

[return to updates](#)

EVO'S AND THE CHARGE FIELD



by Miles Mathis

First published April 18, 2014

I am often told by critics that there is no evidence of my charge field. I have been told that I am, like the mainstream, guilty of reification. That is, making ideas into real objects. But that isn't what I do. I am not a reifier, I am a modeler. In modeling, a modeler doesn't claim that the model *is* the reality. He only claims that the model is an attempt at depicting reality. No model is perfect, but a better model gets closer to reality. All my models are undoubtedly wrong in details, and they may be wrong in fundamental ways. My only claim is that they are better than previous models. They allow us to understand more than we have understood before, and this because we can better see what is—or may be—going on in specific reactions. Though my models may be flawed, they are transparent and therefore easily correctable. Because they are clear and visual, the flaws will become apparent and can be fixed. You certainly can't say this of previous mathematical and heuristic models, which are just short of incomprehensible.

When critics claim there is no evidence for my charge field, I just chuckle. I have compiled thousands of pages of evidence of it, most often using the mainstream's own data. In my mind, to miss seeing the charge field, the mainstream has had to look away at just the right moment millions of times for a couple of centuries. Now that the charge field has become dark matter, a monster of colossal proportions, so gigantic he has swallowed 95% of the known universe, this blindness is no longer really credible. I now begin to suspect the mainstream is looking away from the obvious answer on purpose, upon orders from above.

But however that may be, I have just uncovered another huge pile of glaring evidence of my charge field from the researcher Ken Shoulders. Actually, one of my readers [thanks to Joe Hyde] uncovered it for my benefit, and sent me the links. I say “*my* charge field” instead of “*the* charge field”, because the charge field in the data we will look at acts very much like my charge field and nothing at all like the mainstream's charge field. The mainstream's charge field is so poorly defined and so misdefined, that in all data like this they only see mystery. They never see the charge field.

That is my answer to those critics who have written me telling me the standard model is well aware of the charge field. No, they are well aware of a puny little beast they *call* the charge field, but they aren't aware of my charge field, or the real charge field. If they were, they wouldn't be sitting around with

their hands in their shorts, trying to figure out what dark matter is. They wouldn't be stumped by so-called vacuum energy and symmetry breaking and the strong force and unification and literally a million other things.

Ken Shoulders died recently, but his research was both long and well respected. Even Wikipedia fails to slander him in any way. They admit he was the “father of vacuum micro-electronics.” He was also a pioneer of electron beam lithography, and he patented many useful detection devices. He had been working on EVO radiation since the 1980's.

EVO's are exotic vacuum objects thought to be collections of electrons. However, [in this short introductory paper](#), Shoulders admits they can't be only that:

When calculations are done to see what the energy balance is to produce the impact mark, using input measured electron number and velocity, it is clear that the effects seen are not tractable due to inertia. Ballistic laws are strictly not followed and are off by a factor of thousands. As an example, an entity traveling at 0.1c, composed of about 10^{12} electrons, accelerates a slug of mass 50 material, measuring 20 micrometers in diameter by 100 micrometers long, to a mean velocity of about 10^7 centimeters per second. Indications are that a very high force is available due to motion of the entity and that this force is directly indicated by this measurement technique. . . . This entity is thus more forceful than any condensed material can withstand and it is controlled by a minute amount of input power.

Since electrons can't do that even with their known charge fields, this looks like a big mystery. This is why Shoulders' research has been used as proof of the zero-point energy field and other exotic fields. But Shoulders never went there himself. He was satisfied with reporting data only.

But with my charge field, you don't need any exotic fields to explain this data. The reason the electron's charge field didn't seem adequate to explain this data was that the charge field was misdefined and misunderstood. The mainstream tells you that electrons and protons are charged, but they aren't. They are in a field that is charged. The particles are not charged, they are simply driven by a charged field. Electrons don't charge the field around them, the field around them charges the electrons. The electron and proton are nothing but buoys in this field, telling us local energy levels. The cause of the energy is the stream of charge photons, which always manages to remain invisible to these researchers. It would be quite simple to switch devices, measuring photons instead of electrons, but somehow that never occurs to anyone in this experiments. It never occurs to them to bring in other machines (which they do have now) to try to measure the photon field fluxes at and around the target. They have been so in love with the electron for so many decades, they cannot dance with another partner.

