

# *Scientific American: Spook Magazine*

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published March 28, 2020*

Before we get into it here, I want to tell my readers that I just turned down a minimum of \$3000 per month advertising package for my two sites. The reasons I did that are many, but I we don't need to go there. Just thought you should know that I seriously considered it, since I do need the money. If you want to continue to visit here ad-free, you might consider bumping up your donations a bit. Considering that my sites are now viral, [generating incredible numbers](#), it is sort of disappointing to see my donations lagging far far behind. I make almost nothing from my kitties on the two sites. Partly that is because I never ask for anything and never beg for funds. I think this is the first time I have even mentioned the subject since I started. Because of that, many may assume I am privately wealthy, or that I have other sources of subsidy. I am not and I do not. This is just me, and I am supported only by my own art sales, which are few, and book sales.

Anyway, perhaps in response to my [recent cover-blowing](#) of agent Bernardo Kastrup, Get Pocket has republished and top-listed [his 2018 UnScientific American article](#) entitled “Coming to Grips with the Implications of Quantum Mechanics”. The subtitle is his first lie, since we are told “The question is no longer whether quantum mechanics is correct, but what it means”. My readers know this is one of the go-to feints of these professional sophists and pettifoggers like Kastrup: start a discussion by immediately putting the central thesis of it beyond question. He wants you to *think* quantum mechanics is beyond question, and that we are now just quibbling over philosophical implications. Because that saves him from having to defend most of the theory now on the table. But my readers know I have **destroyed** mainstream quantum mechanics in literally hundreds of papers, both the math and the theory. [My sections](#) on quantum physics, QED, light, the nucleus and EM alone now comprise over 250 papers. In them, I have proved quantum physics is wrong in just about every conceivable way, being riddled with basic mathematical errors, field errors, mechanical errors, dynamical errors, errors of fact, errors of assumption, errors of deduction, errors of induction, errors of logic, and huge errors of every other sort. But since these hired bozos like Kastrup aren't able to respond to my actual *scientific* arguments, they have to fall back into these squishy responses of interpretation and mentation and so on. Having no way to win this by addressing the actual data, math, or experiments, they see their only hope is to muddy the argument by pumping in their usual million gallons of confusion, unction, and misdirection.

This paper at *UnScientific American* is a prime example of that in every way, being nothing but hot air. Kastrup begins by referencing several “experiments” that supposedly prove his thesis, the most “remarkable test” being a May 2018 Bell test published in *Nature* by Abellan et al. I am glad he mentioned this event, because it proves my assertions here like nothing else could. My main thesis has been and still is that Kastrup is some sort of Intelligence asset and that *UnScientific American* has been taken over by Intelligence to promote its acceleration of Operation Chaos. You don't even have to pay \$200 to read the whole article at *Nature*, since this is clear enough from reading the abstract and footnotes. Start with the acknowledgements, where we see a list of government ministries and research councils, which tells us the banks and military are involved in this conjob. We then get the list of authors, which as usual is now endless, to try to give the con some ballast. I won't bother counting them, but it is in the hundreds. Then affiliations also have to be listed, again to give the con ballast.

These of course include the spooky Max Planck Institute.

Before we study the abstract, just remember that I have already blown the cover of these fake Bell tests, in my 2012 paper [CHSH Bell Tests](#). I showed that they are all pushed on purpose, and showed you exactly how it is done. That paper is unanswerable, so these government people decided to try to snow you with huge numbers instead. They recruited over 100,000 gamers in this latest fake Bell test, generating 97 million binary choices in the course of the game. The abstract ends with this:

**The observed correlations strongly contradict local realism and other realistic positions in bipartite and tripartite<sup>12</sup> scenarios. Project outcomes include closing the ‘freedom-of-choice loophole’ (the possibility that the setting choices are influenced by ‘hidden variables’ to correlate with the particle properties<sup>13</sup>), the utilization of video-game methods<sup>14</sup> for rapid collection of human-generated randomness, and the use of networking techniques for global participation in experimental science.**

Is that true? No. It is a very bold lie. I don't say it is a mistake, because I assume these people can't be stupid enough to actually believe their own bullshit. This huge experiment falls to the same basic tricks I exposed in the CHSH paper. It is only larger, with more flashing lights as diversion. But again, the data is very hamhandedly pushed to make it look like it is conforming to quantum uncertainty and nonrealism. But it isn't. There is nothing here that is even slightly nonlocal or nonreal, just a lot of pathetic data massaging by huge groups of slimy people.

