

[return to updates](#)

# Cool Moonlight



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published March 2, 2018*

I have been studying the claims that Moonlight causes cooling. Although this claim is now being used by Flat Earthers, and is being argued as part of that psyop, this is not what interested me. It was something else entirely, as you are about to see.

My readers know that I have about equal disrespect for Flat Earth and mainstream science. In fact, since I have shown Flat Earth is a project of misdirection by mainstream science, there is really no difference. They come from the same place. Flat Earth is being promoted by mainstream institutions like NASA and SpaceX as a convenient way to avoid criticism. When anyone criticizes mainstream science, they can be dismissed as a Flat Earther, which saves mainstream scientists from having to defend the merit of their own theories and projects.

But I suppose I should repeat here that I am not a Flat Earther. Along with Pizzagate and Trannies, I consider it the stupidest thing ever promoted by the mainstream media, and anyone who emails me and starts talking about any of those three is immediately sent to trash. I needed to say that, because I am about to confirm the cooling of Moonlight, and the last thing I want is for that to be seen as a confirmation of Flat Earth. It isn't. Why? Because Flat Earthers use the cooling of Moonlight to propose that it isn't light reflected from the Sun. And that is supposed to prove the Moon is creating its own light, which is supposed to prove it is a lamp placed there by God, I guess. I don't know why God couldn't have placed the Moon there as a reflector, but we aren't going to get into all that.

The first thing I did after looking at the first round of evidence in favor of cooling by Moonlight (which was direct tests with heat sensors by amateurs at Youtube and other places) was to search for a logical debunking. Yes, I wanted to see the mainstream response. Curiously, there is no real mainstream response, and by that I mean that there is no big or small cache of data on this question from university or institutional physicists, using expensive tools and trying hard to control the variables. I did discover that this had been a question since the time of the Greeks, but nonetheless mainstream science hasn't found it worth researching seriously. They are more interested in black holes and the first seconds of the universe than in running simple experiments like this, as we have seen. As just one example, only in the past couple of years did they think to put [table salt under high pressure to see if it confirmed](#)

[mainstream electron bonding theory](#); and we can see why they stalled because the experiment showed electron bonding theory was false. So it is possible they are avoiding experiments with Moonlight for the same reason. It would prove once again they don't know the first thing about light theory. With or without experiments on Moonlight, we have seen the mainstream doesn't know diddly about light theory, and apparently isn't interested in knowing anything—since they ignore me like the plague. Despite [having some of the highest numbers](#) online on this and many other important physical questions, the mainstream pretends I don't exist.

Anyway, without any mainstream data to look at, I had to make do with what was available. The top-ranked mainstream response [is from PhysicsCentral.com](#), a site managed by and under the auspices of the American Physical Society. This just proves there is no real mainstream data here, because if there were, APS would link us right to it, wouldn't they? They wouldn't need to put up this pathetic page with no data on it. It is the expected bloviating, with zero content. The anonymous “argument” there consists of *ad homs* cast generally at Youtubers and Flat Earthers, which proves my point above. Any evidence the mainstream doesn't want to look at is simply dismissed, which of course isn't scientific. It is claimed that the amateur scientists in question don't know how to use a thermometer, but no evidence is given to support that. Thermometers are very easy to use, and calling those using them “yokels” doesn't prove they are misusing it. Maybe they are misusing it, but the only way to prove that is to rerun the experiment in the right way. Does our anonymous blowhard at APS bother to do that? Nope. He simply *assumes* the result can't be right. So as scientists, we can ignore him completely.

