

# SOMETHING FOR MY CRITICS

*by Miles Mathis*

As you may know, I have been blessed by a pestilence of critics. But while they have been paid to devour my grain, they have only managed to fertilize it with their droppings, further increasing my harvest. As one example, we have seen them dismiss me by saying I have no support, no readers, etc. So let us test that claim scientifically, shall we?

Let us go to Google to find out. Let us search on the subject of one of my papers, say the one on Galactic Rotation. We won't even search on "Galactic Rotation Miles Mathis". No, we will search very broadly, on "Galactic Rotation Problem". Out of over a million results, my paper comes up number 11, ahead of EarthSky.org, Universetoday.com, ArsTechnica, Forbes, Harvard, Berkeley, physics.stackexchange, quora, phys.org, wikiwand, Learner.org, and *all* the books at Googlebooks.

Now let us search on "Drude-Sommerfeld". Out of almost 21,000 results, my paper comes up on the front page, number 10, ahead of MIT, physicsforums, Arxiv, and all Googlebooks. Of course my critics probably won't know what that means, but real physicists will.

How about "Canada/Canada's Gravity Deficit"? Out of 966,000 results, my paper comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of. . . well, everyone.

How about "All-Known-Physics Equation" (with or without hyphens)? Out of over 9 million results, my paper comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of physicsforums, Forbes, preposterousuniverse, Cosmomagazine, Wired, and Wikipedia. If you think that is skewed by searching on my own equation, it isn't. That paper is in response to *the mainstream's* promoted all-known-physics equation, so my response to the mainstream actually outranks their own promotion.

How about "Cosmic Mass Deficit"? Out of 299,000 results, my paper comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Arxiv, Wikipedia, and aps.org.

How about "CHSH Bell Tests" (including results for "CHSH Inequality")? Out of 44,400 results, my papers comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, after Wikipedia.

How about "Specific Heat Problem of Electrons", including all similar results such as "electron heat capacity"? Out of over 5 million results, my paper comes up 2<sup>nd</sup> after Wikipedia.

How about "Cometary Antitail", including results for Antitail and Comet tail? Out of 27,300 results, my paper comes up 2<sup>nd</sup> after Wikipedia.

How about "Planck Relation", including results for Planck-Einstein Relation? Out of 2,360,000 results, my paper comes up 2<sup>nd</sup> after Wikipedia.

How about "Schiehallion Experiment"? Out of 8,100 results, my paper comes up 3<sup>rd</sup>, not including two videos, above phys.org, physicsforums, Harvard, and the Royal Society.

How about "C-orbit Asteroids" (including results for "Horseshoe orbit")? Out of 672,000 results, my

paper comes up 3<sup>rd</sup>, after Wikipedia and Space.com.

How about “Galactic Magnetism”, including results for Galactic Magnetic Fields? Out of 329,000 results, my paper comes up 4<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Cosmosmagazine, Sciencealert, Arxiv, Springer, NationalGeographic, and Space.com.

How about “Phosphorus-Hydrogen Bond”? Out of 380,000 results, my paper comes up 4<sup>th</sup>, ahead of phys.org, sciencedaily, chegg, chemistryworld and sciencedirect.

How about “Manhattan Metric”? Out of 1,800,000 results, including results for Taxicab Geometry, my paper comes up number 4, just behind Wikipedia and Mathworld.

How about “Hollow Neon Atom(s)”? Out of 329,000 results, my paper comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Sciencedaily, phys.org, Sciencedirect, and nih.gov.

How about “Hadronization”? Out of 125,000 results, my paper comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of cern, iopscience, aps.org, Sciencedirect, and Springer.

How about “Metacinnabar”? Out of 108,000 results, my paper comes up 7<sup>th</sup>, ahead of merriam-webster and dictionary.com.

How about “Cause of the Solar Cycle”? Out of 2,910,000 results, my paper comes up 7<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Space.com, ScientificAmerican, iopscience, NationalGeographic, Almanac.com, and Nature.

How about “Wilkes Land Anomaly”? Out of 67,000 results, my paper comes up 11<sup>th</sup>, ahead of ScienceDirect, Cambridge, Nature, Quora, and Oxford.

How about “Bending of Starlight”? Out of 425,000 results, my paper comes up 12<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wired, PBS, UCLA, NewYorkTimes, Forbes, and NationalGeographic.

