

[return to updates](#)

A LETTER FROM THE MAINSTREAM

I get many positive emails from the mainstream, but because I have so far not published any of them, my detractors like to camp out on forums and tell their little choirs that I have no support. As you saw in a recent exchange with these detractors, they have convinced themselves “no one wants to work with me.” When I reply that most of my emails are positive, and that I only get a few nasty ones like theirs, they claim I am making it up.

That is one reason for publishing the set of emails below. A better reason will occur to you as you read them: they are heartbreaking. I received these emails more than four years ago, and though I could immediately see they were extraordinary, I didn't really know what to do with the information. As you will see, the sender didn't know where to go next, either. Due to circumstance, he was far more trapped than me. Because I could see he was trapped, I simply sat on the emails for years, not wishing to put any more pressure on him than there already was. But when I reread them today, I could see more clearly. I could see that they were a powerful testament to the way things really are: important documentation of facts rarely or never documented. They needed to be seen, if only in partial and anonymized form.

Like my papers, these emails are a truth-telling. And because they come from the inside, they may be that much more compelling. Some readers find it easy to dismiss my critiques and analyses, due to my outsider status. They say that I have never been in academia: how can I know how it is? They accuse me of making it all up to suit myself. As if I *want* physics to be like it is. As if I want the world to be corrupt, so that I can complain about it. They actually make that argument, as you know. But this set of emails from the inside confirms with resounding exclamation points everything I have been saying, even adding a level of pathos of its own.

What makes these emails so powerful is that they could have come from anywhere. They actually came from one of the top universities in the world, but they could have come from any of them. This is the experience of one scientist, but in reading it we know it is the experience of many many scientists, in many many subfields. And, with some margin of error, we know it is the experience of *all* mainstream scientists. More than that, it is the experience of everyone in the mainstream, scientist or not. This is the way the world now works, and almost every reader will see himself in these emails, to one degree or another.

That said, I have still made every effort to remove or change anything specific or personal in the emails, to protect the privacy of the sender. You may think you know who this person is, but I assure you, you don't. And if you are in the mainstream, I assure you, the speaker is *you*, or some part of you you have kept well hidden.

Dear Miles,

I have discovered your website and am overwhelmed. I have not really found the right words to describe your work without using clichés. How shall I introduce myself? Let me put it this way: like you, as a kid

I was fascinated by physics and wanted to fix the glaring lies and absurdities. However my approach was different than yours. My plan was to enter the mainstream, establish credibility on their terms first (by faking it) and then attack from the inside. Phase one of the plan is now complete. It was a long road. Almost forty years now if you count from that time as a kid. More than 20 years since my PhD in Xphysics and in that time I have established myself as an internationally recognized Xphysicist with a reputation for holding my peers accountable for sloppiness, lying and cheating. I have over a hundred publications in refereed journals, but it is all inconsequential and boring shit, pampering the puppets whose greatest motivation is to maintain the illusion that they are clever, rather than the science itself. Even within the confines of convention, I have managed to piss off enough people in my field that I may soon no longer be able to make a living this way, but I have a family to support so I cannot quit without a sound financial exit plan. I was amused by your aversion to figures of authority—I have the same problem—I have it in writing from the head of my department at X University accusing me of being insubordinate and that I will be fired if I don't keep my mouth shut. Never mind that they don't actually pay me, I pay them out of overhead from my grants.

There was some sadness in reading your papers so far: I realized that in the 20 years I have been in the business I have not been immune to the brainwashing and sometimes I have forgotten the plan. I was not supposed to be just faking it. But the time has come to move on. I see that you have already done an incredible amount of work and made some substantial breakthroughs in many areas of physics. That's great because it means there is more time to push further: I'm sure you'll agree there is much more to be done. I'm embarrassed to say that I have so far done absolutely nothing: the 20 years have been spent mostly just trying to stay above water and make a living, seeing for myself the ugly truth about how science is, from the top down, dictated by liars and cheats. In hindsight this should have been obvious to me because anything that involves money is always controlled by liars and cheats (but I don't need to tell you that).

Anyway, the bottom line is that I'd like to explore the possibility of collaboration. You are way ahead of me in attacking the fundamental problems of physics and I'm sure you can continue very well by yourself, but if I am going to be working on some of these problems as well, we may be able to do more....

[Next email] I have Xyears of Xfunding to provide some things and I feel obliged to complete those projects since it is taxpayers' money that awarded to me in good faith. But beyond that I feel that you may be able to boost and accelerate my ideas beyond that. I agree with you, publishers are not important for scientific truth—after I break free I will not publish my work in refereed journals because it means nothing—it is all fixed. I know how to get my papers published in refereed journals but it is a farce: I often end up having to teach the referee basic physics. As you know, the very idea of having your work judged by one person, who may be incompetent, less experienced, biased and ignorant, is a joke. And then you pay the journal thousands of dollars. A very inefficient, not to say stupid system. We need to publish our work in books like the old days and just say upfront, “C'mon, you reading this, *you* be the referee. I'll answer your questions, but just suck it up and tell me your names, assholes!”

