


[return to updates](#)

DESIGNER ELECTRONS ARE REALLY PHOTONS



by Miles Mathis

Today's news [March 17, 2012] included [a report](#) from the National Accelerator Laboratory SLAC that “designer electrons” were being created in manufactured structures that resembled graphene. The interesting sentence is this one:

Initially, the electrons in this structure had graphene-like properties; for example, unlike ordinary electrons, they had no mass and traveled as if they were moving at the speed of light in a vacuum. But researchers were then able to tune these electrons in ways that are difficult to do in real graphene.

According to current theory, there should be no such beast as a designer electron. This shouldn't be happening, and yet they are selling it to you as no big deal. Yes, it is sold as a big deal as a matter of high-tech, but it is not being sold as the theory-ender it is. The electron is one of the fundamental particles of QM and QED, and beyond the Relativity transforms it cannot vary. You cannot do a Relativity transform on an electron to give it no mass or a speed of c . If you take an electron to a velocity of c , it has infinite mass, not zero mass. So these people at SLAC should know this isn't initially an electron. Since it has the properties of a photon—speed c and zero mass—why are they calling it an electron here? Because:

By writing complex patterns that mimicked changes in carbon-carbon bond lengths and strengths in graphene, the researchers were able to restore the electrons' mass in small, selected areas.

You can't do that with photons, *they think*, so these must be electrons. But what is happening is that the created photons are being re-energized up to the electron level, using my spin stacking method. We are seeing in the experiment the actual making of an electron from a photon. We are seeing proof of my particle unification, which shows that the photon and electron are the same particle, one with more spins than the other.

Although this should be fairly obvious to anyone doing even a quick scan of the data, the researchers won't go there as a matter of theory. Why? One, because they don't have the theory to cover it. You can't turn a photon that is a point particle into an electron, and their photon is a point particle. Two,

because to admit it would bring down QM and QED from the foundations. So they simply gloss over it. They imply that this isn't a problem by not even mentioning it. They toot the horns on the high-tech side, while hiding the theory side completely.

Even more amazing is this:

“One of the wildest things we did was to make the electrons think they are in a huge magnetic field when, in fact, no real field had been applied,” Manoharan said. They calculated the positions where carbon atoms in graphene should be, to make its electrons believe they were being exposed to magnetic fields ranging from zero to 60 Tesla, more than 30 percent higher than the strongest continuous magnetic field ever achieved on Earth. The researchers then moved carbon monoxide molecules to steer the electrons into precisely those positions, and the electrons responded by behaving exactly as predicted — as if they had been exposed to a real field.

Notice that we get no commentary on that, just that it is “wild.” But again, it completely overthrows the current model. How can positions alone create fields of 60 Tesla?

No answer from SLAC, but I can tell you. It is because SLAC is ignoring the charge field, as usual. I [just showed](#) how they ignore charge in accelerators, and they are doing it again here. To see what I mean, we can return for a moment to [a recent paper](#) of mine on the heliospheric current sheet, where we see them ignoring the electrical current of space. I do the simple math, showing that the number, though low, indicates an underlying charge field strength the equivalent of at least 3 million lightning bolts. We have the same thing here, with a magnetic field of 60 Tesla being created “from nothing.” The researchers can't get it through their heads that the created magnetic field is real, even after they measure it. They say that it is “as if” they had been exposed to a real field. But quanta don't react “as if” they are in a field. They either are or they are not. This isn't psychology, this is physics. Check the spelling! Given that the field is being created, the question is, “HOW is it being created?” Current theory has no way to explain it, which is precisely why we have to be told it is a mirage. You don't have to explain mirages, right? So the electrons are just “fooled.”

But the field is real. The magnetic field of 60 Tesla is there. Where did it come from? It comes from the charge field. As I have been screaming for years, charge exists even in the absence of ions. Photons are there even when no ions are present to create the E/M fields we measure. So there are unmeasured photon potentials existing at all times. To see how these are created, you have to study my [nuclear diagrams](#), which show how atoms recycle this charge field, creating the underlying potentials.

What this means in this current experiment is that the spacing of the carbon monoxide in the molecular structure is creating the potentials that then energize these photon/electrons. We are seeing part of the great power tied up in the charge field.

This is not zero-point energy, although like this energy, zero-point energy is coming from the charge field. There is no zero-point energy. Zero-point energy is a made-up term, used to fill a hole in current theory. Because current theory has forgotten about charge, it needs manufactured ideas like zero-point energy and dark energy to fill the gap.

Again, charge is made up of real photons with real radii and real mass. They are not virtual and they are not point particles. They create real potentials, just like wind does. And charge is much “heavier” than anyone understands. In fact, [photonic matter outweighs baryonic matter by 19 to 1](#).

Although I am told daily that there is no evidence for my theories, there is evidence for it on a daily

basis, more each week. But, as we see here, the evidence is brazenly ignored. Here we see physicists call a particle with no mass and speed of c an electron, contra all their own theories. We see them create huge magnetic fields out of nothing, contra to current theory. And they do this without breaking a sweat, apparently without even realizing or caring that they have created unanswerable contradictions. Current theory cannot explain this experiment and my theory can explain it easily. Current theory cannot explain anything that has happened for more than a century, while my theory explains it easily. So why are physicists sticking with current theory and attacking me? We can only suppose it is because neither truth nor consistency is their first priority.