

[return to updates](#)

# NASA'S SPACE CATERPILLAR



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published August 31, 2013*

That is an image from the Hubble Space Telescope of a gas and dust stream in Cygnus OB2 said to be nineteen lightyears long. [NASA tells us](#) it is caused by “wind” from a collection of large stars nearby. This wind is blowing away part of the contents of a large star still in formative stages.

That's a nice illustration, but none of this makes any sense. Here's some questions someone should be asking current theorists. To start with, the proposal that what we are seeing is blown-off dust from dust that is collapsing into a star is a non-starter. It is spectacularly illogical. According to the current theory of star formation, you start with a dense nebula that has 100 particles per cubic centimeter and a temperature of 10K. Just to be clear, that is 10 degrees above absolute zero, or -263 degrees centigrade, and those “particles” are Hydrogen molecules, which have a width of something like  $10^{-10}$  meters. A hundred of those particles would therefore have a width of about  $10^{-8}$  meters. That means you could fit about a million on a line 1cm long, or a trillion in a square centimeter, or  $10^{18}$  in a cubic centimeter. That gives you a particle density of 1 part per million trillion (one quintillion). That is what they are calling a “dense nebula”.

That was bad enough, but real data from Herschel Infrared Telescope proved that areas previously assigned to star formation were actually even emptier than this. Orionis V380, for instance, had been called a dark nebula, and was assumed to contain some “dense nebula”, as above. But it turned out that this area, like others, was as empty as space can get, with no measurable temperature or density. So the terrible theory of star formation was disproved at the ground level. Of course that hasn't led to any change in theory, and astronomers admit the crushing data from Herschel while still teaching gravitational collapse of stars in zero density, zero temperature areas of space.

The way this impacts the current problem is that in the case you wished to save the old theory, you

would place your star formation in some relatively stable environment, where symmetrical collapse was at least a possibility. Remember, stars are spherical, so if they are collapsing, they need to collapse around a point and they need to collapse symmetrically. You can't collapse a star from a caterpillar, for the obvious reason that a caterpillar has no symmetrical center.

To say it in another way, about the least likely place for a star to set up and then collapse about a center is in a high wind of any kind. And yet this is the theory here. They tell us this protostar is BOTH gaining density and setting up around a center, AND being blown away by powerful winds from many nearby gigantic stars. Illogical from the first word.

So this tail we are seeing can't be from a protostar. It must be residue from an explosion or remnants of a collision or material ejected from some *unsymmetrical* event.

An even bigger problem is this wind. There is no wind in space of this sort in current theory, and *can't be* because there is no possible cause of it. It would have to be an analogue to the Solar Wind: that is, ionic emission caused by fusion. However, star winds like this are strong only near the star. They dissipate pretty quickly due to spherical emission, and we know that from the Solar Wind. And yet this wind they are proposing is orders of magnitude stronger and farther away from the stars they say are causing it. Even if we accept that these stars are O-class, they can't be creating such winds 15 lightyears away. The Sun's wind peters out at about 230AU, which is about .0036ly. O-type stars are said to have about 6 Solar radii, or 16 Solar masses, and are about 6 times hotter. But we are being told they create wind around 100,000 times more powerful. The Solar Wind can't even blow the rings of Saturn away, and Saturn is only 9.5 AU or .00015ly away.

I will be told the winds from these many O-class stars are additive, but that is again illogical. Star winds would have to be emitted spherically, which means these star winds wouldn't add, in most cases they would subtract. Unless all the big stars are equidistant from the caterpillar head, nearer stars will interfere with wind from further stars. And even in the case they all happened to be on the same side and equidistant, they *still* wouldn't add. At a distance of 15ly, they would all have dissipated so much by spherical emission that they would add only in a long line perpendicular to the caterpillar. At the actual position of the caterpillar head, they wouldn't add much at all. This is just basic geometry and sums, and it is amazing they think they can pass this by us. Even more amazing is that they *have* passed it by everyone in physics and astronomy for decades.

Another problem is that we are told that 65 O-class stars and 500 B-class stars are blowing on this caterpillar. However, we are taught there are only about 20,000 O-class stars in the entire galaxy. Since the Milky Way is at least 100,000ly across and 1,000ly wide, the odds of finding 65 O-class stars within 15ly of this caterpillar's head is about 1 in 800,000,000. If we add the odds of finding 500 B-class stars in the same vicinity, we just about square those odds, taking us near  $10^{18}$  again.

But the greatest problem of all is the even greater hole beneath this proposed wind. Remember, they have never bothered to tell you why or how fusion creates the Solar Wind. Why would fusion eject an entire wind of ions, both positive and negative, out from the Sun? They assure us it isn't an E/M effect, since they have shouted down the Electrical Universe guys, who propose just that. In other words, it isn't caused by electrical potentials between the Sun and extra-Solar space. So you are expected to believe it is some sort of explosion at  $c$ , emanating from all fusing points in the Sun. But there is no reason fusion would do that. Yes, fusion would create a release of energy, but since fusion is said to take place in the Solar interior, the Sun itself should soak up and block that energy. The Sun's own heat is said to be caused by this fusion, so the energy must be contained, for the most part. Any energy

released to drive the Solar Wind can't also cause local heat, more fusion, emitted heat, luminosity, and so on. As it is, they have the same energy from fusion driving multiple events, and their equations don't come close to adding up.

