

[return to updates](#)

The Moon's Ionosphere

as proof of charge recycling



by Miles Mathis

First published March 27, 2013

Lunar Ionosphere. Around forty years ago, it was discovered the Moon had a strong ionosphere, with at least 1,000 electrons per cubic centimeter. They tell you that is a thousand times more than current theory can explain, but even that is a fudge. Since they find a thousand electrons where they shouldn't find any, they tell you their margin of error is a thousand. But finding a thousand electrons where there shouldn't be any isn't a miss by a factor of 1,000. It is a miss by infinity. How much bigger is 1,000 than zero? The number 1,000 is 1,000 times bigger than 1. It is not 1,000 times bigger than 0. These guys don't ever know how to do math, but they are especially forgetful when they are telling you how wrong they are.

In 2011, they finally got around to covering this embarrassing hole with an equally embarrassing patch. Tim Stubbs from Goddard SFC published a solution using moondust as the source of all this ionization. [According to the reports at NASA](#), moondust is supposed to be ionized by UV radiation from the Sun. That's it. That's the whole theory. The report ends with this, "Updates may be expected in less than 40 years." Hah-hah, right? But I suspect they said the same thing over 40 years ago, when they first reported this. They probably told all the magazines that they would have an explanation within months, as they always do. Forty years later, we finally get an explanation, and it is one word long: *moondust*. Moondust, fairydust; potāto, potāto.

I encourage you to read this NASA report closely. Where does Stubbs get his "data".

He read the accounts of Apollo 15 astronauts who reported seeing a strange glow over the Moon's horizon. Many researchers believe the astronauts were seeing moondust.

Notice that the astronauts neither reported a glow as due to dust, nor confirmed it was due to dust. They said nothing about dust, only about a glow. Later researchers added the moondust part. Based on what? Were air samples taken? No. Stubbs admits in his abstract,

This possibility is examined here using the exospheric dust abundances inferred from Apollo 15 coronal photographs to estimate the concentration of electrons produced by photo- and secondary emission from dust. So again, we see him “inferring” dust abundances based on coronal photos taken in 1971! I point out two things: 1) we have no *evidence* the glow is caused by dust, 2) we have much better data from more recent flybys, so why is he basing this all on photos from 1971? I shouldn't have to remind you that we have fantastic maps of the lunar surface and lunar gravity field and so on (see [my paper on GRAIL](#) from January of this year). We have multiple flybys and atmospheric data sets on the moons of Saturn and Uranus and Neptune, for crying out loud. Why would we need to rely on coronal photos of the Moon from 1971? This was 2011, remember. Don't you think if all that dust that Stubbs is “inferring” was really up there, Japan's Kaguya, China's Chang'e, India's Chandrayaan, NASA's ARTEMIS and NASA's LRO would have said something about it? Something like, “Hey, we can't see shit for all the dust up here!”

Despite all these lunar orbiters, we have no updates since 2011. I should say we have no updates since 2009, since that is when Stubbs [first came up with this ridiculous idea](#). The mainstream only decided to report on it in late 2011. Almost four years later and many lunar orbiters later, we still have to rely on photos from 1971. Why is that? Can't one of these orbiters stick a cup out the window and tell us how much dust is actually in the lunar “atmosphere.” I'm kidding, of course, but they have hundreds of ways of testing the lunar exosphere for this dust, and the fact that we have no data just means they don't wish to give us any. In other words, they know damn well Stubbs' theory is garbage, but because it is better than nothing (they think), you can expect them to keep reporting it and running interference for it. As with a thousand other theories, they think it is better to hide and misdirect than to admit the truth. If they just admit that their gravity-only field theories can't explain anything that is happening in the Solar System, the galaxy, or the universe, then they have to open up astronomy and physics to new ideas. I don't see any sign of them doing that, despite all the lip service they give to openness and democracy and so on.

But before we get to the obvious explanation for the ionosphere of the Moon, let us poke a few more holes in the current theory. Since the Moon has no wind, how does this dust get stirred into space when we aren't there to stir it up with our boots and little carts? The Moon's gravity would settle it very fast, so under normal conditions, there should be no dust.

Another very obvious problem is the height of the dust. With no wind, no thermals, and no convection, any dust magically produced would have to stay very near the surface. And yet we know from Stubbs' [own paper](#) that the lunar ionosphere peaks in strength at about 5km. How is moon dust stirred into empty space to an altitude of 5km? Why is this moon dust immune to the Moon's gravity?

Even if Stubbs had been able to prove dust at 5km, he would have needed to show how it got there. Since UV radiation is coming *down*, it is unlikely that the UV radiation drove the dust *up*. Stubbs has actually covered a smaller problem by creating a larger problem. An atmosphere of dust, being heavier, is much harder to explain with gravity-only than an ionosphere of light electrons, especially at 5km. Stubbs might have used coherent interference (see opposition surge) to fudge a lifting of electrons by reflected photons. But it would be difficult to get enough coherent interference from photons to cause them to lift dust into the air. That is a lot of work to ask of the photoelectric effect. If we do find some confirmation of glow on the horizon of the Moon, I predict it will be found to be caused by charge ionization, not by dust.

And finally, why is Stubbs using UV radiation for his fudge here? He should study older and more

“successful” fudges that use cosmic radiation instead. The mainstream already uses cosmic rays for everything from cloud formation to lightning creation. Surely he could push some computer models to make use of these cosmic rays in a similar fashion to increase his ion production? And what about radioactive isotopes? Dynamos in the core? These are the go-to fudges when you are trying to ignore the charge field (see [my paper on the Earth's heat](#) for more on this).

