity were invented by Newton, of course, and they have never been overwritten. They have been updated with time differentials by Einstein, but Newton's equations stand beneath the field equations. Certainly neither Laplace, Lagrange, nor Einstein ever denied that gravity increases with decreasing distance. None of them falsified the inverse square law. It is still taught in all physics books, and it is bedrock to this day. That being so, all we have to do is look at the asteroid as it approaches the Earth, from either direction (point A or D). The distance between asteroid and Earth is diminishing with time, so the gravitational force between them must be increasing rapidly. The distance between Sun and asteroid is not yet changing at these points (it changes soon afterwards), so the force between Sun and asteroid is not changing. Therefore, we may ask what would make the asteroid make a 90° turn at this point in its motion. Even more to the point, what would make it turn

another 90° and move away from the Earth? We need a force or other mechanical cause here, not just math or field lines. Neither math nor field lines can turn an asteroid. The force of gravity, which is supposed to be beneath these field lines, defining them, cannot possibly cause the asteroid to turn around and move away. Gravity is a force of attraction, remember? And we have a diminishing distance here, which should cause a steady increase in attraction. By all the laws of gravity, the asteroid should crash into the Earth. It doesn't, so the gravity-only theory cannot be correct. And no amount of pushed equations can save the gravity-only theory, or convince us that gravity can *repel* an incoming asteroid.

As I often say, it is beyond belief that I have to be on this page saying this. It would be like a basketball critic needing to tell other professional basketball players that when you throw the ball, you should throw it at the basket instead of into the stands.

My charge field solves this problem in just as spectacular a fashion as the current theory fails to solve it. It solves it with the Unified Field. The second half of the Unified Field is the charge field, and the charge field is repulsive. Charge is just emitted photons, and they work by straight bombardment. Just as the solo gravity field increases with decreasing distance, so does the charge field. But the charge field increases even faster than the gravity field. Gravity increases its attraction by the square, but charge increases its repulsion by the quad. So the charge field is capable of bouncing out intruders, even while the gravity field is still working full strength.

How does it do this? It does it with simple mechanics. The nearer you get to the surface of a sphere, the denser the emitted charge field becomes. And this is due simply to the surface area equation. You have the same field in a smaller space, so the density rises.

This is not some wild hypothesis on my part. I have simply brought the charge field that is admitted to exist at the quantum level and applied it at the macro-level. A force cannot appear at the quantum level and disappear at the macro-level. Current physics tries to dodge this question by making charge at the quantum level virtual, but that is not physics. "Virtual" is the opposite of "physical", and both the math and the "physics" of virtuality should be outlawed. Furthermore, I have shown where this charge field fits into [Newton's equations](#), Coulomb's equation, and [the Lagrangian](#). I have not just cobbled together a theory, I have done all the math. You will say they have done the math, too; but my math and theory are mechanical at all points, theirs are not. My math and theory is also simpler and far more transparent, since I take the time to label all the variables and explain all the motions. They never do this.

Looking at the diagram above, any teenager can see the repulsion. The asteroid is being turned by a field. The E/M field of the Earth is excluding the asteroid. I will be asked why it excludes this asteroid, but doesn't exclude smaller bodies, like meteorites. Again, it is strictly a matter of E/M field interaction. This asteroid has a diameter of several hundred meters, so it has not only an appreciable cross section, it has an appreciable E/M field of its own. A high density may add to this field. A low incoming velocity also helps. The asteroid is traveling about 175 times *slower* than the Earth, as both objects move around the Sun. This means that as they approach, the velocity belongs almost entirely to the Earth. The Earth is moving about 29.78km/s, so the asteroid is moving only .17km/s. And the combined velocity is then 29.95km/s. This means that the Earth is moving at the asteroid only .0057 faster than it is moving at the Moon. We shouldn't be so surprised that the E/M field of the Earth could counter such a motion, since we see the Moon repelled more than that everyday. Meteorites pierce this field because they are smaller and are moving much much faster. Meteorites reach speeds of 100km/s, which is almost 600 times faster than this large asteroid.

[\\*http://earthsky.org/space/asteroid-2010-so16-is-following-earth-in-its-orbit-around-sun](http://earthsky.org/space/asteroid-2010-so16-is-following-earth-in-its-orbit-around-sun)

---

If this paper was useful to you in any way, please consider donating a dollar (or more) to the SAVE THE ARTISTS FOUNDATION. This will allow me to continue writing these "unpublishable" things. Don't be confused by paying Melisa Smith--that is just one of my many *noms de plume*. If you are a Paypal user, there is no fee; so it might be worth your while to become one. Otherwise they will rob us 33 cents for each transaction.

**Donate**

If this link to paypal doesn't work, please use the donate button on my homepage or updates page (see kitty).