

CHARGE IS FUNDAMENTAL

by Miles Mathis

First published March 16, 2022

In response to [my paper of January 26 on the X particle](#), PBS Spacetime has just published [a new video at Youtube](#) entitled *What if Charge is not Fundamental?* It has allegedly gotten over 100,000 views in just six hours, and almost 10,000 thumbs-up, with **zero thumbs-down**. Impossible, so we know the numbers are faked. This is also more proof PBS is a front for the billionaires and is NOT public broadcasting or a service, since this video is obvious promotion of theories and people already enshrined for many decades. Which is not science, public or otherwise. It is transparent propaganda. It is the effort to salvage old Nobel Prizes that are now tarnished and worthless.

Murray Gell-Mann is the recipient of most of the smelly attempts at promotion here, which is not surprising, since I hit him hard in my paper. [I have been bludgeoning his ghost since 2008](#), and now, only a few years after his death in 2019, his legacy has completely evaporated. Only the mainstream report of it is lacking, although insiders are well aware of it. I assume that they either know I am right or that they are in therapy, or both.

But that doesn't stop these agents like Matt O'Dowd, who I assume is just following orders and trying to read his scripts without chuckling at how bad they are. He has been instructed to keep selling the unsalable, while continuing the pretense I don't exist. Those behind him are wildly dishonest and wholly uninterested in truth, data, or science, as we have seen many times before. Theirs is a science driven by money alone, so they protect their current schemes to the bitter end. And this end is looking very bitter for them indeed, since they already know a whole century of their top people have been beaten easily by one artist on a mac mini. Whether my name ever makes the front pages is beside the point, since they know it regardless. It has happened and they cannot unhappen it. It will eat at their tiny spirits til the end.

They could have avoided the greater part of this infamy if they had welcomed my arrival years ago, being fair and cordial and scientific. Instead they decided to block and libel me, calling me childish names and sicking their wolves at Google and Youtube and Facebook on me—like the nains they are. So if you are wondering at my present attitude, wonder not: it is far from undeserved. Dealing with these people for two decades, I have earned my rancor.

And, to tell the truth, it was all for the best. If they had brought me into the fold from the start, I wouldn't have done a tenth of the revolutionary work I have. It was my absolute freedom that took me where I went.

Even now, the [Air Force has taken over sunspot counting](#) from NASA and NOAA to try to bury my Solar Cycle prediction from 2014. They are miscounting sunspots on purpose, simply to try to push numbers toward their own predictions and away from mine. It isn't working, though it is instructive. They have already [faked the Solar Minimum date](#), using an embarrassing 13-month data smooth to move the minimum forward a year, from 2018 to 2019. Why? Because they had predicted 2020 while I predicted 2018.

They are doing the same sort of data-hide in many subfields, to keep eyes off the fact I have revolutionized physics in the past two decades. They are [hiding my nuclear diagrams](#), they are hiding my [dark matter solution](#), they are hiding [my unification](#), they are hiding my [Bode solution](#), they are hiding [my explanation of superposition](#), and literally dozens of other huge things, simply to save face and protect their expensive funding. And they are doing it here at PBS on this question of charge. They chose that title “Charge is not Fundamental” precisely because [I have proven that it IS](#). The video was clearly made in response to my recent paper.

But as in all other fields right now, what the powers-that-be are doing reeks of desperation. They are in a freefall of historical proportions and can't think of anything else to do than bluff and lie. They could have backed off decades ago, but they decided to keep doubling down on the lies. With each new round of claims, they look more absurd and more weak and more disturbed.

In this current Youtube video, notice how O'Dowd never defines hypercharge or isospin. He is supposed to be explaining what charge is, or explaining why it is not fundamental, but he never get to that, does he? He just creates a couple of new terms to replace charge, but they remain floaters. There is no mechanics or dynamics involved. Just a slur from one undefined term to a new pair of undefined terms. He even admits that halfway through, saying that isospin and hypercharge are—like charge—just mathematical abstractions in current theory, claiming we need “something deeper”. But does he go deeper? No, he just goes sideways into quarks, though he never gets around to explaining how quarks create charge either. The closest he gets is telling us charge is an “emergent quality” of quarks. More blather, in other words.