How about “Newton/Newton's Lemma”? Out of 436,000 results, my paper comes up 12<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Jstor, mathforum, Springer, arxiv, archive, and academia.edu.

How about “Magnetism of Mars”? Out of 417,000 results, my paper comes up 13<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Astronomy.com, Space.com, Wired.com, Nature.com, and Wikipedia.org!

How about “Why does hot air rise”? Out of almost 2 million results, my paper comes up 15<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Forbes, Learner, Socratic, Physlink, and ScientificAmerican.

How about “Diatomic Hydrogen”? Out of 618,000 results, my paper comes up 15<sup>th</sup>, ahead of hyperphysics, aps.org, Sciencedirect, and all Googlebooks.

How about “Allais Effect”? Out of 196,000 results, my paper comes up 15<sup>th</sup> (not including 4 youtube videos).

How about “Designer Electron”? Out of 2,780,000 results, my paper comes up 15<sup>th</sup>, ahead of nih.gov, acs.org, and aip.org.

How about “Variable Acceleration”? Out of over 5 million results, my paper comes up 15<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Saturn Anomaly”? Out of almost 300,000 results, my paper comes up 16<sup>th</sup>, ahead of msn.com, Nature, arxiv, Earthsky, and NationalGeographic.

How about “Cavendish Experiment”? Out of 693,000 results, my paper comes up 16<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wikia, RoyalSociety, and encyclopedia.com.

How about “Ice Caps on Mercury”? Out of 1,890,000 results, my paper comes up 17<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Nature.com, Sciencedirect, Wiley, PopularMechanics, Astronomy.com, Caltech, and NationalGeographic.

How about “Vacuum Catastrophe”? Out of over a million results, my paper comes up 18<sup>th</sup>, ahead of scienceforums, physicsforums, vixra, academia.edu, Harvard, and all Googlebooks.

How about “Anomalous Magnetic Moment”? Out of 467,000 results, my paper comes up 18<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Columbia.edu, nih.gov, iopscience, and Harvard.

How about “Unified Field Equation”, including results for Unified Field Theory? Out of one million results, my paper comes up 18<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Arxiv, AIP, and Harvard.

How about “Klein-Nishina Formula”? Out of 31,300 results, my paper comes up 19<sup>th</sup>, ahead of aps.org, Harvard, Sciencedirect, Springer, and Vixra.

How about “Asymptotic Freedom”? Out of over 4 million results, my paper comes up 19<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Dictionary.com, Oxford, Princeton, Harvard, and Physicstoday.

How about “Stern-Gerlach”? Out of 289,000 results, my papers comes up 20<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Nature, PhysicsToday, ScienceDirect, Springer, APS, and the Royal Society.

How about “Noether's Theorem”? Out of 510,000 results, my paper comes up 21<sup>st</sup>, ahead of thefreedictionary, Springer, Oxford, Nature, Discovermagazine, Sciencedirect, and Britannica.

How about “Bode's Law”? Out of 260,000 results, my paper comes up 21<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Collinsdictionary, scienceworld.wolfram.com, Oxfordreference.com, Infoplease, Springer.com, thefreedictionary, encyclopedia.com, Elsevier, Wiktionary, iopscience, Harvard, Oxford dictionary, quora, jstor, gizmodo, and WorldReference.com.

How about “Perihelion Precession of Mercury”? Out of 56,000 results, my paper comes up 21<sup>st</sup>, ahead of iopscience, Harvard, Vixra, Springer, Berkeley, Cornell, and Quora.

How about “Strong Force” (including results for Strong Interaction)? Out of 32,400,000 results, my papers comes up 22<sup>nd</sup>, ahead of merriam-webster, Wiktionary, Physicsworld, Learner, Wikiversity, and Nature.

How about “Uranium Tetrafluoride”? Out of 56,400 results, my paper comes up 23<sup>rd</sup>, ahead of aps.org, nih.gov, and avs.org.

How about “Metonic Cycle”? Out of 251,000 results, my paper comes up 25<sup>th</sup>, ahead of the Oxford dictionary, encyclopedia.com, Wiktionary, Wordreference, Harvard, Infoplease, and all Googlebooks.

How about “Axial Tilt”? Out of 817,000 results, my papers comes up 25<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wikitionary, Quora, and nih.gov.

