More Proof *of the* Charge Field from Sound

by Miles Mathis

First published March 12, 2019

A reader alerted me that *Scientific American* just published an article yesterday confirming my charge field and its equations. This is now getting to be a common occurrence, with the mainstream all but admitting I am right on a wide range of problems. I say "all but" because of course they are still hedging, and of course they are still refusing to give me any credit. They have been instructed to continue to pretend they don't know that I exist, though we all know that isn't true. My papers are outranking Wikipedia and all the science journals on many topics, so it is clear I am getting traction all over the world in many fields—including this one.

In this particular paper they hedge by falling back on the phonon dodge. In some problems we have seen them using Landau's or Dirac's quasiparticles, but most often they use phonons. Phonons *are* quasiparticles or virtual particles, so the difference is slight. Remember, phonons are not real particles. None have ever been seen or tracked, and physicists aren't even looking for them. Why? Because they are just place fillers in bad theory. That is pretty much admitted, though they don't say it so directly. Phonons are useful since they can do anything. They don't have to act mechanically and they don't have to follow rules of logic. Any gap in any equations can be filled with a quasiparticle, and there is no requirement of consistency in this gap-filling. Phonons can act one way in one theory and another way in another theory. Their masses can be whatever is needed, their speeds can vary wildly, and their energies are infinitely malleable. A phonon is a fudge particle, basically. A Betty Crocker particle.

In a paper from Esposito et al in *PRL*, it is theorized that sound waves have mass. This is to answer experimental results that are puzzling. It has been found that in some situations, sound seems to act anti-gravitationally. This result can't be fit into the standard model, since that model doesn't include a charge field of real photons with real spins, as mine does. The real photon in the standard model has a zero mass, which doesn't help them when it comes to problems like this. Which is why they have to dodge into Betty Crocker particles at times like this. They also don't have a real charge field at the macrolevel. The charge field in the standard model only exists at the quantum level, and when it comes to experiments like this, they ignore it as if it weren't there—although it is 95% of the unified field at all levels.

But even in my theory, sound waves can't have mass. Why not? Because, *by definition*, sound waves are just patterns in a field. Patterns in a field can't have mass. What has mass is the field itself, which is made up of real charge. Sound is then a pattern in that field. So, loosely, one might say sound had mass. But strictly, by the current definition, sound can't have mass. We can change the definition, so that sound is now the motion of charge, but if we do that then sound is no longer just a pattern, you see. At any rate, it is this sort of lack of rigor in definitions and fields that has doomed the standard model, so my point is not cavilling.

And how does my theory solve this without phonons? It solves it in the way I have solved dozens of other problems before this one. **With real photons with real mass having real spins**. Also crucial is

my unified field math, in which charge is arrayed opposite of gravity. In the simplest equations—which are just tweaks of Newton and the Lagrangian—the gravity vector points in while the charge vector points out. The easiest way to see this is to reread my paper *Lift on a Wing*, which shows that charge has a pre-existing vector up, due to charge recycling by the Earth. This is what causes buoyancy and lift. Well, that paper solves this current problem with sound immediately, since sound will be travelling in the same medium that an airplane is. It will be lifted—not by the air molecules, but by the rising charge. Yes, sound can still be thought of as waves in the molecular (air) field; but with charge, sound *also* has to be considered as a wave in the charge field. The charge field is the fundamental field here, not the molecular field. The molecular field is driven and created by the charge field, so charge can never be ignored.

In more recent papers we have seen that the mechanics of the unified field may be a bit more complex than that. It now appears that gravity is also a charge result, so we have multiple fields of spinning photons. . . but we don't have to get into that here. In a somewhat simpified mechanics that follows the dual field of Newton and Lagrangian, we can solve this current problem without confusing the issue in that way. In either the simple mechanics or the full mechanics, we have a straightforward cause of the "anti-gravitational" motion of the field up at the surface of the Earth, so Esposito's problem evaporates.

Also notice that researcher Ira Rothstein thinks this experiment is indicating that "sound transfers mass". No, since no transference of mass is happening along the line of sound transference. The only transference of photon mass is up, so **the field** is "transferring" mass, not the sound. Sound is moving linearly, left to right, say, in the experiment, so strictly sound is not transfering mass.

But the worst part of the announcement is in its conclusion:

"Until this paper, it was thought that sound waves do not transport mass," says Ira Rothstein from Carnegie Mellon University, who was not involved in this research. "So in that sense it's a really remarkable result. Because anytime you find any new result in classical physics, given that it's been around since Newton, you would have thought it would be completely understood. If you look carefully enough, you can find fresh [ideas] even in fields which have been covered for centuries."

As for why this has never been spotted before, Esposito is uncertain. "Maybe because we are high-energy physicists, gravity is more our language," he says. "It's not some theoretical mumbo jumbo kind of thing. In principle people could have discovered it years ago."

I would say that Mr. Rothstein is still not looking carefully enough, since he appears to be blind to my papers, which have been up for years. Same for Mr. Esposito, who pretends that he doesn't know why it wasn't spotted before. But I can tell him. It *was* spotted before, years ago. . . ***by me***. Which means that this has been buried on purpose. It hasn't made the cover of *Scientific American, Physical Review Letters,* or other journals because those places have been running interference against my ideas for almost two decades. Fortunately, the burying and interference hasn't been very successful, since my websites have gone viral anyway. Tens of thousands of people worldwide knew the answer to this question before Esposito and his pals got anywhere near it, simply because they know how to do a websearch on the internet and know how to read my papers. All of us have been way ahead of these people at Carnegie Mellon and other mainstream institutions. And we still are, since we know this has nothing to do with phonons.