Directly after that, he tells us that after experiments in the Stanford Linear Accelerator in 1968, “the reality of quarks quickly became conclusive”. Except that. . . [they didn't](#). Now, 54 years later, no one has ever seen *any* evidence of a quark. Not one quark has ever been seen. Ever. So, as I said, this is just the continuation of a long bluff. Charge is explained by quarks because they tell you it is. Gell-Mann is important because they say he is. When you ask for anything more solid, they got nothing. Just word salads in circles.

The last third of the video really goes off the rails, since O'Dowd now tells us that it is weak theory that explains charge, *not* quarks. This is all relatively new theory, since it wasn't what we were taught. Historically, the weak force wasn't used this way. In fact, there was a period recently when the mainstream tried to back out of the weak force, calling it just a subset of EM. Like Pluto being downgraded to a dwarf planet, it was downgraded from a weak force to a weak *interaction*. But I guess that after I [destroyed both the weak force](#) and the [strong force](#), they decided to re-animate the weak for this new purpose, refudging the previous fudges.

O'Dowd begins the big lie by telling us that the weak force is unlike other forces in that it can transform particles into other particles. That's convenient. How does it do that? Well, apparently it only works on left-handed particles. Why, and how does that explain charge? The left-electron can emit a W-boson and [become a neutrino](#). OK, so how does that explain charge? I thought neutrinos were chargeless—hence the name—and it seems like creating charge with chargeless particles might be difficult. Well, no, ignore that, they create charge by allowing us to coin a new undefined term called [weak-isospin](#).

If your head isn't isospinning by this point, the fake theorists haven't done their jobs. The whole point, as usual, is to get you so confused you will just accept anything they tell you. If they coin enough stupid new terms and uncaused events and data-less assumptions, your brain will eventually lock down.

The only way you can go on is to assume these people know something you don't. And they do. They know how to keep bluffing until you cry Uncle.

Anyway, at minute 10:51 O'Dowd tells us weak-isospin is the charge carried by these W-bosons. But since you still may not be confused enough, he doubles down: we also need weak-hypercharge, carried by Z-bosons. Next he says

And we know these weak versions of isospin and hypercharge must be fundamental because they are properties of elementary particles that can't be broken down into smaller pieces.

If you aren't laughing by this point, you aren't paying attention. Do you seriously believe this “explanation” of charge got 10,000 thumbs-up and zero thumbs-down? We are now eleven and a half minutes in and he hasn't said anything. He has just led us around in tight circles. If you don't believe me, reread that last sentence. It is completely circular.

Definition of fundamental: Fundamental properties = properties of elementary particles that can't be broken down into smaller pieces.

Therefore: And we know these weak versions of isospin and hypercharge must be fundamental because they are fundamental properties.

So he has told us they are fundamental *because they are fundamental*, but he has not told us how we know isospin and hypercharge actually exist, or how they create charge even if they do. As I say, nothing is being said here. His entire speech is just a simulacrum of language.

It is actually far worse than I thought coming in. [I have hit O'Dowd before](#) so I knew this would be misdirection, but I had no idea how bad it would be. You would think they would avoid posting something this empty, since it just makes Gell-Mann look bad. It makes mainstream science look like the sad shellgame it is. And, by comparison, it makes me look good. So after studying it for sense, I am actually glad it is up. I encourage O'Dowd and PBS and the mainstream to keep saying stuff like this.

I also encourage my readers to go to Youtube and get in O'Dowd's face, just for fun. Using this paper and the links I have given you above, you should be able to tear him down to bare ground without much effort. And if you get censored, let me know.