


SCIENCE PROPAGANDA

Continues to Accelerate



by Miles Mathis

First published February 28, 2020

I missed [this *UnScientific American* article](#) when it came out last year, since of course I don't subscribe or read it online. But Getpocket republished it today, to be sure it hit my eyes. I am glad it did, since it gives me a chance to hit this topic again in 2020. I previously hit a couple of these characters briefly in my [2015 paper on Elon Musk](#), since I mentioned Max Tegmark as a fellow spook there. We are about to see him again.

The title of the piece is “Physics is Pointing Inexorably to Mind”. Which it isn't and never was. The author Bernardo Kastrup (above) is leading with a huge lie, as is usual with *UnScientific American* writers. Not only is physics not “inexorably” pointing to mind, it isn't pointing to it at all. . . and never has. Neither Kastrup nor anyone else has ever made a good argument for that, and in this piece he makes *no* argument. He just says it. In fact, the little comment he makes on the subject here undercuts his title, so on a first reading we are not really sure what he is up to, beyond purposely self-destructing in print.

Kastrup starts out quoting creepy fake physicist Max Tegmark (below),



Protons, atoms, molecules, cells and stars are all redundant baggage.

Further, they *don't exist*. Yes, you read that right. Tegmark wrote a whole book, *Our Mathematical Universe*, seriously “arguing” that matter should be done away with and replaced by raw and unassigned math. Only information is real.

Kastrup tells us in paragraph two that this theory called “information realism” is philosophical in character, but has been associated with physics from its very inception. Except that. . . it hasn't. That's another lie, and Kastrup doesn't bother to back up that claim with any examples from the inception of physics. The truth is that physics has been diametrically *opposed* to that notion from its inception, hence the name “physics”. Why would they have called it physics if physical things don't really exist? They would have called it mystics, or magic, or. . . to call it what it is, agitprop.

For you can't understand what is going on here until you recognize these people for what they are. Kastrup and Tegmark* and the rest of these bozos aren't real physicists or scientists. They have been given titles and awards and set up in chairs, but they are frauds through and through. This isn't science, it is science **theater**. These people have been hired by Intelligence and installed in these positions to sell mystification *on purpose*. This is the science wing of [Operation Chaos](#). Just as Operation Chaos has an art wing and a media wing and a literature wing and a Hollywood wing, it also has a science wing. Like their colleagues in other fields, these pretend scientists have been set up to confuse you and disempower you. Job one is to flip the world on you, so you don't know up from down. They sell you these asinine ideas in top science magazines to stir your mind. If they feed you enough contradictory and illogical information, your mind will at last misfire and seize. Eventually, they hope, you will just give up and accept the world they have created for you.

I learned this from the field of art, which I have inhabited even longer than I have inhabited the field of science. Modern science is just like Modern art in this regard. They want you to waste decades of your life trying to make sense of the senseless garbage they pile on your head, because they know you never will. The longer you try, the stupider you will become. So while they are short-circuiting your blood-brain barrier with fluoride, they simultaneously short-circuit your brain-mind barrier with a constant stream of rampant irrationality.

[Also notice how Kastrup is being sold at **Gnostic** Warrior in the picture above. Do you recognize those graphics? The fonts are the same as Gnostic Media, [which I blew the cover of](#) a couple of years ago. Gnostic Media was by Jan Irvin, while Gnostic Warrior is Moe Bedard. So why the same graphics? I am telling you it is because these are all Intel projects, and they hire the graphics out to the

same in-house company or team. Just so you know, Kastrup** is a prominent name in Denmark, being the name of a major suburb of Copenhagen, where the airport is. So he is probably from the families as well.]

I will be told that this new information realism does have precursors in the history of philosophy. Yes, I am aware of that, since I was a philosophy major. I know about these precursors, such as they are. They are normally classed as idealists. But rather than list them and respond to them, I will simply tell you they all fall to the same cut: those old guys were doing in their centuries exactly the same thing these new guys are doing now. They were spreading confusion on purpose, to disempower their enemies. In fact, the old guys and the new guys are from the *same families* who have ruled the world for millennia. So I agree the project isn't new. It is accelerating, and it is less subtle and less sophisticated than it has ever been, but it isn't different in kind.

What do I mean? I mean, Tegmark isn't really a Tegmark. That is his mother's name, though we aren't ever told why he took her name instead of his father's name. He isn't Max Tegmark, he is Max **Shapiro**. But I guess they want you to think there may be a Gentile or two in the upper levels of physics, so they have these creeps like Tegmark pretend not to be from the same old families. I can only imagine he was chosen because he is from Sweden and doesn't look very Jewish.

So if you really wish to make sense of this article, you can, but you have to look at it in the right light. Once you do it all becomes crystal clear.

