

[return to updates](#)

A MAINSTREAM RESPONSE TO MY DARK MATTER PAPER



by Miles Mathis↑

The website “bad astronomy” had [a short discussion](#) of my theory last summer in one of its forums, which I just stumbled across by accident. I found it amusing enough to share with you.

Some unknown person—who doesn't even have a moniker—quotes the three equations [from my paper](#), showing that dark matter is just charge. He then asks if it is possible I can be correct.

$$e = 1.602 \times 10^{-19} \text{ C}$$

$$1\text{C} = 2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ kg/s (see definition of Ampere to find this number in the mainstream)}$$

$$e = 3.204 \times 10^{-26} \text{ kg/s}$$

This means the proton is emitting 19 times its own mass as charge every second. 19 times is 95%, which is the percent of dark matter we are told is in the universe.

It looks like he asked the wrong people. Someone named “loglo” answers first:

Well for one, they are not equations of physics. They are just specifying the values of known constants. For two, we already know how to convert from mass to energy, its a real equation with real experimental and theoretical heritage, $E=mc^2$.

Interesting. Those “are not equations of physics.” I guess that is why they are in all physics books, and include this symbol: =. But according to loglo, the equation $e = 1.602 \times 10^{-19}\text{C}$ has no real experimental heritage. The Coulomb and the Ampere have no real experimental or theoretical heritage. Hmm, I guess that in the physics books loglo was brought up on, the Coulomb and the Ampere and the fundamental charge were just invented by some oddballs on the internet who wanted to make trouble.

Then he mistakes charge for energy. Someone needs to tell him that c doesn't stand for charge in

Einstein's equation. I am not converting from mass to energy, I am converting from mass to charge. Not the same thing. Why would I use Einstein's equation when it has no charge variable in it? How can he use it to calculate charge relative to the mass of the proton? How is $E=$ a real equation but $e=$ is not? Then he says this:

For three he seems not to know that the effects of dark energy and dark matter are actually detected in wildly different parts of the universe, the least dense and the most dense parts.

Is loglo implying that density has something to do with charge? Do we find charge only in more dense matter, or less dense matter? I thought all electrons and protons had charge, according to current theory. If so, his statement here is a *non sequitur*. What do “wildly different parts of the universe” have to do with charge?

Why can't loglo seem to look at what is actually in my equations, instead of misdirecting from the start? Why can he not address the question asked? Are three equations really too hard for him to follow? Apparently, because after these three very silly answers—none of which addresses the question asked—he gives up and starts calling me names. First I am misguided, then clinically insane. Then he accuses me of writing under a pseudonym, although my real name is Miles Mathis, which I put boldly on every paper right under the title. More than anyone in this forum does. Loglo, is that your real name? Must be an eskimo.

Then he takes issue with me attacking Wikipedia. He says real scientists don't attack Wikipedia. Yes, real scientists in the world of loglo accept everything their elders tell them without question.

He also says real scientists don't ask for donations on their websites. He is offended that I ask for a dollar if you like what you read. Instead, real scientists go on the pages of the mainstream science journals and beg for a trillion dollars. They go to Congress and beg for billion dollar space programs and colliders. I guess my problem is I ask for too little.

Of course mainstream scientists don't need small donations from friendly readers, since they already get paid good money from the various institutions to do what they are told, follow the current lines of research, and keep quiet otherwise. Loglo would obviously prefer I took large amounts of hush money rather than small amounts to do independent research.

Then someone named Cougar chimes in to back up loglo. He confirms that I am “bonkers,” without of course mentioning anything in particular. He says I correct Einstein, Newton, and Euclid, and am therefore bonkers, but he doesn't bother to address anything I actually say about Einstein, Newton, or Euclid. That would be unscientific I guess. Better just to sit around and blow smoke on forums, while hiding behind cutesy handles. Unless Cougar is his real name. Cheyenne brave, I guess. But since Newton corrected major physicists before him, I suppose he must be bonkers as well, by the same logic. And since Einstein corrected Newton, he must be bonkers. So I like the company.

The nameless person who asked the question then thanks these nameless people who threw mud for their mud, thanks them for not answering the question, thanks them for being so opaque, thanks them for the physics lesson, thanks them for clarifying that equations are not equations and that the fundamental charge has no experimental heritage, and gives them a :).