The next ranked response is from [flatearthinsanity.blogspot.com](#), and this anonymous poster does at least take the time to rerun the experiment himself. . . kind of. He took an infrared cooking thermometer outside on a very cloudy, “Moonless” night and collected some numbers. He says his point was to show there were great variations even on Moonless nights, but it is still curious he made no attempt to run numbers under a full Moon—since that was the question after all. He seems to be taking great efforts to avoid the question. Nonetheless, he found a one-degree variation from open sky to shade, cooler in the open, which would seem to confirm the question. . . except that he claims the sky was cloudy. He says the variation therefore couldn't be due to the Moon. *However*, notice that he never says there was no Moon behind those clouds, so we don't know. He doesn't even bother to be clear on that question, which should tell you how rigorous he is. He implies that Moonlight can't penetrate clouds, but that is ridiculous. Light penetrates everything pretty easily, so the clouds are only blocking *some* of the light. According to our poor human eyes, the Moonlight is being blocked, but instruments would tell us much of the light is penetrating the clouds. Therefore, this guy's experiment is total misdirection. Yes, it indicates there is great variation in temperatures as you move across the ground, so there are other factors involved here than Moonlight. But a good experiment could easily factor those out. Anyone interested in the truth here would make some effort to do that, instead of just *assuming* Moonlight is not a factor. So we can completely ignore this guy, too. His experiment was even less rigorous than those he was criticizing, since they were only incomplete while he was actively misdirecting.

The next one we find is from Metabunk.org, which we know not to trust from previous research. I call it megabunkum. Mick West leads the mainstream debunking here—such as it is—and we have caught him misdirecting furiously in the [Charlottesville, VA case](#). So we already know Metabunk is an Intelligence front of some sort—like Snopes and many others—paid to blow smoke. Here is one thing West says that proves that here:

**Take a step back. Do you really think if that if Moonlight cooled water then this had somehow gone unnoticed by science? Or that such a trivially easy thing to test was somehow being covered up?**

**No, what's going to happen here is that eventually you'll accept that moonlight is in fact NOT cooling (or measurably warming). You might even do the math and find out that the brightness of the full Moon ( $1/400000$ th the brightness of the Sun) is exactly what you'd expect for sunlight reflected off a rocky object the size of the moon at those distances.**

Red flags all over that statement. One, he assumes science has already noticed and cataloged everything of importance. We know that isn't true, and I gave you one example above, with salt. There are millions of others. Two, he *assumes* Moonlight doesn't cool, without any good argument or evidence. Three, he misdirects the question into brightness, which isn't the question. For someone like me, who isn't questioning whether the Moon is reflecting Sunlight, that math is pointless. As we will see below, this isn't decided by brightness, it is decided by the spin quality of the light, or its phase.

West has a FLIR and tells us he is going to run the experiment himself. But the forum is five very long pages, and in the first three he keeps begging off, instead doing tests on his computer screen, his carpet, and so on. It takes months for him to finally get around to a test. Why set up the question like this? If West ran a conclusive test, wouldn't he provide a link on page one, instead of requiring us to scroll through five pages of bombast? Finally, he gets outside on a clear night, and the first thing he does is point the FLIR at the Moon. He tells us the Moon registers as a hot spot in the sky. More misdirection, since that is not the question. Next, he leans a wooden plank against a wooden table, creating a shadow on the table. He then steps back many feet to the side and publishes one picture. He implies this resolves the question, since we don't see a heat difference in the shadow.

Oh my God, could he try any harder to flub this? It's pathetic. I encourage you to take [the link](#) and see it for yourself. My prediction is, once I link to it, it will be taken down. It is that bad. Why? Because he doesn't give the table any time to absorb or lose heat after he places the plank. He just creates a shadow and then immediately takes a picture. But there's an even greater problem: even if the table *had* lost some heat from Moonlight, his picture couldn't show it. Why not? **Because the table is already dark blue before the Moonlight hits it.** Dark blue is the camera's coldest color, so it has no way to show variation beyond that. If the Moonlit table had become colder, how would we know? Obviously, he needs to let the Moonlight hit something that is red to start with, or at least yellow or green, so that we can see a difference. If he lets the Moonlight hit something that is already dark blue, there is no possibility of a color change to clue us in. You will tell me the shaded part might have become greener, but again, he sets up the experiment to make sure that won't happen. His shadow is just a thin strip in the middle of the table, crossing many planks, and it is surrounded on both sides by larger unshaded areas. Being surrounded by cold all around it will be harder to heat. And we see yet another source of dissipation, since the planks in the table are separated by air gaps. I have to believe West chose his object purposely to ensure a negative outcome. I also remind you that at the top of this page, the question is "does water cool faster in Moonlight". Did anyone at Metabunk ever get around to testing water? No. We see five pages of misdirection, but never a single experiment addressing the original claim.

