return to updates

The new LED bulb taps the Charge Field

by Miles Mathis

The editor of my last book, Joe Hyde, sends me several links a week, to keep me properly primed. This is one from last month (yes, I am falling behind). An article at PhysicsCentral tells us of the new LED bulb, which they claim has an efficiency of 200%. Of course that is just hyperbole, and they admit it. They aren't claiming to break the conservation laws. The number 200% is found by showing that the energy output is twice the *electrical* energy input. But they admit that the difference is made up by quantum heat energy. This is what I wish to comment on, because I don't think they fully understand where this quantum heat is coming from. It is coming from the charge field. The LED bulb is direct proof of my charge theory.

Here is how they explain the extra energy:

What is happening in this system is that the LED, a semiconductor diode, is not only having electrical energy transferred to it. It is also having heat energy transferred to it by transforming some of its thermal energy. Thermal energy is the jiggling around of the atoms that make this solid semiconductor, and the average jiggling around (average motion energy) is what we call the temperature of the object. The solid has a crystalline structure or repeating pattern that is called the lattice, and it has certain vibrations that are allowed. These vibrations make up some of the jiggling, and it is this vibrational lattice energy that is being transferred to some of the outer electrons in the material to move them up to a set of very closely spaced energy levels called a band. As the atoms and its parts jiggle less the LED cools down. It transforms this thermal energy and the electrical energy to near infrared radiation energy. When the lattice energy is transformed in this way, it is said that heat energy is transferred.

Except for the last part, that is close to correct. But even the correct part begs the question: what is causing the jiggling? If you have read my paper on heat, you know that I have answered this question. The charge field is causing this jiggling. The atoms are in a field of photons, and the photons are colliding physically with the atoms, causing both vibrations and charge channeling. So, if we wish to be more rigorous, we must say that the heat is coming from the photons, not the atoms. The ultimate source of the missing energy is not jiggling atoms, it is moving photons. It is the charge field.

This is important because it shows that this light bulb is actually tapping the charge field. In this way, the bulb *could* be said to be tapping "zero-point energy." I have shown in other papers that there is no zero-point energy, because there is no zero point and no vacuum energy. It is not zero-point energy that solves most current problems and conundrums and equation failures, it is the charge field. But because the charge field is misunderstood, misdefined, and is left out of the current field equations, its power is variously given to dark matter, zero-point energy, Majorana fermions, or other manufactured fields and particles.

I say that the last part of the quote above is wrong, because they are inventing a middle step where they don't need one. They tell us that electrons move up into a band. Then, as the LED cools, this energy is transformed into near-infrared. I am not sure that makes any sense, because it would require the bulb to cycle on and off. But even if the bulb does that, it isn't any movement of electrons that is causing the near-infrared energy they are seeing or calculating. This near-infrared energy is just one more sign of my charge field, since I have already shown in many places that the charge field peaks in the near-infrared. I have "shown this" by developing the simple equations that prove it. So they are seeing near-infrared energy precisely because they are tapping the charge field.

In fact, that is what piqued my interest in scanning the article the first time. **Near-infrared energy**. To me that is like a big white flag with colored circles on it, waving me in.

So the LED is not transforming the electrical and thermal energy into near-infrared energy. The charge field is *already* near-infrared, so it is the charge field that is transforming the local and input energy into its own profile. They have it backwards, as usual.

You see, using their explanation, there is no answer to the question, "why near-infrared?" Their only answer is, "Because heat is infrared." But that is circular. They are just calling the discovered output energy heat, and they are calling it heat only because it is infrared. That begs the question again, or two questions. 1) Why is quantum or atomic heat infrared? 2) Why is the output here infrared? Why are the electrons falling from one level to another, and why is the difference in levels equal to near-infrared wavelength?

My quantum spin equations allow me to answer all these seemingly esoteric or intractable questions. Heat is infrared because it is caused by the charge field. The energy level differential is near-infrared because the energy level differential is caused by the charge field. And the charge field is near-infrared because that wavelength is $8c^2$ times the radius of the individual charge photon. Yes, all this is determined by the real radius of the real photon, which is on the order of 10^{-24}m.

