More Proof of the Charge Field from Andromeda

by Miles Mathis

April 30, 2025

As I just said yesterday, I get more major proof from the mainstream that I am right almost every month now. A reader alerted me to this press release from *Futurism* concerning research published at *Nature Astronomy* by Kanehisa et al. It is a basic study of satellite galaxies of Andromeda, admitting that almost all of them are on the near side of Andromeda, closest to the Milky Way, and even stranger that they are pointed right at us. They also admit the odds of this being due to chance are almost zero, given that there are 37 of these smaller galaxies. [36 of 37 within about 100 degrees of us, and all pointing roughly at us, so you can do the math if you want. They say the odds are .03%, but that is based on comparing to other galaxies, not comparing to a completely chance configuration of 37.]

And yet the team can't think of anything that would cause this, calling it a mysterious asymmetry. Incredibly strange, they say.

My reader saw that this was explained by charge immediately, so it is interesting to see the researchers talking about dark matter here.

Our current understanding of cosmology holds that large galaxies form from smaller galaxies that merge together over time. Orchestrating this from the shadows are "haloes" — essentially clusters — of dark matter, the invisible substance thought to account for 85 percent of all mass in the universe, whose gravitational influence helps pull the galaxies together.

That mention of dark matter seems to come out of nowhere in the article, since, given current theory, dark matter couldn't possibly explain this. As you see, they use dark matter only to extend gravity out into dark invisible haloes.

But dark matter is indeed a clue, since I have shown that dark matter IS the charge field. I did the math using mainstream equations and both just happen to be 95% of the total field. But since dark matter is charge, it doesn't work just gravitationally. It works as the major part of the unified field. What this means is that Andromeda and the Milky Way, being galaxy neighbors, are tied together by charge, like atoms in a molecule. These satellite galaxies are in line with the Milky Way because they are literally residing in a line of charge linkage. These lines work electromagnetically, so of course they will align any bodies they come in contact with, like magnets.

Galaxies, like all other bodies large and small, are recycling the universal charge field, pulling in charge at the pole and releasing it on the equator. Which is why most of the mass in a galaxy is on the equator. It is also why these satellite galaxies are orbiting the central galaxy on its equator. It is also why we see Andromeda almost on-edge: we, too, are caught in Andromeda's charge field, even at this distance. If not for other influences, we would be right on its equator:

So it isn't strange at all. The only thing that is strange is that the mainstream still hasn't caught with me after two decades of this. They are still ignoring me as if I don't exist, although my papers have been superviral for many years, outranking the university sites and often even outranking Wikipedia.

The second sentence of the published paper is this:

The unexpected presence of flattened and co-rotating planes of satellites around the Milky Way[3,4] and Andromeda[5] galaxies, as well as a handful of dwarf associations beyond the Local Group[6,7,8,9,10,11,12], are hence difficult to explain in the context of concordance cosmology. Similarly anisotropic satellite distributions are highly rare (<1%) in cosmological simulations based on the ΛCDM framework[4,6,13], sparking an active and enduring debate on whether this discrepancy indeed constitutes a challenge to our understanding of small-scale structure formation[14,15,16,17].

And there is the problem. Expectation is based on computer simulations from **ΛCDM.** Lambda Cold Dark Matter. But **ΛCDM** is not unified and does not include charge, so there is nothing in current theory that would explain this charge asymmetry. But if you treat galaxies as very large unified-field beasts, like charge particles, this is very easy to explain. It is almost impossible to believe no one before me thought to treat galaxies as charged entities, and even harder to believe no one went "of course!" when I suggested it years ago. We have to imagine the reason they didn't is because they didn't want to give me credit. Same thing we have seen in hundreds of other instances, most famously right now in the Solar Cycle problem, which the mainstream is tying itself into knots to avoid admitting I solved it. And how did I solve that one? Same way as here: charge streams.