

BEYOND VELIKOVSKY

by Miles Mathis

First published December 13, 2018

[In a recent paper](#) on the Thunderbolts, I showed that Velikovsky is an untrustworthy source, being from the prominent Jewish families who have faked all of recent history. But I have been asked what this means for his theories. Does this mean he is completely wrong? Of course not. The *modus operandi* of these people is to tell as much truth as the project will bear, so the trick is to unwind the project, discovering where the truth ends and the misdirection begins.

I got back on this subject recently when I took a trip to visit my parents. I needed some light reading material on the airplane, so I took along a paperback copy of *Worlds in Collision*. I wanted to reread it now that I know what I know about Velikovsky and the Thunderbolts. I began very soon to see what Velikovsky was up to. This is another “eyes-off” project, in which the audience is given a partial reading of data to prevent them from a fuller reading. In this, it is much like the *Titanic* project we just [unwound a couple of months ago](#). There, author Robin Gardiner of the families admitted it involved insurance fraud, but he wove a complex tale to keep you away from realizing how grand the fraud was, and who was really involved. We saw that he was misdirecting your attention away from Lloyd's of London, John Jacob Astor, and many other parties. And he didn't wish for you to figure out the truth: the *Titanic* never sank at all. The whole story was faked from the ground—or the seafloor—up, as usual.

With Velikovsky and *Worlds in Collision*, the main physical theory involves Venus settling into its current orbit. Velikovsky claimed Venus had come into its present position recently, having a close pass (or several) with the Earth which caused it to heat up. According to him, Venus was ejected from Jupiter some time in the past few thousand years as a comet, intercepted the Earth's orbit, had one or more close passes or collisions with the Earth, and caused various historical upheavals, dark years, etc. It then settled into its current position as a planet, carrying the heat of collision with it.

We now know this is both true and untrue. It is true that Venus is very hot, spinning the wrong direction, and slowing its period of spin, indicating a fairly recent orbital change of a large kind. The fact that Velikovsky predicted most of this (not the spin) just before it was discovered by the mainstream is highly curious, and requires an unwinding. Also curious is that the mainstream still buries the problem. Mainstream astronomers admit the data, but do not talk about what it must mean. They do not admit it indicates Venus recently experienced a catastrophe of some sort—if not the catastrophe of Velikovsky, then some other. Since Venus and her spin are still very round, we can rule out an actual collision, but she may have had a close pass with an intruder—or the Earth.

However, what no one has pointed out is that Velikovsky is wrong about the source of Venus' heat regardless. As he admits, *all* planets have excess heat that is unexplainable by the mainstream. . .

Venus just has a lot more of it. I have shown [in previous papers](#) that this excess heat is explained by the charge field, and planetary recycling of charge. Due to the bipolar nature of the field, all planets pull in charge at both poles, but since part of this charge is upside down (spinning opposite) to the other part, we get photon spin-ups—which are the same as a heat increase. It is a magnetic effect that creates heat in a very simple way, as we have seen many times. See [my paper on Period Four](#) for my first full explanation of it, as THROUGH CHARGE.

In the case of Venus, it is her opposite spin that is the cause of her heat. She exists in the charge field of the Sun, which is mainly spinning left, say, while she is trying to spin right as a whole. Her entire body is made up of atoms that are spinning right, while now recycling an ambient charge field that is mainly spinning left. This is why her overall spin is slowing. I have predicted before that she must slow her spin still further, and eventually reverse it. This is a natural outcome of her new position. She cannot maintain an opposing spin in such a field, since the field is what causes spin to begin with. The only reason she hasn't already reversed is that reversing the spin of such a large body takes a very long time. There is a lot of angular momentum that must be countered by the charge field, and the field cannot just stop a body the size of Venus overnight.

Notice that Velikovsky's explanation fails immediately, because if Venus had been heated to such a degree by a collision or close pass with the Earth, the Earth should have been also. But instead of several hundred degree temperature rises on the Earth, Velikovsky only shows some decades of darkness and other fairly minor changes. Yes, to the people alive at the time they seemed catastrophic, but compared to temperature changes of hundreds of degrees, they were nothing.

So in fact it *wasn't* Venus' close pass to the Earth or other body that caused her new heat. It was that she was flipped in the charge field, afterwards creating her heat by a sort of photon friction.