Actually, the machines they have here *are* measuring the photon fields quite well, but these researchers and theorists are blind to the data. Even the field numbers are direct confirmation of the charge field, but since they have the wrong equations, they don't see that either. I have tweaked their own equations, giving them back in a form which allows them to solve these things, but no one has accepted my gift.

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

$$1\text{C} = 2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ kg/s (see definition of Ampere to find this number in the mainstream)}$$

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

That's 19 proton masses per second, and that is just the ambient charge field. In an induced field, the charge densities may be even greater, which easily explains the huge energies in Shoulders' data.

The way these energies act also points directly at the charge field:

As a second point of verification of this enormous force, along with another peculiar property of material entrainment, is the way a simple electrical impedance mismatch can reverse the direction of travel for the entity along with the entire load of material it is carrying. This happens when the entity of a particular energy or type creates a hole in a target boring material, such as SiC, backed with a metal foil that is, in turn, spaced from another anode material. This mismatch produces an intense, point flash of light, having a diameter of about 5 micrometers, resulting from the reversal of the entity with its load, followed by high velocity ejection of the load material in the opposite direction originally traveled by the ensemble. Not only is the force of the entity high in the forward or original direction it was launched but also it almost instantly reverses direction and applies the force in the opposite direction—all under electrical control afforded by the local structure instead of external dictates.

That description of the data has *charge field* written all over it. The electron is obviously in a stream composed of something else, since that stream reverses in ways the electron couldn't on its own. It is this stream that all of Shoulders' machines are measuring, not the electrons in it. A stronger field of charge photons is moving in this experiment, simply carrying the electrons along with it. The electron is like a bullet, but in this case the “air” around the bullet is more powerful than the bullet itself. The electron is special only in that it can further focus the photon energy around it, giving us traveling areas of higher density.

Shoulders then shows that electrons travel easily together, contradicting what we are taught about repulsing charges. He provides data proving that although electrons have some repulsion, they have nothing like a repulsion of -1. I have shown that this is because electrons have a smaller charge profile than the proton. We do not have equal and opposite charges, and never have. The mainstream's own experiments and equations have long indicated the electron has a charge of 1/1821 that of the proton, but as with the charge field itself, that data is ignored to suit old standing theories.

Furthermore, I have shown that it is the electrons' real spins and charge emissions through those spins that are keeping them apart, just as fans would keep one another apart. But in some cases, electrons can huddle even closer, stacking like the protons stack in the nucleus, pole to equator. To get there, they have to be driven by a non-linear charge field, which is rare. But this is the explanation of some quantum particles, [such as the tau neutrino](#). The neutrino is not an indivisible particle: it is four x-spinning electrons.

Finally, here's the clincher:

Curiously, the critical number density of the substructure matches Avogadro's number. To a first approximation, the parts within are spaced the same as if they were in an atomic lattice.

Why would Avogadro's number be showing up here? It is supposed to be the number of molecules per mole of substance. But we aren't looking at molecules or even atoms here. We are supposed to be looking at free electrons. This makes no possible sense until [you read my paper](#) re-assigning Boltzmann's constant and Avogadro's constant to the charge field. There I show that both constants are following the charge photons present, not the molecules. Once we understand that, we understand why Avogadro's number is showing up here with electrons. It is because, once again, Shoulders' devices aren't measuring the electrons in the field, they are measuring the photons. As with the molecules, the electrons are just along for the ride. Not only do they not cause any of the major effects, the math—such as it is—doesn't even apply to them. Like all previous researchers, these guys like Shoulders just assume that because they put electrons in (and nothing else), the electrons must be causing the effects. So they apply their field math to the electrons. But since it is the photons that are causing everything, the math should be applied to them.

To be fair, Shoulders himself was careful not to jump to conclusions. He has left the door wide open for me by admitting they have no evidence that electrons are the cause of anything here. He goes to extreme lengths to avoid that, even calling his particles “entities” rather than electrons. I think this was because he could see that his entities weren't acting at all like electrons. But he couldn't figure out what else might causing the energies, so he left the question open. This was refreshingly scientific of him. Needing a model—and not having one—he left the door open for a good modeler. I thank him heartily. Since I spent 20 years in Austin, where he did his research, it is too bad he and I never got together. I was at least a generation too late.

We will look at more of Shoulders' experiments in upcoming papers.