

# RATIONAL WIKI

RationalWiki (which is known by most people outside their offices as RatWik or RatDik) [now has a page on me](#), which is nice. I appreciate the promotion. They could just not mention me at all, which, considering what they say about me, would be the “rational” thing to do. If they are right and I am just a deluded crank, why have Google redirect all searches on Miles Mathis to their page? Why the obvious and pathetic smear campaign? Do you really need to smear deluded cranks? No, logically and rationally, you can ignore deluded cranks, because they are no threat to any real science. Therefore, logically and rationally, the fact that they feel it necessary to slander me with this prominent transparent project is another sign they are threatened.

And they should be. I am kicking their sorry asses and the asses of their masters all over the field on a daily basis. But rather than respond in a scientific manner by addressing what I actually say, they hire a bunch of nameless pussies hiding behind fake sites to build little “snarky” pages with zero content. I encourage you to read their anonymous response to me, and compare it in content to my papers. They say that neither they nor anyone they know can comprehend my charge field theory. Hmmm. Is that an argument against it, or just an admission of rank ignorance? Since RatDik was not started by physicists or mathematicians, we wonder why they think they *would* understand my theory. That would require some study of physics and mathematics, and we have no indication of either one from these hidden people.

These poor fellows confirm everything I say with every word they write or utter. Because they are incapable of rational response or a real counter-argument, they are forced to rely on these sub-collegiate ploys, where they call me names and never once show their faces. I have been waiting for over a decade for someone to write a serious paper, addressing anything I have written. I am still waiting. If they can't comprehend my positive theories, they can simply address my destructions of mainstream proofs and derivations. How about where I show simple mistakes in [Bohr's derivations](#), for example? Where I show he conflated the mass of the photon with the mass of the electron? I have never heard a peep about that. How about Feynman's and [Landau's massaging of variables](#) in the circular motion proofs? Zip. How about where I show [a magnificent fudge in the proof of the Schrodinger Equation](#)? Nada. How about the finessed proof in the [CHSH Bell tests](#), which I have ripped to shreds? Not a word. How about my wrecking of the [Drude-Sommerfeld model](#), and through it all of solid-state physics? Silence. All they can come up with against hundreds of revolutionary papers is this:

1. The UNIFIED FIELD. Newton, Lagrange, Coulomb and Maxwell all gave us UFTs<sup>[2]</sup>  
UFT in this case is referencing Unified Field Theories. This signals a living in the 1990's which UFT was in vogue. Today's scientists are more concerned with the Standard deviation of particles found by colliders.

You have to laugh. Is that all you've got, guys? I have chopped off all your masters' heads, and all you can do is launch a water balloon at me. . . and miss. You don't wish to try again? I'll look away and pretend you didn't lead with that, if you want to dip into the bag again. According to them, everything I have shown concerning the bedrock equations of these top physicists can be ignored, because I am not “in vogue”. Good to be reminded that is what Modern physics is really about: vogue. And why am I not in vogue? Because I have not followed lockstep with the other mainstream physicists, being interested in what they are interested in. Remember, not only is there a standard model, there is a *daily program*, written for scientists from the top-down, and we are supposed to conform any and all research to that program. They will tell us what to be interested in day to day. The **program**

determines what is in vogue, not any search for scientific truth.

Also notice how they pretend not to be interested in Unified Field Theories anymore. Hah-hah. They want you to think they were only interested in UFTs in the 1990s, but got over it. Funny then how many mainstream sites, including *all* the science sites, admit the search for unification is still one of the top problems of physics. It has been one of the top three problems of physics since the days of Einstein, back in the 1920s and before, **and still is**. But as soon as an outsider solved that problem for them, they had to pretend they didn't care anymore. “Oh, that! We are too cool to talk about that anymore.”

As more proof these guys are chronic and acute foot-shooters, we can quote their third sentence from the page:

Mathis claims to be able to decipher the givens of the mathematical greats, similar to Newton being able to decipher the Bible with mathematical proofs. Which is a two fold ego trip.

So they compare me directly to Newton! They actually attack Newton on a page about me! Amazing. It's an ego-trip alright, but one they just launched me on themselves. I can just see those who hired them finally getting around to reading this: “What? You compared him to Newton? You boneheads! Why not put him on the same pedestal with Leonardo and Einstein while you are at it! We hire you to slander this guy on a half-page and you can't even get that right!”

But this is why I let them yap. I could sue for defamation or file take-down notices, but I am quite satisfied to find the anti-Miles-Mathis page in this form. It just makes me look good. Please guys, *say more stuff like that*. Talk more about my ego, too, since it just makes you look envious. Say more things about my conspiracy work while you are at it, since that just sends more people to my pages. I am probably already getting more hits than all of RatDiki, and this will just add to the gap. I certainly have more content. If Google didn't pad the numbers of these Intel-front websites like RatDiki by many orders of magnitude and suppress mine, we could discover that truth, but as it is we probably never will.