Next I went to Youtube for a debunking, and of course [Astronomy Live](#) is one of the top promoted videos there. As with Metabunk, we already know what to expect from Astronomy Live, since he is also now promoting the fake SpaceX projects. So he looks like another paid agent of some sort, although we can't say who he is, exactly. I got an email from him on SpaceX, and even there he signs himself Astronomy Live, as if that is the name of a person. I don't trust anyone who can't sign his own name to his work. He may be working from the same offices as Mick West, since he uses the same hamhanded misdirection. His video is only 3 minutes long, but he acts like it is a solid debunking. It isn't. He starts in the same way, by ignoring the evidence posted by others and instead pointing his

instrument up at the Moon. Why can't he just address the evidence given, instead misdirecting us immediately into a different question? After that, he misdirects a second time, by putting a piece of tinfoil in the sunshine. Hey, the question was about Moonlight, buddy! So running tests on Sunlight isn't really to the point, is it? Are you ever going to get around to addressing the question at hand? The answer is no. He never addresses either the given evidence or the question of Moonlight at all. It is not clear why this video even comes up when you type Moonlight in at Youtube.

So, as usual we see something very fishy going on with this “debunking” of cold Moonlight. No real debunking is going on, just a lot of hamhanded misdirection. If the evidence of cooling by Moonlight was really so weak, that should have been pretty easy to show. Proving lunatics are lunatics isn't that hard. I do it every day, as you know, and I make a much better job of it. But these guys can't even address the evidence. That by itself is a sign here, and it may mean the data showing cooling by Moonlight was given to Flat Earthers on purpose. In other words, I think it is entirely possible that the data was released this way to blackwash it. These fake Flat Earthers were assigned the job of publicizing the data, so that it could immediately be blackwashed as coming from a lunatic fringe. But if so, the project backfired in my case, since I take from it just the opposite conclusion. If the mainstream is spending so much time blackwashing this evidence, it only indicates more strongly *it is true*. That is what I have found in every other case, so it is a good assumption here.

What this pathetic debunking does to any rational person is to send him back to the experiments. If I had some funding and some fancy thermometers, I would run the tests myself, but I don't. As usual, all I have is my brain, which I was given for free. Given that alone, I should be able to sort through the various experiments run by others, throwing out the less strong evidence and keeping the most strong.

Despite the fact that the experiments online aren't tightly controlled, we do have some evidence that is hard to dismiss. I am not going to link to any Youtube video, since I don't want to promote any Flat Earthers, but if you have been there you will know for yourself which evidence is the strongest. I shouldn't have to tell you. I wouldn't call any of them conclusive, but many are suggestive, and demand a more scientific response from the mainstream. With all the billions of dollars given to physics these days, it looks like they could run a few basic experiments like this. What I would like to see at the least is an honest experiment from someone NOT promoting Flat Earth. It may be up to one of my readers, since I found no experiment showing a positive result from a non-Flat Earther. You will say that is evidence enough against it, but I don't see it that way. As usual, I think we are getting misdirection from both sides, and I am taking a third side.

Yes, compiling all the partial evidence for and against here, I have come to the temporary conclusion this phenomenon is most likely true, though it is no evidence for Flat Earth. We are told by Flat Earthers that this result cannot be explained by science, which is not true since I am about to explain it. We are told by mainstream spokesmen like Mick West this is not to be seriously considered because it would overturn all of science. But that is not true, either. It requires one major fix, yes, but that is not an overturning of all of science. Although I have previously found a lot of major fixes, my intent was never “overturning mainstream science”. It was debugging and correcting mainstream science, so that it would be stronger. I am not “against the mainstream”. I am against false information, bad equations, and dishonest people. It is just sad that so much of the mainstream happens to fall into those categories. Like anyone else, I would prefer that the things I was taught were true. It would be so much easier, wouldn't it? It would save me a lot of time and effort. But that isn't the world we live in, unfortunately, so best admit it.