Then “macaw” gets in a late swipe, confirming that I am “a known crank.” Good to see these braves ended on a high note. You wouldn't want to rely completely on *ad hominem* remarks. That would just

be empty and childish, wouldn't it?

Someone should tell them they can get their obvious frustration out in an even lower fashion by going to my youtube site and making fun of my hair. That is what other science critics have been doing.

Addendum, March 2, 2012: The day after I posted this, the page at bautforums tripled in length, but still nothing substantial. They invited me to come over and be buzzed at close range by flies, but I begged off. I have my five papers to write this week and can't waste all my time being a target for frustrated science readers. I *will* tell you what I told them when they invited me, however. I am not shy that way.

"I just checked the page again, three times as long but still nothing substantial. So a jerk isn't an acceleration? What does he think it is? It's a higher order motion, which by definition is an acceleration. m/s : velocity, m/s^2 : acceleration, m/s^3 : higher order acceleration. If he can't figure that out, he is in the same lostland as loglo, denying that the Coulomb is real physics. The forum page was about my three equations. Is anyone going to get around to actually looking at what they say? How long does the page have to get before anyone thinks of actually answering 'quotation's' question?"

"Antoniseb" says I respond to *ad homs* with *ad homs*. Not really, although my substantial responses *are* barbed. My response has ten times the content of their initial attack. But as usual they can dish it out but can't take it. He says I don't clarify anything. What is there to clarify? The papers exist. The equations exist. They are already clear. "Quotation" asked *them* a question on *their* forum, not me. They chose not to answer it, not me. They chose to misdirect, not me. I am still waiting for some question or response with content. So far, none. He says that my "3-page paper" is "simplistic." He apparently doesn't know how to read the page counter at the top of a PDF, because it is 5 pages, and it is backed up by much longer papers on the [bullet cluster problem](#) and [MOND](#) (and many others), where I address many questions and data, *including* his questions here. Ask yourself why he is purposely undercounting my pages and implying falsely that I have only a few half-baked papers up? If he wants to attack me, why doesn't he mention my standing answers to his questions? Why would he imply that I haven't addressed them [when I have](#)? He points to gravitational lensing, but I have [a long paper](#) on that as well, written in clear words and equations. These guys read a couple of sentences in one paper and immediately dismiss me as "simplistic." This despite the fact that I have around 2,300 pages up free to the public on a myriad of linked topics. The problem would appear to be that I have done too much, not too little. They can't absorb it and give up, I guess.

"Tensor" "hasn't checked my math" on reversing the vector to solve GR problems. Interesting, since my math is about 4 lines long and Einstein's is about 40 pages long. Are the guys afraid of actually looking at my math? Does it frighten them? Yes, the very thought that I am right *is* frightening. An artist seeing things they missed! It makes contemporary physics look very bad. Tensor is probably mad because [I just showed](#) once again that the tensor calculus is a misdirection. I prove it with [those equations](#) he "hasn't checked."

Just looked again and the page is still completely composed of anonymous slurs and refusals to address any real questions. It looks like they don't really want me there, which is understandable. Why would they? If they were really interested in science, they would have corrected these things before I got there, or at least be interested in considering my corrections. They have shown they aren't interested in that. They are interested in remaining in their little shells and calling people names who threaten their surety. That isn't science, braves.

I suppose I should thank them, though. I realized I was lacking a couple of links in that dark matter paper, and added them, so this was not a complete waste of time.

Addendum, March 4, 2012: the forum moderator closed the discussion. They couldn't come up with one substantial point to the question asked them by “quotation”, and the whole lot of them were getting publicly embarrassed by my comments above, so they decided to give it one more round of weak slurs and slink off to hide behind their monikers. Pathetic. A whole forum beaten by one artist who didn't even have to show up. Just the threat of me showing up was enough to shut them down.