I take this all as more indication I am right. What is more, I take it as indication *they know I am*. I said above they were threatened, but they aren't acting like someone threatened. They are acting like someone already beaten. Their response is so weak I think we would have to call it **pathological**. Yes, there is a pathological transparency to the anti-Miles-Mathis response, so much so that it confirms by itself that physics has utterly bottomed-out and deconstructed. There appear to be no real physicists left, only these witless flunkies hired by Intel for their wit. I guess these are the guys in the cubicles not clever enough to write for the *Onion*, so they are sicced on me. They know squat about physics, but someone in management thinks they are clever swordsmen, I guess. They aren't even that. While they are waving their rubber swords in the air, glorying in the movements of their own girly arms, I am lopping their genitals off—and they are already too emasculated to notice. If they had a lick of sense, they would have consulted my [previous disembowelings](#) of their confreres—who are now walking around dickless in Langley or Harvard or Berkeley or somewhere—and begged off. But as proof they can't read, they keep lining up for more.

Some of their comrades have claimed I am actually an esoteric writing committee myself. That's right, RatDiks, while you are and your pals are writing from sub-basement 12 at Langley—sucking on fumes from the boiler room—my writing committee is nested in the spire of the Burj Khalifa, getting messages through the windows from eagles flying in from Etna and Everest. So you may as well tap

out.

As fun and empowering as this is for me, I can't waste any more time punishing these naughty little boys begging for punishment. If these guys want another, thank you sir may I have another, they are going to have to perform amongst themselves. I have work to do creating real art, real science, and real history.

**Update June 30, 2017:** This is getting really weird, so I returned to mop up a bit. As long as it is this fun, I don't mind spending a few more moments on it. One of my readers told me the guys over at RatDik have spent a lot of time extending my page, so I thought I would take a look. I asked them to say more stuff, and they certainly have. However, it looks suspiciously like promotion, even to me, so I can't figure it out. They post a nice pic of me, probably looking far more attractive than any of them ever were or will be, so the fact that they jokingly misdate it doesn't really hurt me too much, does it? They say it is from 1990 and is colorized, but of course it isn't. It is from about 2010, and I still look almost exactly like that, as I can easily prove if they want to send a photographer over here. They kid that I look like a surfer, but again, not much of a cut. That's exactly what I want to look like, so I am well satisfied.

Honestly, the heaviest punch landed on the page is that I misspelled colossal one time as colossal. Yeah, that one hurts. If I were you, I would totally dismiss anyone who has ever misspelled a word. Especially if he looks anything like a surfer.

They also promote my books, posting a pic of one of the covers, including the nice blurbs. They say they don't like that the blurbs are so glowing, so I guess they should compare it to one of their own books, which no doubt has negative blurbs. No, wait, they don't have any books, as far as we know—they don't even have names. They are just a sim voice arriving from the void.

They say that no real scientists agree with me, but that is simply a lie. A physicist from NASA and John Hopkins wrote the leading blurb on that blue book they have pictured. Also the Introduction. But I guess the RatSims missed that. Of course, no one would accuse them of being good or close readers.

They briefly ridicule my  $\pi=4$  papers, but have nothing substantial to say against any of them. They link you to a counter-argument by someone named MarkCC, but this “argument” is, as usual, short, shallow, and not to the point. It is full of ad homs but lacking any real content. Not surprising, since MarkCC is a software dude at Twitter. We aren't told how much physics he knows, but it appears not much. We also aren't told how much or how little he looks like a surfer. He does avoid making fun of my hair (that, and other equally sad stuff, is saved for the comments section), but other than that he hits about the same depths as his RatSim pals. But those pals do take the time to give you direct links to almost all my  $\pi=4$  papers, where you can compare for yourself my content to theirs. Amazing.

They list a few of my most interesting hoaxed-event papers, but their only response is that I give no evidence. But of course anyone who reads any one of those papers will see that is again a bold lie. I give huge amounts of evidence in every single paper, most of it compiled from the mainstream's own sites like Geni, Wiki, Ancestry, Intelius, thepeerage, Findagrave, and mainstream newspapers. So again, the form of the RatSims' “argument” hurts them and helps me. They even give you direct links now in the footnotes to many, many papers, sending traffic to my sites. In fact, their response is so weak that some of my detractors have written to *me* angrily, accusing *me* of being in cohorts with the RatDik team. They accuse me of manufacturing my own opposition, as some sort of strange

promotional gambit. As if I have the reach and the time to create my own opposition. Funny, though, I admit. Just think how powerful that would make me!

Then the RatSims quote extensively from *this* paper, above, doing little or nothing to block or counter my punches. I appreciate it, but can't really figure it out. Are they that terrible at polemics, or is the page actually *intended* as promotion of me? Does someone over there like me—they just don't feel free to say it directly? Much of it reads like it is coming from a shy or jilted lover.