

[return to updates](#)

ON WEAK ALLIES

by Miles Mathis

I have many great allies, and this paper is in no way aimed at them. But a recent email from someone who should have been an ally led me to write this. Here is the email:

You doubt science altogether too much. I believe you have a higher IQ than mine but if you won't bother to cooperate with somebody you will not see what they have hidden from us, the rest of the story, so you can bring the balance. It is a pity. In your personal life what are you searching for? It will be very difficult for the bureaucratic system to accept a different opinion like mine, it will be impossible to accept a total denier like you. You need to sort things out. Only if you read something from me you might get some answers.

I won't give his name, since I suspect this was just a momentary lashing out, and since I know he is fighting the mainstream like I am. I don't want to embarrass him or create an enemy for no reason, although he seems to think I have no problem with that. To understand this email, you have to know a bit of backstory. I get emails all the time from people like this that want me to read their papers, although they make it clear pretty quickly that they haven't read mine. He wanted me to read a paper on hidden variables. I told him I had already shown there are [no hidden variables](#), and gave him the links. [Just to be clear, I show that there are no hidden variables, since I have assigned them to *real* things. Some might think I am saying there are no hidden variables because current theory of non-locality is correct. No.] He then said he couldn't find that paper (although I gave him the direct link). He said his proof was simple and that it started from the Virial. I told him [the Virial was pushed](#), providing a link to that paper. That was too much for him, and he exploded as above.

I hope you can see that the logical thing for him to do would be to show me that my Virial proof was wrong, or that my non-locality paper was flawed, sending me to his papers for confirmation of that. Instead, I got the very strange email above. I don't know what he thinks this has to do with my personal life. My personal life is hardly affected by what I put on the internet. That is my professional life. If he means my "inner life" or something like that, my inner life isn't determined in the least by what "the bureaucratic system accepts." As I have stated outloud in many papers, I am not even trying to convince the mainstream leaders of anything—but especially not the bureaucrats (he probably needs to look up the definition of "bureaucrat"). I am driving around them, trying to talk to people anywhere and everywhere who have sense. If some of them are in academia, fine. If not, fine. Obviously, I don't care what the mainstream gatekeepers think of me. If I did, I wouldn't be doing what I do.

That isn't completely true, of course. I *want* the mainstream gatekeepers to hate me. I want to give them all ulcers. I want to goad them into acting even more unscientific than they already are, saying as many stupid things as possible, so that I can respond. But as for caring what they think, not at all.

According to my friend above, "I need to sort things out." If I don't agree with him, I must have mental problems. If I don't agree with the mainstream OR with him, I really must be cracked. Anyone who finds more errors in the mainstream than him, regardless of IQ, must be off the rails. In this he is just

joining his enemies. He can't respond to me logically or scientifically, with any content, so he resorts to slurs based on nothing.

Hopefully, with more analysis in a cooler moment, he will remember that this is supposed to be science we are talking about, not a church picnic. Our concern as scientists isn't getting "accepted by the bureaucratic system," it is discovering and telling the truth. If that truth takes us very far from the mainstream, so be it. The truth is what it is, and it isn't influenced at all by what the mainstream happens to be selling this decade or century.

You should also remember that I don't send my papers to anyone, enemy or ally. I gave up on that years ago. I simply post them, and those who are interested can read them. Those who aren't can go elsewhere. *Very* rarely I drop someone a link, as I did recently in Glasgow, but that is usually at the request of a reader. I have such a distaste for the current salesmanship in physics that I can't even stomach doing my own PR. In my opinion, the ideas should sell themselves—in the old format of a paper—and if they can't, OK. I am a thinker and a writer, not a marketing executive, video producer, or professional lecturer. And, as it turns out, the ideas *are* selling themselves amazingly well. I get a lot of hits, which is why I have to field emails like the ones above.

The emailer implies that I am too into myself to forge alliances, but that isn't true, either. I have published several papers by other scientists, and have recommended to other readers—who send me ideas—that they write something I can put up. Sometimes they do, usually they prefer not to. But of course if you want me to publish something you have written, you are going to have to write on something I haven't already hit, or show me you have done it better than I have. I suspect (and hope) that will happen more and more in the future, but those who send me things can't expect that I will agree with everything I see. Being human, sometimes I don't even have time to look, and sometimes, yes, I will miss things that are really important. That will be unfortunate, but even in that case, we must remember that it is not my responsibility to publish all important papers from everyone. Those who have important papers can build a website as easily as I have, and I will be happy to link to it.

While I am here under this particular title, I want to take this opportunity to exhort my allies in the mainstream and in academia to speak out more. Despite what my friend says above about the mainstream never accepting me, I happen to know that a percentage of academic physicists are already reading me with interest, though so far very quietly. I know that geologists are reading me, and that chemists are reading me, and that mathematicians are reading me. But I also know they are afraid to speak out. They are afraid of those leading their fields, who rule over them with only the pretense of academic freedom and free speech. Well, you all know your positions better than I do, and many of you may only be biding your time, waiting for the right moment to rebel. But if you aren't supporting me openly, I hope you are at least talking amongst yourselves, planning a future revolution, and pushing back now to the extent you can. I know that just changing the way you look at your leaders is a great first step, and that it will lead to actions small and large, premeditated and unpremeditated. I am creating the cracks in the wall that you must walk through, and you will decide when to walk through them.

In this sense alone, my friend above is dead wrong: the more cracks the better. The more evidence of fraud I can compile, the stronger my overall argument becomes. And the more cracks I show, the more opportunities for escape from the current prison there will be. What is a passable crack to a physicist may not be a passable crack for a chemist or geologist or astronomer. So although I hit a lot of topics to keep myself fresh, this method has the welcome side effect of creating many points of weakness in the current edifice, points of exit from many cells. After a decade, my papers are starting to have the

effect of a colony of termites on a wooden penitentiary, and the guards hardly have enough planks or nails to fill all the escape holes. In truth, the integrity of the entire structure has been compromised, and a collapse is imminent. It would probably be best for the inmates to get out before they get trapped under the falling rubble.