Since they ended with one last set of comments, I will, too. Tensor still can't seem to understand that a jerk is a *negative* acceleration. So of course it won't cover as much x as a positive acceleration. The textbook I am critiquing [in that paper](#) is talking about a positive change in acceleration, not a negative, so his comments are once again purposeful misdirection. He can't say anything substantial about the question at hand—which was about charge and dark matter, remember—so he diverts us into something he thinks he knows. He should keep looking, because he doesn't know much about that either. In the same way, his comments about my vector reversal are hardly worth responding to, they are so weak. He says that I say the vector reversal doesn't apply. I never say that. I say that it *may* not imply an actual motion in the field, as an expansion of the central body. But since the vector reversal allows us to get around the tensor calculus and to solve GR problems in a fraction of the time, it certainly applies in that sense. But it is clear he knows that, and just can't admit it.

As for antoniseb, he tries to come off as the level-headed old man among boys, but he is just more unctuous. He says he is avoiding slurs even as he delivers nothing but. Who is really handwaving here, him or me? His argument was worse than handwaving, since it was just lying, lying I caught him at. Undercounting my pages, saying I don't answer questions that I have answered, and saying I am “unarmed to support what I've written.” It is you, antoniseb, that are failing to support what *you* have written. Why don't you mention the long [bullet cluster paper](#) I wrote, addressing your questions? Why don't you mention that I look hard a lot of mainstream data there and in other papers? Why do you feel the need to misdirect all the time *away* from what I have done and said, claiming that I haven't done and said it? If you are the moderator over there, why did you allow the braves to slur me and slander me? Are you surprised I am angry? You apparently find my heat unbearable, but if so why did you start the fire?

As I said, these guys can dish it out but can't take it. When they start getting beat they close up shop. My regular readers are asking me to stop and get back to work, but I just wanted to show that what I have claimed is true *is* true: the mainstream has been existing on slander and threats and hot air for decades. They've got nothing but numbers. But numbers don't mean anything. A whole forum can't even stand up to a single artist.

My readers are saying, “Don't bother with these people, they are just wasting your time!” Perfect, since that is exactly what I *wanted* to get my readers to say. I wanted my readers to see that all these mainstream gatekeepers slurring anyone who makes a peep are just propagandists, surviving on slander and misdirection. I wanted my readers to actually *say* it. If I say it, it doesn't mean much. If I show it, it means much more.

Addendum, March 7, 2012: I thought my readers would be interested to see how they closed up shop over at bautforums:

Moderator: Let me say again... we need to be careful to not open this thread as a general mechanism for putting Mathis'

clearly ATM [against the mainstream] ideas into mainstream threads.

IF you, **quotation**, want to discuss Mathis' ideas any further, you must bring them up in ATM threads, and defend his ideas until you are convinced he is wrong, or you convince us he is right, or 30 days pass. No infraction points so far, but there will be after this.

People can respond for the next 24 hours. After that this thread will be closed.

Infraction points. Closing threads to prevent discussion of “against the mainstream” ideas. 30-day time limits. 24-hour time limits. All proof that the mainstream is controlled. Fascist science.

I made a believer out of “quotation” at least. He admitted today in an email to me:

I didn't even know what a forum rat was till I read this today from the moderator. I posted a few relevant bits from your [new relativity paper](#) that were directly related to dark matter, which after all was the crux of the original question. I particularly liked the part where I'm supposed to defend your ideas until I'm convinced you're wrong...Noobody expects the Spanish Inquisition! I thought you'd kind of weenied out there a couple days ago by not accepting their challenge, but see now you did the right thing. Problem is these guys do represent the mainstream, but don't want to talk about real science...the kind that is constantly open to new ideas... which means we are royally screwed. btw I thought you did a nice job on that new paper, and in all honesty, thought (foolishly) that these people would get it, too. Hang in there!

Notice that I *did* accept their challenge, I just did it on my own terms (above) on my own site, not on their site where they could threaten me with infractions and other manufactured debating rules to suit themselves. I am not sure these guys really “represent the mainstream,” either. They have either been hired to protect it, or they have volunteered (don't assume it is the latter), but that just means they are dupes of the scientific 1%. They call themselves the mainstream in order to create a nice-looking bandwagon, but that is just more propaganda. I don't believe anymore that they represent any majority. In my experience, the majority of physicists are disillusioned and are looking for something else. These forums like baut are then created to browbeat the majority back into line. They are created to give physicists the impression that their colleagues are in line with current theory. But it's all a house of cards and I am blowing it down as we speak. Do you want to know what was as deflating for the baut guys as anything? The fact that I continued to publish new papers while I was knocking them over. They didn't even manage to break my stride.