But back to it. Unlike Kastrup, I can prove everything I just said. I already have, in thousands of papers over the past two decades, but I will do it again here. I will show you line-by-line that Kastrup and Tegmark and the rest are lying right to your face. For very soon Kastrup says this:

Indeed, according to the Greek atomists, if we kept on dividing things into ever-smaller bits, at the end there would remain solid, indivisible particles called atoms, imagined to be so concrete as to have even particular shapes. Yet, as our understanding of physics progressed, we've realized that atoms themselves can be further divided into smaller bits, and those into yet smaller ones, and so on, until what is left lacks shape and solidity altogether. At the bottom of the chain of physical reduction there are only elusive, phantasmal entities we label as "energy" and "fields"—abstract conceptual tools for describing nature, which themselves seem to lack any real, concrete essence.

You see how that contradicts what he *just* said? He said physics had been tied to information realism since its inception, but here he admits the Greek atomists believed just the opposite. The Greek atomists really were part of the inception of physics, and physics became *physics* because these guys insisted on the reality of atoms.

But it gets worse, because Kastrup then says that atoms were later divided into smaller bits, until what was left lacked shape and solidity. No it didn't. Do electrons lack shape and solidity? No. Do photons lack shape and solidity. No. I remind you of the photoelectric effect, where photons, the smallest things we know of, knock matter out of matter. How do they do that without solidity? Do you think an idea can knock real particles out of real matter? Do you think math can?

Kastrup says matter has been reduced to phantasmal entities that we label energy and fields. No it hasn't. Where did he go to school, Pettifoggers University? Energy is and always has been defined as that real capability a real particle has due to its velocity. It is defined as mass times velocity. Neither

an idea nor a math can have a physical velocity. And a field is defined as a collection of real entities with real characteristics. There is no such thing as a phantasmal field of elusive nothings. A field is not field unless it has something in it. As in a field of molecules, a field of atoms, or a field of photons. A photon is not an idea. A photon is a real thing which you can experience and then have an idea *about*. In which case you do have an idea of a photon. But your idea is only useful to the extent that it matches and accurately describes the real photon. These guys are simply fudging past the difference between the idea and the thing that *causes* the idea. They are trying to conflate the photon with the idea of the photon.

But I don't think they are doing that accidentally, or from ignorance. I don't think there is any possibility they are that stupid. I don't think there is any possibility they believe in what they are pushing here. Not only because it is not possible to actually believe it, but because their entire way of writing and arguing gives them away. In short, this is the way propagandists write. This is the way liars write. Kastrup is telling you very simple things here that he *must* know are false. They contradict the definitions of the words he is using. To believe him, you would have to believe that energy is not energy, a field is not a field, physics is not physics, and consistency is not consistency. If you accept what Shapiro or he is selling, not only physics but the entire history of everything evaporates. Language itself evaporates.

Your ability to think evaporates. Which is just what they want.

I can even give you an easy example that Kastrup doesn't believe what he is saying. Here is his next paragraph:

To some physicists, this indicates that what we call “matter,” with its solidity and concreteness—is an illusion; that only the mathematical apparatus they devise in their theories is truly real, not the *perceived world* the apparatus was created to describe in the first place. From their point of view, such a counterintuitive conclusion is an implication of theory, not a conspicuously narcissistic and self-defeating proposition.

You see what he did there? He just flashed his hand to you, admitting he knows this is all BS. How could the belief that “the mathematical apparatus they devise in their theories” is more real than the real world be anything but conspicuously narcissistic? It would be like an artist thinking his painting was more real than the world he was painting. It would be like me claiming my portrait of Mary is more real than Mary herself. How could I deny that was narcissistic (and obviously false)?

Which begs for a digression. When I paint a beautiful woman, I only hope to approach her beauty. I know that, at best, I can capture only a fraction of it. God or Nature is the real artist, and I am just a paltry imitator. It is the same with physics. As a physicist, I can only hope to approach the truth I see around me. So the question at hand is not only a question of fact, it is a question of *attitude*. You can see how my attitude toward both science and art is diametrically opposed to the Modern attitude. While I put myself in the position of a devotee or lover, the Moderns put themselves in the position of usurper or rapist. For them there is no question of God or Nature, since nothing exists except themselves, and perhaps other usurpers. They create both themselves and the “world” around them, by some sort of sad act of projection.

So, if we make the leap and actually assume they believe this stuff, it just gets worse for them. For in that case they aren't slimy propagandists, trying to maintain the worthless hegemony of their billionaire families via a boatload of nasty lies; they are heretics and blasphemers, pathetically running from a

truth they are aware of, simply to maintain the fiction of their own importance.

In that last quote, we know Kastrup is flashing his hand because he doesn't have to state it that way. If he really believed in his title or thesis here, he would never have used those words. A good debater doesn't leave himself open like that, and a good writer doesn't either. Not that I think Kastrup is a good writer, but I assume he is smart enough not to tear his own cloak. Unless he *means* to tear his own cloak.

More indication in that direction is what he does next. He throws out information realism as the garbage it clearly is. He says,

In the latter case, there is literally *no sense* in attributing primary existence to information.

Yes, just so. But then he jerks you once more:

The untenability of information realism, however, does not erase the problem that motivated it to begin with: the realization that, at bottom, what we call “matter” becomes pure abstraction, a phantasm. How can the *felt* concreteness and solidity of the perceived world evaporate out of existence when we look closely at matter?

