F U R

by Miles Mathis

First published February 14, 2023

I first started thinking about this after visiting a girlfriend in Quebec over Christmas several years ago. It got down to -50C at night and I wondered how the animals outside could survive that. Look at that moose. They don't go into caves at night, and he doesn't have much hair, unlike his friend the musk ox. You can kind of see how the musk ox might survive very low temperatures, but it is harder to understand with the moose. Why don't his legs freeze solid? He has hooves, which don't have many nerve endings, so he may not feel the cold like you would, but that wouldn't mean his hooves weren't that cold. And the legs only have a layer of short though dense hair. How does that keep him from freezing up at -60C?

As usual, the mainstream has no good answer for this. It is what it is. We are supposed to believe these animals just have super circulation and that the fur is very insulating. Yes, it is obviously very insulating, but WHY? What is so magical about animal hair? If you wore some sort of insulating layer like that, it wouldn't matter: you would be dead within hours at -60C. Dead animal furs are about the warmest thing you can wear, as the Natives know, but even then you can't survive outside at those temperatures. You have to be in a cave or a structure of some kind, even with all the furs in the world piled on top of you.

And that is our first clue: it would appear that LIVING fur is far warmer than dead fur. And realizing that is what allowed me to solve this one. . . that and my charge field.

I haven't run any experiments of course. I don't have access to living moose in the wilds in winter, or to extensive labs and equipment. I am just intuiting the answer here. But if it is right it may be of some use to someone in the future, so I put it down on paper just in case.

One of the things that is so magical about animal fur is that it keeps in heat while still allowing the animal's skin to breathe. So air can get in but heat can't get out and—most importantly, cold can't get in. They have tried to make some substances to mimic that ability, but none of them do it very well. As it turns out, that is because those substances aren't living: they aren't plugged into the body itself, so they aren't alive in that sense. Even if they are made from formerly living fiber like cotton or from fur like wool, they are no longer alive in that sense. They retain some of their former properties, but not the main one: life.

The other reason no one has been able to mimic animal fur is that until now no one understood how it was working.

So what is this "life" doing for these animals? What is it about living fur that makes it seem so magical? Well, the thing that allowed me to solve this, beyond linking it to charge, was seeing the analogy to water and food transport in plants. In my paper on the Pressure Flow Hypothesis in 2011, I showed how the plant was using the charge field to move things up and down the stem. I showed it wasn't osmosis or pressure flow, it was charge channeling. Plants generally grow up, so they need to move substances up. They can use gravity to move them down, so that is no question to answer. But moving them up seemed like a problem. I showed that plants use very small tubes in the xylem and phloem, because at that small size they can use rising charge to lift microscopic amounts very fast. When they need to move stuff down, they can disconnect that rising charge elevator by short circuiting it. They move ions to the sides of tubes, so that the charge channels are then running perpendicular to the stem, instead of parallel. The elevator them moves down.

Once I point it out, you may already see the analogy to our current problem. As with the tiny tubes in the xylem and phloem, hairs have a very small cross section. They are on the same order of magnitude. So hairs also act as charge channelers and blockers. But of course they will do that best when they are hooked up to the animal, because the charge being used is mainly coming out of the animal. It is biophotons. Hairs disconnected from the animal can still channel charge, but at only a fraction of the efficiency of hairs hooked up to the living animal.

My guess is that hairs in living fur are set up in the position of tubes in the xylem that have been short circuited. That is, ions at the outer edge of the hair are set up to move charge crossways, breaking the main charge channel down the length of the hair. Think of the companion cells in a plant's tubes. This creates channels that are perpendicular to the hair itself, running across to the hair next to it. So fur has all these billions of cross channels between adjacent hairs, creating a strong insulator. And, as you see, I don't just mean an insulator like a down jacket. I mean an insulator as in electromagnetic theory. Charge is then running parallel to the animal's skin, so rising charge (heat) is trapped. The animal actually has on a sort of electrical coat. It is more a charge coat, which is why you don't get shocked by your kittens. It doesn't attract electrons and doesn't create current, so it isn't electrical in that sense. In fact the reverse. Being an insulator, it breaks currents rather than creating them. And the animal is a ground, so any current that is created will most likely back into the animal.

As you can see, any natural hair that was once used for this purpose will retain those charge channels, so it will remain an insulator even when dead. But with dead hair, there isn't much charge running through it, because it isn't hooked up to a charge source. Now, if you wear a natural fur next to your skin, and the hairs of the fur are perpendicular to your skin, the fur can draw charge off you, since you are charged. But this is very inefficient, because it is no substitute for having each hair plugged into your skin. Hair follicles act like little electrical plugs, and just placing a hair on your skin isn't the same.