But why? Why would all these “scientists” agree to be involved in such a thing, and why would anyone pay them to lie? Well, they agree to be involved because they get paid for it and get their name in *Nature*. So that part of it isn't hard to understand. And as I just told you, these government agencies and ministries are fronts for the bankers and military, and they have no interest in sharing real science with the public anymore. They want the public totally confused and disempowered, because that public will then be unable to say no to any future “science” projects. The bankers and military are then free to bill Congress and therefore the taxpayers for any conceivable project, no matter how flimsy or asinine, with no fear of rebellion, tax revolt, or even serious questioning. So that part of it isn't hard to understand, either, is it?

Therefore, Kastrup's evidence for QM or QED is nil. The links he provides prove absolutely nothing, except that he assumes you won't take links or read them closely. Kastrup then says he himself has written about this “extensively”, giving you seven links to his own papers. Let's see, that's seven papers in 27 years, which by my tally is not “extensively”. “Extensively” would be something like the 500 papers I have published since 2001 on my science site, or the additional 800 papers I have published on my history/philosophy/art site—which also tie in strongly to this question of faking research.

Anyway, Kastrup soon devolves into outright gibberish, which is proof enough that these scientific magazines have been co-opted. No real magazine—one *not* propped up as an Intel front—would even think of publishing such stuff. For Kastrup next argues that the real world does not exist until a conscious observer measures it. He immediately admits that he has been criticized by those pointing out that unconscious machines can also make measurements of the world. His answer:

**The problem is that the partitioning of the world into discrete inanimate objects is merely nominal. Is a rock integral to the mountain it helps constitute? If so, does it become a separate object merely by virtue of its getting detached from the mountain? And if so, does it then**

**perform a measurement each time it comes back in contact with the mountain, as it bounces down the slope? Brief contemplation of these questions shows that the boundaries of a detector are arbitrary.**

I'm sorry, what? Partitioning the world into discrete objects is only nominal? In other words, it is only a matter of naming? The edges of a rock are only there because I name it "rock"? The edges of the detector only exist because I have called it a detector? Let me ask you this: does any brief contemplation of this question confirm to you—innately, logically, or otherwise—that this is true? I didn't think so. That being so, we would expect Kastrup to have to do a bit more convincing of his reader at this point. But he doesn't have time for that. This is an argument by fiat, the only argument these paid agents know. So he can just blow by this important matter in a couple of sentences, racing through on bluster. He concludes this short section by assuring you that "the inanimate world is a single physical system governed by QM", taking that as proved by his six sentences of gibberish non-sequiturs.

Still don't believe me? Check out his next sentence:

**Indeed, as [first argued by John von Neumann](#) and [rearticulated in the work of one of us](#), when two inanimate objects interact they simply become quantum mechanically "entangled" with one another—that is, they become united in such a way that the behavior of one becomes inextricably linked to the behavior of the other—but no actual measurement is performed.**

By dropping von Neumann's name he hopes to browbeat you away from the obvious fact this is more bombast. Inanimate objects like rocks and detectors interact with the world by becoming united in some nebulous way, but *not* by actually measuring? Good to know. So detectors are not actually detecting or measuring, they are just sharing auras or something. Do any real scientists actually believe this? Aren't any of those hundreds of scientists from actual physics departments referenced above embarrassed to be part of this? Apparently not enough to refuse involvement.

Kastrup is now so far off the rails there is no saving his argument, but somehow he continues to unwind. Regarding [the two-slit experiment](#), he admits:

**QM offers no reason why the *whole system—electrons, slits and detectors combined—wouldn't be in an entangled superposition before someone looks at the detectors' output.***

Yes, precisely, which is why QM is worse than useless. But *I* can offer you a reason why they aren't: because [entanglement is false from the ground up](#), and because [superposition is wrong](#) both as math and theory. I have corrected both, and superposition is now real, local, and fully logical and rational. So you see why Kastrup had to start his argument by taking QM as given. He couldn't admit QM was open to question, because if he had his audience would be reminded that I have not only questioned it but corrected it—and that my corrections kill any possibility that mind or mentation is determining the real world. I show that Kastrup's entire line comes out of simple mathematical and physical errors, and that once these errors are corrected, that line is closed.

The mainstream shoos you away from my papers, but I encourage you to read theirs as closely as you can. No one with a mind still functioning could believe Kastrup is making a good scientific argument here, or that *Scientific American* should be promoting him. Articles like this are proof enough by themselves that science magazines have been taken over by agents working one project or another, and that mainstream science has become a vast fraud. Does that mean science isn't real? No, of course

not. Science is what it always was. These people can't change the definitions of words, though they often try. Science is real, but the ideas and projects pushed now by mainstream science definitely are *not*. Mainstream science has been taken over almost entirely by bald and transparent propaganda, and it should be shunned as such.