OK, let's move on. The reason this gets more absurd every year is that they have a simple explanation for this staring them right in the face. I have shown they have clear evidence of the charge field in thousands of their own mainstream experiments and equations. I have already cataloged literally hundreds in the past decade, in lengthy papers, pointing it out to them in clear language, diagrams, and equations. I suspect the ones who have read my papers know by now I am right. But the field as whole can't come over to my side because it seems too embarrassing. They have been living on bluster for decades and it is hard to turn off the wind machine when you have had it on that long. They have been propping up the gravity-only model since Newton, and the parts of it that weren't already set in stone in 1900 were thought to have been cemented in by Einstein by 1915. They figured it was all a done deal by about 1920, and the last thing they want to do is rewrite the old field equations. They don't really *want* a unified field, despite all we hear. They are quite comfortable with the compartmentalization they have, and the specialization it allows. Any simplification of theory just threatens them with job loss. That is how they see it.

Plus, they have been existing under a grave misconception for a century. They had thought that unification would just be some method of joining the *math* of quantum physics with the math of celestial physics. They hadn't realized it would require joining the *fields*. In other words, it doesn't seem to have occurred to anyone that unification implied the existence of charge at the celestial level, and the existence of gravity at the quantum level. Any layman would see that immediately—since that is what the very word “unification” implies—but the specialists missed it from the start.

You see, the answer to the Moon's ionosphere is in its charge field. As hard as it may be to believe, the mainstream doesn't recognize that the Moon has a charge field. It thinks only electrons and protons have charge fields. It knows full well that the Moon is made up of protons and electrons, and that every atom in the Moon has a charge field at all times; but it has never thought to sum up. If the charge field exists at the quantum level, and the macrolevel is composed of the quantum level, how can the macrolevel fail to have a charge field? The Moon must have a charge field of its own, a field which is simply the sum of its atomic charge fields.

Given that, we then see that large bodies with charge fields must influence one another just as small bodies with charge fields influence one another. Just as the electron and proton influence one another, so must the Sun and Moon and Earth. In other words, the Moon must not only have its own atomic charge field, it must be receiving charge from nearby bodies that also have charge fields. The Moon, like the Earth, is recycling charge it receives from the Sun. Due to its spherical shape and axial spin, the Moon tends to pull in charge at its poles and re-emit that charge most heavily at its equator. Again, that is due only to rules of angular momentum.

With an ambient charge field and charge recycling, we would actually *expect* the Moon to have an ionosphere. The mainstream didn't expect one only because they were ignorant of the charge field. What we are seeing is not UV ionization of dust. We are seeing ions pushed up from the surface by a rising charge field. The Moon has no wind, but it does have rising charge—as all bodies do. This

charge actually acts as an extremely fine wind blowing straight up. This wind isn't strong enough to do much, but it is strong enough to lift electrons. On the Earth, the charge field is strong enough to lift small molecules near the surface, but on the Moon the charge field is somewhat weaker. Even so, it lifts electrons easily, and is fully capable of seeding an ionosphere, up to any altitude you like.

And, since the Moon's gravity is weaker, even a weaker rising charge can seem relatively powerful. With less force down, the same force up can do that much more.

I can even explain why the lunar ionosphere peaks at 5km and starts to drop after that. It is because the ionosphere follows the photonosphere, like everywhere else. In other words, the Moon's charge field remains the major player up to 5km, but above that, the lunar charge field begins to dissipate due to distance from the surface. The density of the lunar charge field falls continuously as we move up, until it begins to be overwhelmed by the charge fields of Earth and Sun. The ions start to get blown away by one or the other.

Since the mainstream knows quite a bit about the Earth's ionosphere and magnetosphere, it should already know this. Problem is, it never dug deep enough into the causes of both. It just measures them and maps them, but never thinks to ask what drives them. We know that the Earth's ions move in particular patterns and reside in particular places, but why? Ions aren't self-propelled. They can only follow fields. What causes the fields? Current theory gives field creation to the dynamo in the core, which theory acts to cover up the real answer. Ions are driven by the Earth's charge field, and the Earth's charge field is a response to the Sun's charge field. The Earth isn't *creating* the fields in its core. The Earth is pulling external charge in through its poles, *which then go through the core* as they are recycled back to the surface. Yes, the core is then heated and energized by this, but so is everything else on the Earth. A large part of the heat on the surface is due to this recycling, and not to surface heating by the Sun directly.

If you need equations, I have already provided them [in previous papers](#). I have provided the world—free of charge—with unified field equations that really work. I have used these unified field equations in hundreds of current and historical problems, showing that they work far better than textbook equations. I have already used them to explain [Bode's law](#), [axial tilt](#), [planetary magnetism](#), a correction to [the Lagrangian](#), the [galactic rotation problem](#), the [dark matter problem](#), the [vacuum catastrophe](#), and dozens and dozens of others.

This is not an esoteric theory. It doesn't even extrapolate very far from historical theory. It is just a logical extension of many things we already know—things fully accepted and documented by the mainstream. It is also not complex. It is far simpler and more rational than the theories that are floated by the mainstream. It doesn't require any borrowing from the vacuum, symmetry breaking, hidden sector particles, renormalization, [coherent interference](#), [magical scattering](#), wormholes, backward causality, many worlds, or 11-dimensional math. It only requires making sense and being mechanical at each all all points in the theory. Anyone with an ounce of foresight can see that it is bound to triumph over the ridiculous mainstream models, and if avoiding embarrassment is the plan, the smart thing to do would be to switch over as soon as possible. The embarrassment to the mainstream will only grow with each passing day and year—with each paper I am forced to write—and those who make the decision to cut their losses now will someday look like heroes. The only way to avoid my fusillade is to be standing beside me.