[Next email] Thanks for pointing out your personal exchanges with the referees. I read your email [exchanges on the Relativity paper](#) with the “experts” [at AJP]. Sadly all too familiar. This is another idea I have had for a book: put together all these referee reports (I have hundreds of them) and expose the cowards for what they are. I first started running into these problems in the second year after formally entering the science world. In was Xyear and I was attending a seminar in the XInstitute in Xcity and at the end of the seminar I asked a simple question: “But what about the contribution of X to the field: don't you need to model that and subtract that off?” At the time there was no way to do this because the machines that could start to do this had not yet been built. The speaker agreed that it was a problem, but

the head of the institute that was hosting me came up angrily after the lecture and demanded to know why I had asked that question. I was bewildered: “Why should he care what question I ask, I’m a young nobody, who would notice?” But he came up to me again later in office and said “We understand what is going on, it’s not a complete mess as you imply, X is negligible.” Problem is, there was no evidence for this because the machine had not yet been built that could provide any evidence for or against that. There was NO data. And, as it turns out, we know years later that the contribution from X is *at least* 50%!

Of course now I understand too well what was going on. For these people at the top it is very important that they convince all those below them that they know what they are doing. The entire structure is maintained to support that illusion. The titles they give themselves, the prizes they create and award themselves, the entire hierarchy is designed for that very purpose, lest anyone should have any doubts. And that hierarchy is a built-in self-protection because the top jobs will go only to those who will not attempt to question the structure. So the moment they feel that anyone—no matter how young or small—is trying to question the structure, they will go to any lengths to humiliate and ridicule the infidels.

You know this already, and you have the added benefit of being beyond the reach of these people. You seem to have no desire to be famous or in the limelight, and have no need of their phony prizes. Therefore while they are off bashing equations around, pretending to be important, and browbeating their students, you get on with the real thing.

I will tell you something: if these people even get a sniff that somebody like you is onto something big they have a huge conflict because on the one hand coming across a major discovery is the thing that has driven them all along, but on the other hand they cannot leave the confines of the protective structure that they are cocooned in because they are nothing without it. If they make any move toward someone like you they are on the outside, and are then open to receiving all the crap that they themselves have been dishing out. They are trapped and wasting their lives.

Anyway, since reading your papers I have realized that I have a lot more deprogramming to do myself. I am particularly interested in the implications of the separation of gravity and E/M because I think the evidence for it may be right under our noses, as you say. In my own field, we see glaring evidence for [your charge field] all the time. It is astonishing that physicists are ignoring this evidence, instead trying to model something that there is no evidence for. Or perhaps not so astonishing, if you think about it.

[Next email] It was reading your [unification papers](#) that made me realize that this is the key to understanding gravitational collapse, as well as dark matter. This is IT. But I also read your calculus papers and have again been floored by the insight. My head is spinning! Partly sad because I can't believe how much I have let myself be brainwashed. But joy because you have actually done it and seen through centuries of nonsense piled and piled on top of more nonsense. You have torn down the iron curtain all by yourself.

Reading [your papers](#) confirmed what I already know: pretty much the only physics problems that can be solved with the standard calculus are those in textbooks and exam papers. Most real physics problems are not solvable with it, which is why we get renormalization, phonons, and all the rest. What people do, without even realizing it, is to throw the calculus out of the window because it does not admit to solution, go to a computer and write code to do precisely what you are saying (make a finite grid and solve the system in a finite number of steps). However, they *think* they are solving the calculus equations they wrote down. They are not solving those equations: their code is not taking anything to zero! They are doing exactly what you are saying but not admitting it to themselves.

Although this set of emails is probably the strongest I have received, my box is full of similar testaments to mainstream corruption. Unfortunately, like my detractors, my supporters usually prefer to remain anonymous. My detractors remain anonymous because they are pussies. My supporters remain anonymous because they rightly fear reprisals. As this mainstream physicist confirms, careers are built on subordination and consensus, not on new ideas. Nor does your freedom grow as you climb the ladder: if graduate students and young professionals cannot ask questions, older professionals can ask even fewer. The brainwashing is cumulative, and the higher you rise, the more things you must accept. As you ascend the ladder, you simply go from a buyer of dogma to a seller of dogma.

In a paper coming out very soon, I will prove that my ties to the mainstream go beyond warm expressions of support and confirmation, as here. I have also been consulting, and I will share with you an interesting example of that—an example that will confirm my nuclear models while not divulging any names or companies.