Finally, I can tell you why the photon has that radius. It is because all the quantum particles are functions of one another. The universal gravitational constant G was my key to all this, since it is telling us the photon is G times smaller than the nucleon. G acts as a field transform in the equation between the gravity field and the charge field, which means that Newton's equation was already unified from the beginning. This also ties into the number 1821, which is the size differential between the nucleon and electron. The charge photon is two of those levels below the electron. In other words,

$1/G \approx (2.5)1821^3$

[I explain the number 2.5 in an another paper.] These new equations not only provide field unification, they explain the near-infrared energy we are seeing from this light bulb. I have discovered the mechanical relationships that tie all these wavelength, radius, and constant numbers together, so I can

see when the charge field is causing energy levels directly.

I am not convinced we have any movement of electrons in bands here, but even if we do, we have to ask why the movement is quantized as it is. Say they are right and the electrons are moving up and down in bands, taking in energy and releasing it. Why does the band differential create an infrared wavelength rather than any other? An electrical input to a bulb or other device does not normally preferentially create near-infrared energy. They will tell me it is because the feedback is atomic heat here, and atomic heat is near-infrared; but again, why? Why do atoms jiggling create near-infrared energy? They dodge the question, while I answer it.

An even better question is where this extra energy is coming from. We have an extra 100% energy seeming to come from nowhere. Telling us it is coming from atoms jiggling or electrons moving up and down in bands only seems to answer the question, but it is really misdirection. Say we accept their analysis, and confirm that this atomic heat is causing the second 100%. The question is begged, what is causing this atomic heat. They have to point to the electrical input, since it is the only initial energy change. But then the electrical input is causing two separate effects, each effect being 100% of the input. That doesn't make any sense, and it *does* break the conservation of energy law. The electrical input can't be causing the atomic heat, or any *change* in atomic heat. If the electrical input was causing any part of an atomic heat change, that electrical input would be used up and couldn't also cause the light we see (the first 100%, you know).

To clarify what I mean here, let us return to the quote above. Notice they are proposing heat or thermal *changes*. The electrons are moving up and down from one level to another. That isn't just jiggling, like Brownian motion or something; that requires an ambient field *change*. It requires input changes. But I just showed that we can't have any input change here, at least not electrical. So their analysis cannot be correct. The numbers don't add up.

We *must* have input from another source. The second 100% cannot be coming from the electrical input, or from any changes to the electrical input. It also can't come from electrons moving up and down in levels or bands, since we would require energy to bump them up. The analysis above gives us no energy input to do that. So in the current analysis, the source of the second 100% remains a mystery. They have only pretended to tell you where it is coming from, but a closer look shows how they fail. Without the charge field providing a constant input, neither atomic heat nor the 200% output here can be explained mechanically.

This is of paramount importance, because it leads us back to the giant hole in quantum mechanics. QM, QED, and QCD, as they exist now, create energy changes only by electron changes. That is, any field change has to be produced, in the first instance, by electrons moving from one level to another, and thereby releasing or absorbing real or virtual photons. But that has always been an effect with no cause. What causes the electron to move in the first place? That question is almost never asked, and when it is, it is implied that a stray photon starts the process, by bumping the electron. I have shown that isn't the way it works, and we can see that again here with the LED bulb. Stray photons can't add 100% efficiency to a small collection of atoms in bulb. Only the charge field can, and a very powerful charge field at that.

Current theory either treats charge as some virtual characteristic that particles like electrons and protons mysteriously own, or they treat it as a real but extrinsic characteristic, like a coat of black or white paint, or like a yin or yang t-shirt. But that isn't what charge is. Charge exists in the field outside of particles as well as inside, and it exists even when there are no charged particles in the field. Particles

only recycle this charge, they do not create it. So the field of charge photons is a huge pool of energy, with 19 times the mass equivalence of the particles that are normally in it. Because this pool of energy isn't normally tapped by lightbulbs or other manmade devices, we tend to ignore it. We have also come to ignore it in quantum and celestial interactions, because we long ago dissolved it in our field equations, and have never understood it was there. So when we see clear evidence of the charge field in data, we give that data instead to dark matter, the Higgs field, symmetry breaking, WIMPs, or exotic fermions, bosons, and virtual or quasi particles.

The time has come to end this blindness. Now that we are actually tapping the charge field with simple appliances, it is time to recognize the charge field. That can only be done by pulling apart the field equations, as I have, showing that charge has existed in them all along.