I will be told that they include the Solar Wind in their math, but they only include the lost mass of the ions. They don't include the energy required to eject the wind in the first place. It's a double energy loss, you see. The Sun loses the energy equivalence of all that mass, but it also loses the energy needed to eject all that mass at high velocity. Energy used to eject the Solar Wind can't also be used to drive fusion in the next round. It is not only the mass that escapes, it is all the kinetic energy of that mass.

And of course they don't include the mass of the photons ejected in the luminosity equations, either, since they think those photons have no mass. Just as with the Solar Wind, the ejected photons are a double energy loss. The Sun loses the energy of the photons, but it also loses energy required to eject them. You will say that since photons are already going  $c$ , the Sun doesn't have to "eject" them. No acceleration is going on, therefore there is no ejection energy. However, that is to ignore the mainstream's own explanation of light production. According to current theory, light has to be the result of a quantum jump, and it requires energy to cause that jump. A photon is said to be the energy differential between one electron orbital and another, so star luminosity is not just pre-existing photons escaping the star. Those photons have to be created by orbital changes, so the star should have to burn energy to create them. According to mainstream theory, when the Sun emits a photon it loses the energy of the photon, *and* it must also lose the energy it burned to create the photon.

We see the same thing with our caterpillar, which is driven by a wind from nowhere. This ionic wind is supposed to be powerful enough to blow dust off a nebula at 15ly, but it is supposed to be coming from stars already emitting a luminosity of 30,000 Suns, maintaining a local temperature of 30,000K, and fusing at least into Period 4. By the "mechanisms" of current theory, that isn't possible. Only by ignoring all the double energy losses in their field equations can theorists even begin to propose such things.

---

---

So what is the answer here? Charge. NASA's caterpillar couldn't be clearer proof of charge. We have seen that the Solar Wind itself proves charge, but the Solar Wind is so close to home most physicists and astronomers have trouble looking at it without being blinded by hometown propaganda. But when they look at this caterpillar, they should see charge immediately. They know charge exists in the problem. They know that at the quantum level, all electromagnetic effects are ultimately the result of charge potentials. Since these distant objects are composed of nuclei and electrons, the field has to be driven by charge at the ground level. But somehow when it comes time to explain these larger motions, both physicists and astronomers forget they have charge to work with. They try to solve all these astronomy problems using gravity only, or gravity plus fusion.

To see how the charge field helps, let's return to the Sun. If we understand how charge drives the Solar Wind, we will understand how charge creates the tail of NASA's caterpillar. Although there is no naïve voltage differential in space, nor any cathode or anode, the Sun *is* using charge to create the Solar Wind. To see this, you just have to remember that charge is different than E/M. E/M is moving ions, charge is moving photons. Charge doesn't require any moving ions, and we know that from the quantum level. Charge causes ionization, not the reverse. Since charge causes ionization, charge cannot be caused by moving ions. In current theory, charge isn't *caused* by anything: it simply exists. In my theory, charge is caused by moving photons, and the photons drive the ions.

This solves many problems because it allows us to see that the Sun is not an anode or cathode so much as he is like a neuron in a series. He gets charge from the galactic core, either directly or through a series of star linkages. This means there is no need for a local circuit. The circuit is a galactic circuit, and the Sun is only one link in it. Physically, the Sun acts as a link by spherical spin. The spin on the sphere naturally creates field potentials which draw charge into the poles and out the Solar equator (or, more rigorously, from maxima at 30 N and S). So this spin creates a wind with or without fusion. The Sun was set spinning by galactic charge channels long before he ever started fusing, and the incoming charge wind was the cause of all later events and local fields.

As this charge channels through the body of the Sun, it ionizes nuclei it comes in contact with, and some of these nuclei and electrons will be knocked out of the plasma, joining the charge stream out. This is all the Solar Wind is. This is why the Solar Wind is predominantly in the Solar Equator. The channels out at 30 N and S are oppositely charged (photons and antiphotons), so they will attract one another like Birkeland currents, rejoining at some distance from the Sun and pulling both back to the equatorial plane.

Now, if we apply this pretty simple mechanics to NASA's caterpillar, we find an easy answer to that as well. Since all large-scale galactic winds are charge winds, we don't have to use gravity or fusion math to scale up to the energies required. We use charge channels instead, and look back to the galactic core to explain the local strength. Select lines in the galaxy will have stronger charge channels simply due to galactic structure. The core emits more energy on some lines than others, and matter follows that charge. So our caterpillar is ultimately a sort of wind sock, pointing back in some way to the galactic core. That is to say, we would expect the head of our caterpillar to be pointing toward the galactic core, back along greater charge field lines.

As further indication of this, notice the smaller caterpillar at the bottom of the image above. Its tail is in the same direction. This can't be a coincidence. Are we to believe that a group of big stars also just happen to set up to the right of this caterpillar? No. Clearly, this entire region of the galaxy is in a main line of charge from the galactic core, and the galactic charge is blowing right to left across the entire image. Of course this means that any star groupings aren't causing the wind. They are *in* the wind, and their grouping was caused by the wind.

As usual, the mainstream has cause and effect reversed. Stars don't cause winds, they simply reside in pre-existing wind paths. They are where they are *because* the wind is there. Matter is drawn to charge channels by straight potentials—or statistics if you like. Just as wind in the atmosphere draws material into it, any particulate wind will draw matter into it. Since photons are very small particles, the charge field acts exactly like wind. Charge *is* photon wind.