Anyway, now for the real meat of this paper. Those who read my [last paper on light theory](#) know how I

got here. They know I didn't get here by lounging around on Youtube, watching Flat Earth or SpaceX videos—which are about equally asinine. I got here because I have been working for about 18 years on photon and charge theory (charge is photons). Part of that theory concerns antiphotons, which are photons that are simply spinning opposite to photons. I have shown that 1/3 of the ambient light/charge field is antiphotons. I have shown that we have two major vortices here on Earth, with photons going in the south pole and antiphotons going in the north pole. They then recycle through the Earth as charge and heat, coming out everywhere—but most heavily in the north and at 30 degrees north and south. We have a similar recycling by the nucleus and by protons.

Well, I have also shown that in some situations antiphotons cause cooling. See for example my 2013 [paper on blackbody radiation as an attraction](#). There we see a spin cancellation causing less repulsion, which is equivalent to an apparent attraction. Such a spin cancellation would also cause cooling, since spin is a form of energy. When spins cancel, you get an energy drop. Less energy=less heat. So the same thing that would make antiphotons cause an apparent attraction also causes them to create cooling. We saw a similar thing in [my paper of the same year on Mercury's icecaps](#), where photons coming in the poles caused cooling. I didn't tie this to antiphotons there, but I should have, since the polar photons are acting like antiphotons. They are spinning down the local charge field, so they are *anti* that local field. Technically, they are antiphotons.

In many previous papers I have shown that all you have to do to make a photon an antiphoton is reverse its direction, as from left to right. This seemed curious to many, but it is simply a matter of logic. It is one of the basic rules of chirality, and I didn't invent it. The best way to see it is with a non-digital clock or watch. Hold the clock at arm's length and move it toward your face. Its hands are moving CW, of course. Now turn the clock around and move it away from your face. It is now CCW. The same clock has switched its chirality, and all you had to do is turn it over. It is the same with photons. Reflected photons become antiphotons, if you compare them to the original unreflected field.

I hope you can see how this affects the current question of Moonlight. You see the Moon because she is on the opposite side of the Earth from the Sun. She has to be, since if the Moon and Sun were on the same side, the light would be reflecting back to the Sun. You would never see it. So Moonlight is always coming from the opposite direction of Sunlight. This alone is enough to flip it. It doesn't have to be flipped in some fancy process at the surface of the Moon. All it has to do is bounce. The Moon's light is automatically antiphotonic simply because it is coming from the left when the Sun is right. In fact, *all light* coming from the direction of the Moon is antiphotonic, simply because it is coming from that direction. The light from the planets and stars, when falling at night, is also antiphotonic.

Which means. . . it doesn't matter if the Moon is up or not. We would get cooling from starlight and the planets, though not as much. For this reason, someone should have *predicted* long ago that Moonlight was cooling, and I am just dissappointed it wasn't me. I am getting to the party rather late, and I can only apologize by arriving with an explanation rather than a prediction. The explanation is that the opposing spins of those antiphotons at night tamp down the spins of the dominant photons in the field, causing cooling. We don't even need photon-antiphoton collisions, since antiphotons will spin down anything and everything they hit. All ions and nuclei in the field will have been spun up previously by the dominant Solar photons, and will therefore be spinning left, say. So whatever the right-spinning antiphotons now hit, they will spin down. This spin down is an energy loss, and thereby a heat loss.

This effect on Moonlight would be at a maximum at full Moon, but not only because that is when the reflected light is greatest. It is also important that light at that time is most antiphotonic. At full Moon, the Moon is directly opposite the Sun (or the most opposite it would be without being in Lunar eclipse).



In that position, we don't have to take any sines of angles, getting a reduction in opposition. In that case, the Moon is not “to the side” at all. For this reason, I can at least predict that the maximum cooling effect will be when the Moon is nearest Lunar eclipse without actually being eclipsed. No one else would think to predict that since they don't have my mechanics.

