Ballooning Spiders
as Proof of my Charge Field

by Miles Mathis

First published January 6, 2020

I am getting to this about a year and a half late, but better late than never. I don't read mainstream magazines, online or off, so as usual I have had to rely on a reader to prompt me. In July of 2018, all the mainstream outlets reported that it had been proved ballooning (flying) spiders were using not wind, but the Earth's electric field to fly. In these reports, we are told physicist Peter Gorham had resurrected an old 19th century prediction in 2013, showing mathematically that flight using the electrical field was possible. What they don't tell you is that I beat him to the punch by several years, and that this new finding bolsters my charge field theories as presented in several papers previous to 2013.

Among these papers are my lift paper of 2012, my pressure flow paper of 2011, my paper on atmospheric pressure from 2009, my paper on the Allais Effect from 2008, and my paper called "The Moon Gives up a Secret" from 2005. In the 2011 paper, I show the rise of water in the xylem is caused not by pressure flow, but by the charge field. Since charge is rising straight up out of the Earth at all times, the plant can use it to move water up to the leaves. In other words, I show it can be used for levitation, under the right circumstances. In the 2009 paper, I do the math for a second time, showing the speed of this charge field is .0095m/s^2. That is, it can be written as a fraction of gravity, and treated as such. In the atmosphere, it acts in the reverse direction of gravity. And again, it can be used for levitation. I show this is how the Earth levitates the atmosphere, since the effective weight of gasses matches their charge lift. In my 2012 paper "Lift on a Wing" I make the same argument, but apply it to airplanes rather than gasses. There we see that planes fly not due to unequal winds speeds top and bottom of the wing, but due to charge lift. So it is curious to find Peter Gorham applying this to spiders in 2013, don't you think? Coincidence?

At the end of the Allais Effect paper, I show how the Podkletnov Effect works, using the rising charge field and accelerating it with spinning magnets and supercooling. But I think the first time I mentioned this was in that 2005 paper on the Moon, where I did the math showing the Moon has an even greater rising charge field than the Earth, as a matter of charge density on the surface of the Moon. I showed how to simply and quickly separate the charge field from the unified field and gravity, by looking only at mainstream numbers for mass and density. That is where I first obtained the number .009545 for the charge field of the Earth, which I later confirmed in unrelated math in the paper on the atmosphere. I proved that the charge field was rising, therefore opposite to gravity.

So although it looks like Gorham may have borrowed this idea from me, he still gets it wrong. It isn't "static" electricity in the atmosphere, or even "the Earth's static atmospheric electric field", that is the fundamental cause of spider flight. It is rising charge that causes all instances of levitation in the atmosphere, including this one. In the article at the *Atlantic*, Ed Yong, explaining the theory of Erica Morley and Daniel Robert, says

Every day, around 40,000 thunderstorms crackle around the world, collectively turning Earth's atmosphere into a giant electrical circuit. The upper reaches of the atmosphere have a positive charge, and the planet's surface has a negative one. Even on sunny days with cloudless skies, the air carries a voltage of around 100 volts for every meter above the ground. In foggy or stormy conditions, that gradient might increase to tens of thousands of volts per meter.

That is wrong, because technically the upper atmosphere does not have a positive charge. The surface does not have a negative charge. Charge isn't moving up due to potentials of that sort, although it *is* moving up. As I have shown in dozens of papers, ions (mostly electrons) move up not because the upper atmosphere is attracting them with an opposite charge, but because they are being driven up by real charge photons. Protons are also moving up, driven by the same photons, and their rise cannot be explained by an opposite potential. The potential is either positive or negative, and cannot be both at the same time. All ions are simply lifted by this photon wind. The potential looks like it does simply because more electrons are lifted. There are more of them and they are easier to lift.

And what causes the photon wind? Charge recycling by the Earth. The Earth pulls in these charge photons from the Sun, taking them in her poles and re-emitting them everywhere (but most heavily 30 degrees north and south). The Earth is a huge charge engine. In fact, *everything* is a charge engine, from the electron to the galaxy. Everything is recycling charge, using spin to do it.

So strictly, spiders aren't ballooning on the planetary electrical field. They are ballooning on the charge field. But since they are also using rising electrons to balloon, we could say they are using the electrical field as well. But since the electrical field is ballooning on the charge field, it is more precise to say that everything is being levitated by charge. Again, charge is photons, electricity is ions. The fields often go together, but they aren't equivalent. You *can* have charge without electricity.

We also find this in the article at *The Atlantic*:

Ballooning spiders operate within this planetary electric field. When their silk leaves their bodies, it typically picks up a negative charge. This repels the similar negative charges on the surfaces on which the spiders sit, creating enough force to lift them into the air.

Wrong again. The silk is used mainly as a sail, although electrons are definitely used as the wind. First, the emitted silk increases the spider's cross section without increasing its mass. The silk was inside the spider, remember, so the spider is basically spreading himself out. Lowering his density. In this way he can capture a larger section of rising charge, and thereby rising ions. Yes, the silk will capture (absorb) a number of electrons, giving it a greater negative charge, but this is slightly counter-productive. The spider doesn't want to *capture* electrons, he only wants them to bounce off him from below, driving him up. But electrons weigh so little it doesn't make much difference whether they bounce off or get absorbed. What is more important is that both the spider and the silk do not conduct on the z-axis. The spider wants to be completely non-conductive in the vertical, so that electrons *have* to hit him. So what is more important than negative or positive charge is *direction* of conduction. The spider and the silk have to resist vertical conduction as much as possible. This is why I believe the spider must be capable of molecular manipulation, of the same sort we saw in the xylem. In the same way that chameleons can change color, I predict it will be found that the underside of the spider is able to create charge resistance, via transportation of molecules like K+, salts, etc. In the case of the spider, it will be found that this manipulation creates the opposite effect of that in the xylem. In the xylem, this manipulation creates vertical conduction, assisting the charge that is already rising. In the spider belly, this manipulation creates *horizontal* conduction, creating strong charge paths moving across the

rising charge field, and blocking it. This manipulation acts like the MU-metal on airplane wings, which does the same thing. We saw in my paper on lift that this metal on the wings is useful only in the horizontal, since in that position it creates conduction at a right angle to rising charge, acting to partially block it. Only blocked charge can create levitation, you see. The rising photons and ions have to *hit* something in order to drive it up. If they are conducted, they don't hit. They pass. So the spider or airplane wants to create long paths, not short paths. It wants to create horizontal paths, not vertical paths.

By the way, it looks like my reader sent me here because Getpocket just republished this old story from *The Atlantic*. I just said a few weeks ago that Getpocket's propaganda would reverse on them, and we see another case of it here.