Is your head spinning yet? If it isn't, Kastrup hasn't done his job. He asks how the felt concreteness of matter can evaporate when we look more closely. The answer: it can't and doesn't. He is just claiming it does, without giving us even one example. I have looked very closely at these problems for decades, and never once, for a single moment, has the solidity of the world evaporated one iota. None of the thousands of bogus lectures and papers on quantum mechanics I have read have succeeded in making me doubt the reality of the world for the tiniest part of a second. That is because those “arguments”, like this one of Kastrup, crumble upon delivery. It is these arguments that have no solidity, and that evaporate when we look more closely.

If we are honest, what a closer study of Nature does is confirm the astonishing complexity and **reality** of it, a reality beyond the ability of any human or set of humans to create or recreate with math, ideas, art, science, or all put together. In this closer study, it is not Nature that becomes elusive, but our ability to comprehend Her that becomes elusive—which is not at all the same thing. Nature remains firm and solid, while our own surety and confidence in our penetration tends to dissipate. It is human understanding that is phantasmal and partial and fractional, not Nature. Nature is fully real, while human science is mostly bombast. Articles like this one at *UnScientific American* simply confirm that with tall exclamation points.

For Kastrup continues to backslide into agitprop or utter stupidity, he can take his pick:

Tegmark is correct in considering matter—defined as something outside and independent of mind—to be unnecessary baggage. But the implication of this fine and indeed brave conclusion is that the universe is a *mental* construct displayed on the screen of perception. Tegmark’s “mathematical universe” is inherently a mental one, for where does mathematics—numbers, sets, equations—exist if not in mentation?

So for him, it is not information that is ultimately real, it is what he calls *mentation*. The universe as human mental construct. He doesn't explain how that dodges the narcissism problem, or how it isn't circular or self-defeating (since it clearly is), but he does claim it dodges the charge of solipsism.

How? By admitting the existence of other minds. So I guess we are supposed to believe Kastrup has read about as much in the history of philosophy as he has in the history of physics, since he doesn't seem to be aware that you can't dodge solipsism that way. I recommend he start with Descartes and work his way up. To make short work of it, if you define reality as mentation, the only mentation you can prove is your own. Other people's mentation is no more "felt" than the solidity of a rock. It can only be inferred by experience, and if you are going to infer other people's mentation, you might as well infer everything else, including the reality of the real world.

So Kastrup's PhD in philosophy would appear to have been worthless, or awarded on nepotism. We are told he studied philosophy of mind and ontology, but I see no evidence of that in his writings. He appears to have studied nothing but propaganda and sophistry, and he isn't even good at those.

His Freewiki page reads like it was written by Kastrup himself, but it doesn't mention his PhD in philosophy, much less where he got it. Neither do any of his other posted bios. We *are* told he got a PhD in computer engineering from Eindhoven, which explains a lot. The depth of his thought and writing betray such a partial education, and the spookiest spooks often come from a computing background, since they are often tied to military. The level of their fiction remains at this life-as-computer-simulation gambit, since that is as creative as they get. No real people are buying it, but they justify their government paychecks by reviewing and extolling one another.

Just ask yourself why any magazine would print an article like this. As a piece of writing, it is an embarrassment on all levels. As a sample of philosophy or science, it simply isn't. And as a sample of argumentation or polemics, it is even less. I was writing stronger papers in high school. The only possible answer is that these magazines have been taken over by lower levels of Intelligence, and the articles assigned to sub-basement committees manned by the partially competent. They are instructed to cause as much mental dissonance as they can, and since they believe their audience are idiots, they don't require themselves to be consistent, erudite, or credible. They just have to spew out the required number of pages per week. The same can be said of these science books that somehow get published, despite containing no science and no good writing. These books and journals must not be intended to be read by anyone with a clue: they must be targeted to the uneducated effluent of our American university systems, which are set up to charge as much money as possible for as little good information as possible. Which sort of throws a wrench into the whole information-as-reality theory. If either information or mentation is reality, we are in serious trouble.

*Tegmark was groomed by Joseph Silk, another Jewish fraud who has never done a real days work in physics or astronomy in his life. Despite that he has been flooded with awards and chairs, including one at Oxford. The Silks are in the peerage, related to the Keyes baronets, the Wallop viscounts, the Flemings, the Calvert barons, the Lee earls, the Bennet earls, the Grey earls, the Berkeley earls, the Blairs, and the Fords. Through the Fitzroys and Villiers, the Silks descend directly from King Charles II. So it appears Silk was assigned a key role in the destruction/cloaking of real science. Just as Modern art has replaced real art, Modern science has replaced real science, switching it out for a Intelligence-created simulacrum that generates far more profit (in the form of treasury-draining fake projects) and far more psychological damage upon the general population.

Kastrup was named for the Kastrups, related to industrialist Jacob Fortling, who founded the town. He worked early on with British sculptor Simon **Stanley. Although born in Germany, he was later given Danish citizenship, and became a prominent architect and merchant. I assume he was Jewish, since he worked mainly for a crypto-Jewish king (Christian IV, descended in direct line from **Anna Jagiellon** through his mother).