---

---

In fact, the mainstream admits that this cooling effect of light exists. Not only is it admitted that blackbody radiation causes an attraction, it is admitted that in many experiments the mainstream has found light causing cooling. See for example [this 2017 announcement at Physorg](#), which admits cooling was caused by sending photons *in*. Yes, they then try to fudge an answer with phonons (which are quasi-particles that do not exist), but the correct explanation involves my antiphotons. They say they are “squeezing light at a magic level”, but the mechanics of that are mystical in the extreme. All they need is a little simple spin mechanics to explain this directly, as I do.

You may also wish to visit the [Wikipedia page on laser cooling](#). Yes, that is “LASER COOLING”. And what does LASER stand for? Light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation. So light is being used for cooling. We are told there that cooling is achieved by a compression of velocity distribution, but that is more hedging. If you don't believe me, take the link there to “[doppler cooling](#)”, which is the most common form of laser cooling—known since 1978. We are told:

Thus if one applies light from two opposite directions, the atoms will always absorb more photons from the [laser](#) beam pointing opposite to their direction of motion. In each absorption event, the atom loses a [momentum](#) equal to the momentum of the photon. If the atom, which is now in the excited state, emits a photon spontaneously, it will be kicked by the same amount of momentum but in a random direction. The result of the absorption and emission process is a reduced speed of the atom, provided its initial speed is larger than the recoil [velocity](#) from scattering a single photon. If the absorption and emission are repeated many times, the mean velocity, and therefore the [kinetic energy](#) of the atom will be reduced.

Did you notice what they said about applying light from opposite directions? Isn't that what I just told you? If you apply light from opposite directions, you will have created antiphotons. When the photons and antiphotons come together, you will get cooling. But you will get it from the meeting of opposing spins and spin downs, not from this mess about velocity distributions. Just ask yourself whose theory is cleaner. They talk about atoms absorbing photons, but how do atoms absorb photons? We have no evidence atoms absorb photons, and a lot of evidence they don't. The primary evidence is that the theory is illogical and contradictory, as you can see here. We are told that in each absorption event, “the atom loses a momentum equal to the momentum of the photon”. What?! That isn't physics, that is antiphysics. If an atom absorbs a photon, wouldn't we expect it to *gain* the momentum of that photon? If the atom doesn't gain it, where does it go? The photon just lost it, because we just lost the photon. So if the atom also loses it, we have a doubled loss here. Energy has not been conserved.

You will say we have a velocity loss here, not an energy loss: the collision causes the atom to slow down—no problem there. Yes, but by keeping your eye on velocity or momentum, they have taken it off energy. Momentum is mass times velocity, so they get you thinking that if velocity drops, momentum must drop, and with it energy. Since the photon has no mass, you are led to believe that part of the equation just evaporates. But remember that the photon has a large mass equivalence due to its velocity  $c$  and the equation  $E=mc^2$ . The energy due to that mass equivalence can't just evaporate. If the atom absorbs the photon, it must also absorb that energy. Otherwise the equation has just been finessed. An atom cannot absorb a packet of energy and then have less energy than it had before, can

it? The very definition of “absorb” tells us that. So this talk of velocity is just misdirection. It doesn't matter if the atom is stopped cold by the photon collision: the atom has absorbed that energy regardless, by definition, and can't be less energetic than it was before the collision. Yes, it can have a very low *kinetic* energy, because it isn't moving linearly. But its *total* energy must go up. If its total energy has gone up, it can't be losing heat. You simply can't have atoms absorbing packets of energy and losing heat. It is the opposite of sense.

I will be told that heat is a function of linear kinetic energy, not total energy, but that is likewise anti-empirical. In other words, we have no evidence for that and tons of evidence against it. Solids, which have very little linear velocity of their atoms, nonetheless have a lot of energy readily available for heat, and I have told you why: that energy is real spin energy, and is therefore *kinetic* energy. Despite not being linear, it is caused by motion. *Circular* motion.