What this means is that both Velikovsky and the mainstream are wrong about the source of Venus' heat. The mainstream still tries to explain the heat as a function of the greenhouse effect and other heat trapping, but the astonishing temperatures cannot possibly be explained that way. Certainly, heat trapping by the heavy atmosphere adds to the temperature, but it cannot be the cause. In fact—as Velikovsky correctly pointed out decades ago—an atmosphere as thick as that of Venus should act to *block* heat coming from the Sun. This is why it is cooler on cloudy days and in the shade, you know. Terrestrial clouds block some of the heat. Thicker Venusian clouds would block more heat, causing lower temperatures, not higher. Also remember that Venus is so bright because her atmosphere is reflecting huge amounts of visible light. Well, in the same way it must be reflecting in the infrared, which is heat. This should short-circuit any greenhouse effect, since that effect requires heat coming in from above. But according to my charge mechanism, the heat of Venus is actually coming up from below *and then* being trapped by the atmosphere. Without that charge effect, the mainstream cannot create enough heat coming from below to explain a surface temperature of 500°C, not with all the heat trapping in the world.

Also remember that although the mainstream belittles Velikovsky's explanation of Venus' strange numbers, it offers no good theories itself. As with the rest of the planets, Venus' numbers are simply reported. No effort is made to explain them, no matter how anomalous or leading they are. Uranus is just lying on his side because he prefers to; Saturn has rings because he likes them; and Venus rotates retrograde as a fashion statement, I guess. For the state of the art in nescience, you may consult [this 2001 article](#) at *Scientific American* on the question of Venus' spin, which comes up first on a Google search. There we find this:

Now Alexandre Correira and Jacques Laskar suggest that Venus may not have flipped at all. They propose instead that its rotation slowed to a standstill and then reversed direction. Taking into account the factors mentioned above, as well as tidal effects from other planets, the team concluded that Venus's axis could have shifted to a variety of positions throughout the planet's evolution. Regardless of whether it flipped or not, it is bound to settle into one of four stable rotation states--two in either direction. The researchers add that Venus would be more stable in one of the two retrograde rotational states. So in essence, it was just a question of time before Venus started spinning the wrong way.

You have to laugh. Does anyone really think that is *more* scientific than Velikovsky? It looks like it was written by a couple of junior high schoolers on weed. Not only is the content there zero, it is chock-full of glaring logical holes. We aren't told *why* Venus would be more stable in one of the two retrograde rotational states, belying the title of the piece, which promised we were about to be told just that. And how, precisely, was it just a matter of time before Venus started spinning the wrong way? Nothing in the short article leads up to that conclusion. Not only do we have no proof of that, we have not the slightest indication of that, or even the attempt at an argument. Just a tacked-on summation arriving from empty space.

Anyway, this indicates to me that Venus *has* flipped recently, though I can't (yet) calculate whether that would be a few thousand years ago, or a few hundred thousand. And why would she do that? Well, it is very unlikely she was ejected from Jupiter as a comet, as everyone can see. Comets don't have much in common with planets. All of Velikovsky's arguments in that direction are a stretch, to put it nicely. As a first correction, we could push Velikovsky by offering that Venus was ejected from the *vicinity* of Jupiter, having been a moon until then. But that is also unlikely, since neither Jupiter nor Saturn have any moons that large. Also, there was no *reason* for Jupiter to be ejecting moons in Biblical times. Jupiter may have ejected moons in the past, but only for a very good reason (such as the Great Inequality). That is to say, a close pass of Saturn or of an intruder might have caused such an ejection, but nothing like that was going on at the time. If such a thing had happened just a few thousand years ago, the moons of Jupiter and Saturn would still be in turmoil.

Which reminds us a better solution is suggested by the known dance of Jupiter and Saturn, that I pursued [in my paper on Laplace](#). Over long periods, it is known that Saturn tries to go below Jupiter, and [I have also explained that](#). According to my correction to Bode's Law, smaller planets want to orbit below larger ones. Once again, the charge field determines this. So far, Jupiter has prevented that from happening, by excluding Saturn with his own charge field, but Saturn will keep trying until he does go below. That will be a momentous event in the history of the Solar System, because of course Saturn's moons will also have to get past Jupiter's moons. We can expect that some of them will not make it, getting bounced up and out or down and in—where they will cause havoc in the inner System. I have theorized before that the asteroid belt was caused in this way during one of the previous meetings of Jupiter and Saturn.

Anyway, I would say it is probable that Venus and the Earth are near-twins like Jupiter and Saturn. Venus used to orbit above the Earth, and the Earth and Venus once danced in the same way Jupiter and Saturn now do. Venus finally made it below the Earth, and in passing got flipped. Any moons she had may have gotten stripped. It is possible Mars took part in this, or he may have come down from Jupiter/Saturn. Given his current position and stats, I would say it is more likely he took part in the asteroid belt event than in the Venus event.