How about “Coulomb's Equation”, including results for Coulomb's Constant and Coulomb's Law? Out of 692,000 results, my paper come up 26<sup>th</sup>, ahead of NYU, Wikiversity, physicsforums, and utexas.edu.

How about “Rydberg Formula”? Out of 231,000 results, my paper comes up 26<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Chemistryworld, aps.org, academia.edu, Arxiv, and Vixra.

How about “Pressure Flow Hypothesis”? Out of over 9 million results, my paper comes up 28<sup>th</sup>, indicating large numbers even for my papers that aren't straight physics.

How about “South Atlantic Anomaly”? Out of 384,000 results, my paper comes up 29<sup>th</sup>, ahead of stsci.edu, oxfordreference, dict.cc, spacetelescope.org, arxiv, astronomynow, Springer, and nsf.gov.

How about “Bohr Magnetron”? Out of 190,000 results, my paper comes up 33<sup>rd</sup>, ahead of Caltech, Quora, aps.org, Springer, and Nature.com.

How about “Gravity Waves Bicep”? Despite the recent media blitz on that and over 141,000 results, my paper comes up 35<sup>th</sup>, ahead of NewScientist, Space.com, nih.gov, independent.co.uk, sciencemag.org, USAtoday, kavlifoundation, caltech, kipac.stanford.edu, and dcc.ligo.org!

How about “Reduced Mass”? Out of 251,000 results, my paper comes up 35<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Zeno's Paradoxes”? Out of 73,800 results my paper come up 38<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Cornell, Jstor, BBC, arstechnica, and Proofwiki.

How about “Fine Structure Constant”? Out of 19 million results, my paper comes up 41<sup>st</sup> .

How about “Enceladus Brightness”? Out of 133,000 results, my paper comes up 49<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Slate.com, Cornell, Phys.org, Earthsky, PhysicsToday, Sciencedaily, Astronomynow, Smithsonianmag, hyperphysics, popsci, and Astronomy.com.

And if you search on “Charge Field”, but disallow results containing “electric” or “electrical” in the title, my paper comes up 1<sup>st</sup> out of 342,000,000 results. That is proof enough the mainstream doesn't realize there is any difference between the charge field and the electrical field, doesn't it?

Notice that all the searches above were on general topics, not slanted my way at all. We could also look at topics like “physics is corrupt”, but that is no longer neutral, I admit. Of course on topics like that, my papers almost always come up first on a search.

Now, do you honestly think any other private individual in the world can claim rankings like that, on a broad array of scientific subjects? Of course my critics will claim I have some way to cheat the rankings. I don't. I just put the papers up and let them fend for themselves. I am not a computer geek, as you can see by my website formatting. I wouldn't know how to boost my rankings if I wanted to. But that doesn't stop my critics from whining. We saw one of them complaining that I cheated the rankings by putting the subject of my papers in the titles. No, really, he actually said that.

Others will claim that only stupid people visit my site, but do you really think stupid people are surfing the internet on those terms above? Do stupid people commonly search on terms like “Drude-Sommerfeld”, “Klein-Nishina Formula” or “Rydberg Formula”? Of course not. What these rankings indicate is that mainstream physicists are secretly mobbing my site on a broad array of topics, taking what they can from it.

To make this even more interesting, while doing these searches on my own papers, I was notified at least a dozen times by Google that their systems had “detected unusual traffic” from my computer, forcing me to prove I was not a robot via reCAPTCHA. Anyone want to tell me what that was about? My guess is someone monitoring my computer was not happy I was finally getting around to doing this: searching on my own papers. Until now I guess I had better things to do, and this is the first time I have done it in all the years the papers have been up. But if you think it was fun, you are right.

It would be even more fun if those mainstream physicists causing these rankings would revolt tomorrow. Or if they would at least drop me an anonymous line now and again, telling me they wish they had the balls to do it. I guess I should take solace in what I have, though. The numbers above tell me—and should tell you—that the revolution has already taken place. It is already done. We just haven't heard the report yet. Those in charge are holding the presses, but I guess it doesn't really matter. I know, you know, and they know, so a report isn't really necessary.

I can't wait to see how my critics respond to this paper. I am sure it will be amusing, providing many pounds of new fertilizer to my fields.