Therefore, we can see the mainstream is just performing another one of their tricks here. They slip in a bit of cooling where we would expect heating, and therefore seem to explain cooling by assuming what they are expected to show. They tell you an atom is cooled (has less momentum) when it absorbs a photon. But that is simply a contradiction in terms. An atom cannot be cooled by absorbing energy. An atom can only be cooled by losing either its linear energy or its spin energy. Unless it is a gas, it won't have much linear energy to start with, so we have to look to spin. Its spin energy can be lost only by being tamped down by an opposing spin, so if we are seeing energy losses in collisions, we have to be dealing with antiparticles—usually antiphotons.

But whether or not you understand what I just said there, you can go back to the fact the mainstream admits light can cause cooling. If it admits that, why do we get such stick-in-the-mud denial on the Moonlight question? Is it not possible the Moon causes a sort of doppler cooling? We are told

**Doppler cooling involves light with frequency tuned slightly below an [electronic transition](#) in an [atom](#).**

Well, maybe Moonlight has a frequency of that sort, eh? Maybe it then causes a compression of velocity distribution, and a reduced velocity of the atom by the absorption of a photon. Strange the mainstream proposes that mechanism with laser cooling, but isn't open to that possibility with Moonlight, isn't it?

The truth is, the same mechanism *is* at work in both laser cooling and Moonlight, but it isn't a compression of velocity. It is the interaction of antiphotons.

**[Addendum March 3, 2018:** While we are on this, you may also wish to visit [this page](#) at NASA called “Strange Moonlight”. There we learn that Moonlight “steals color” from everything it hits. Except blue. In the so-called Purkinje shift, if you stay outside for a while, your eyes become accustomed to the Moonlight, and you see more and more blue. We are told that the cause of this is that in low light situations, your eyes see with rods instead of cones, and rods are color blind. But of course that doesn't explain the blue, which science currently can't explain. As you now see, this explanation with rods being colorblind is unlikely to be true. It is not that we are blind to the reds, yellows and greens at night, it is that they aren't there for some reason. Problem with that theory is that spectrometers tell us the spectrum of the Moon is the same as the Sun, so for the machine the reds *are* there. So why would the machine tell us they are, and our eyes tell us they aren't? Well, again, it is because our eyes are tuned to both photons and antiphotons, while the machine isn't. The machine was built by people who didn't know about antiphotons, so it couldn't possibly be built to register them,

could it? The machine can't tell a left spin from a right spin, so all it can do is detect energy levels. If that energy level is present, it registers the color we have assigned to that energy. But our eyes don't see in such a simple way. Remember, except when we are looking right at the Moon, we don't see like the spectrometer sees. When we look right at the Moon, we see the full spectrum like the machine does, so we see her as a warm white. But when we look down at a red flower, we are seeing the light bounce off the flower. The bounce is an interaction, so we have to take that into account. Everything in the flower is photonic, or spinning left, while the Moonlight is spinning right. So the bounce will cause spin downs. The same thing that causes the cooling will also cause a color change. The light on the red end of the spectrum is less energetic, so it is affected by this spin down more than the more energetic blue light. Most of the less energetic light in red, yellow and green gets cancelled by the tamp down, while blue only gets partially cancelled. Some blue remains, leaving us with a dim bluish landscape.

This shows you why I said above that pointing our machines at the Moon was misdirection. Measuring the Moon directly isn't to the point, because that light hasn't interacted with anything here on Earth yet. We have to let the Moonlight bounce off objects here to understand this phenomenon.]

In conclusion, you can see that I have managed the astonishing feat of embracing Lunar cooling without embracing Flat Earth. Also as usual, I have managed to write 7 pages PDF without agreeing with anyone in any camp. Which is proof enough I am not part of some agenda. My only agenda is staying on the unused third path, which I have previously called the Third Wave. On this road I don't have to worry about dodging traffic from liars or fools of any stripe, since they are clogging up the main highways with their wrecks. On my stretch of clean dirt, all I need are my legs and my trusty machete.