Of course, this would also explain the large gap between the Earth and Mars. The gap between the Earth and Mars is about double the gap between the Earth and Venus. So there was plenty of room for

Venus to be above the Earth in the past. The Mars' year is also getting shorter, and that is because Mars is falling into that gap left by Venus. The charge exclusion of the Earth isn't enough to keep Mars at its present distance. This can also be seen by Phobos, which is getting closer to Mars. While the Moon is getting further away from the Earth. This is because the Earth's orbit has increased, forcing the Moon's orbit to increase also. While Mars' falling orbit forces Phobos lower as well.

This would also explain a shorter Earth year in the past, since with Venus above it, the Earth would naturally orbit nearer the Sun. Again, my Bode's Law math shows how that works. The planets don't just orbit in a gravity field, they orbit in a charge field, and that has to be taken into account.

If this was the mechanism, it destroys Velikovsky's thesis, since if Venus came close enough to the Earth to be flipped by its charge field, the Moon would also be strongly affected. At worst it would be thrown completely out of orbit, and at best it would move closer or further away. And yet in historical times the Moon has not changed greatly. The old calendars indicate no major turmoil in the month. This does not mean Venus and the Earth didn't dance: it means they didn't dance in Biblical times. It had to be *much* earlier. At that time, the Earth may have stolen the Moon from Venus, and the Earth may have previously had a different moon or no moon. Or, the Moon may have simply been nudged in or out by some margin. And if the Moon happened to be directly opposite Venus during a quick pass, it may have dodged an effect almost entirely. All those possibilities should be looked at in regard to historical—and even more pre-historical—events.

But this begs the question: if I am right, why would Velikovsky be misdirecting us away from any of this? I have said that he not only got it wrong, but *got it wrong on purpose*. Why would he do that? The whole Velikovsky Affair has the usual signs of pawing, with both sides now looking manufactured. Why? The timing is one clue here. The book came out in 1950, when the Families were consolidating their control over all parts of society via the CIA and other institutions and programs. Given Velikovsky's connections, I would say it is likely he knew about Venus before the mainstream decided to broadcast the information. In fact, my gut tells me Velikovsky wrote his books to softsell the new information to the public, and to divert them from much greater truths. One of those greater truths was obviously the charge field, which his children the Thunderbolts are still diverting you away from—while appearing to sell it. They are teaching their converts that there are no photons, which to me is the greatest red flag imaginable. They also misdirect at all times away from the charge field and to the EM field, though the two aren't the same.

So I think there was something about the Venus data that was considered too hot to handle. They were afraid that a straight-up reportage would lead many in academia and out of it to figure out the Solar System was not gravity-only. It appears that charge had become a classified secret sometime in the first half of the 20th century, and the governors didn't want to divulge any of it to the public or to academic scientists. They wanted to keep it for a few military scientists.

Enter Velikovsky, who would first divulge a small part of the secret in a book geared to the popular reader—one of those books with neon fonts on the cover and exclamation points and overstated titles. While giving you the first level of information, he would be instructed to sex it up with lots of Biblical references and wild speculation. This he had learned from his precursor Ignatius Donnelly, who in 1882 in *Ragnarok* had done much the same thing in related fields—divulging to the public a lot of good data but then subtly blackwashing it by its context, presentation, author, and proposed results. Donnelly was buried by mainstream science back then just as Velikovsky was buried 60 years later, and this burying was no accident. It was part of the project. It acted to squelch discussion and research in these fields for decades, *especially* in academia. Why do you think so little attention has been given by

mainstream astronomy and physics to the Venus question? Precisely *because* Velikovsky and the Thunderbolts have given it attention. Mainstream astronomers didn't even want to use the same washroom as Velikovsky, and Carl Sagan was making sure of that up until the 1990s. Someone wanted to ensure you never **got beyond Velikovsky**.

Why? Because if you got beyond Velikovsky, you would be like me. You would be looking in your rearview mirror at most mainstream science in all fields. Obviously, they couldn't have that. To maintain control of science, they had to keep everyone penned in the gravity-only, shut-up-and-calculate, Relativity/QED fog that defined the 20th century. If your average academic scientist had understood the charge field, the revolution would have been quick and fatal. All the big names at the top of all fields would have been guillotined, and their pet projects would have fallen with them—including black holes, Big Bang, gravity waves, inflation, Higgs bosons, spooky forces, and all the rest. Since this mainstream fraud not only hides many classified projects but also allows for billions in theft from worldwide treasuries, you have a pretty clear *cui bono* for any misdirecting projects like Velikovsky.

Does this mean Velikovsky was wrong that historical events were caused by celestial events? Again, no. I think he was wrong about the specifics, but right in general. I don't think these events were caused by Venus, and I have shown why her flipping must have come earlier. But they may well have been caused by close passes of comets, asteroids, or meteors. In fact, I think the evidence he states indicates many of the them probably *were*. Which makes it all the more surprising he didn't propose them instead of Venus as the cause. You should really ask yourself why—given objects in the sky that looked like dragons with tails—he didn't propose normal comets or asteroids* as the culprits, instead coming up with this fanciful and unnecessarily complicated theory of Venus as a comet ejected from Jupiter, reversing and making multiple passes. . . followed by Mars doing the same thing a few years later. Doesn't that seem suspicious on the face of it? Why would such a smart guy make such a hash of it? I am telling you why: he was paid to do just that. This was another big blackwashing of the truth and Velikovsky was another Anti. The ideas to be blackwashed were 1) charge, 2) serious reading of historical texts as honest physical accounts, 3) “amateurs” as scientists, 4) the public as a serious player in the history of science.

As far as 4) goes, the governors were tired of having to answer questions, about science funding or anything else, so they wished to jettison any and all public participation in science, except as a prostrate consumer. Before WW2 and especially before WW1 the public had maintained some education in science. Consult old issues of *Scientific American* to get a taste of this. Back then, the magazines had to treat their audiences with some respect, since those audiences had been partially educated. Those same magazines can now treat their audiences as ninnies, since in almost all cases they are. They know nothing but the current propaganda. Read back to back the first issue of *Scientific American* from 1845 and the latest issue, and you will have a capsule of the precipitous drop in intelligence of the average American science reader—a drop planned and abetted over the past century and a half.

But back to Velikovsky. He was the Anti here because he was hired and set up specifically to fail. The entire series of books was written to fail and the surrounding controversy was composed to blackwash all the ideas he promotes. Did he help the cause of charge, or of a serious reading of ancient texts, or of planetary influences, or of anything else? No, he damaged them irreparably at a time when they were on the rise, and I am telling you that was no accident. I am just surprised they didn't later blackwash him as a pedophile, Satanist, or wife beater. Had the project peaked fifty years later, they probably would have, but the 50s were not the time for that. Velikovsky was a spook, but he was an old-world spook who thought too much of himself to put his name through that kind of sewer. Now, the spooks

are not so proud or elevated. They will do whatever it takes to promote the old projects, as long as it pays handsomely.

As usual, it looks like they saw me coming, since the Velikovsky Affair was the perfect pre-blackwashing of all my discoveries. Via charge, I can be fatuously linked to Velikovsky and flushed without a second—or even a first reading—and this is just how the mainstream wants it. I don't really think anyone predicted my coming, and my guess is someone like me was probably on the rise in 1950. They have since buried him so completely not even a gravestone remains. Probably he didn't have my tenacity. But what was created for him can be retuned overnight for me, and it *has* been via the Thunderbolts and other players.

However, as you have seen their projects aren't working against me, and there are many reasons for that. To start with, the projects have lost all subtlety. Used to getting their way, the spooks have become overconfident and lazy, and they have lost their edge. Beyond that, the anti-education project has turned out to be a two-edged sword, cutting back on its makers. Meaning, the governors have gotten stupider along with the rest of us. They can't recruit the talent they used to, because it simply doesn't exist. They have had to breathe the same polluted air the rest of us have, and it appears they forgot to install the fluoride filters at Langley.

But the main reason they have failed is that they *didn't* predict or prepare for someone like me. How could they? When in history have they had to? My method of advancement is unprecedented, and I doubt you can point to any analogue in history. I have piggybacked on their own tools like the internet, which didn't exist until recently. So there is no way anyone could have predicted my form of attack. It has been so serendipitous and unorthodox, even I failed to plan it or predict it. As an almost overnight creation of the Muses, I have turned out to be as unanswerable as a talking unicorn.

*The horseshoe asteroids, now known to cohabit the Earth's orbit, are the perfect candidate for theories like this, since they go up and come back. If one of them had been accelerated by an intruder, it would indeed approach much closer to the Earth than previously before it turned around, possibly creating just the sort of havoc Velikovsky describes from historical texts. Back in 1950, mainstream scientists responded to Velikovsky by screaming that heavenly bodies don't come up to the Earth and then turn around, since this would contradict the rules of gravity. But it is now admitted they do. This is precisely what the [horseshoe asteroids](#) do. Gravity-only cannot explain this. Only the charge field can explain it.