

# SOMETHING FOR MY CRITICS

*by Miles Mathis*

*November 2017, updated July 2018*

*In just eight months many of these papers climbed considerably, including Hollow Neon Atoms, which moved up from 6<sup>th</sup> to 1<sup>st</sup>; Saturn Anomaly, which moved up from 16<sup>th</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup>; Bending of Starlight, which moved up from 12<sup>th</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup>; Galactic Rotation Problem, which moved up from 11<sup>th</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup>; Designer Electron, which moved up from 15<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup>; Icecaps on Mercury, which moved up from 17<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup>; and Coulomb's Equation, which moved up from 26<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup>. I also added many papers to the list, including two more number 1's: Equatorial Anomaly and  $x'=x-vt$ .*

As you may know, I have been blessed by a pestilence of critics. But while they have been paid to devour my grain, they have only managed to fertilize it with their droppings, further increasing my harvest. As one example, we have seen them dismiss me by saying I have no support, no readers, etc. So let us test that claim scientifically, shall we?

Let us go to Google to find out. Let us search on the subject of one of my papers, say the one on Galactic Rotation. We won't even search on "Galactic Rotation Miles Mathis". No, we will search very broadly, on "Galactic Rotation Problem". Out of over a million results, [my paper](#) comes up number 2, ahead of PhysicsWorld, Space.com, EarthSky.org, Universetoday.com, ArsTechnica, Forbes, Harvard, Berkeley, physics.stackexchange, quora, phys.org, wikiwand, Learner.org, and *all* the books at Googlebooks.

Now let us search on "Drude-Sommerfeld". Out of almost 21,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up on the front page, number 5 (not including videos), ahead of MIT, physicsforums, Arxiv, and all Googlebooks. Of course my critics probably won't know what that means, but real physicists will.

How about "Canada/Canada's Gravity Deficit"? Out of 966,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of. . . well, everyone.

How about "All-Known-Physics Equation" (with or without hyphens)? Out of over 9 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of physicsforums, Forbes, preposterousuniverse, Cosmosmagazine, Wired, and Wikipedia. If you think that is skewed by searching on my own equation, it isn't. That paper is in response to *the mainstream's* promoted all-known-physics equation, so my response to the mainstream actually outranks their own promotion.

How about "Cosmic Mass Deficit"? Out of 299,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Arxiv, Wikipedia, and aps.org.

How about "Equatorial Anomaly"? Out of 4,800,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of ScienceDirect, Wiley, Harvard, and Geofisica.

How about "C-orbit Asteriods" (including results for "Horseshoe orbit")? Out of 672,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Wikipedia and Space.com.

How about “Hollow Neon Atom(s)”? Out of 329,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Scientific American, Sciencedaily, phys.org, Sciencedirect, and nih.gov.

How about “ $x' = x - vt$ ”? [My papers](#) comes up both 1<sup>st</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Specific Heat Problem of Electrons”, including all similar results such as “electron heat capacity”? Out of over 5 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Wikipedia and all others.

How about “CHSH Bell Tests” (including results for “CHSH Inequality”)? Out of 44,400 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, after Wikipedia.

How about “Cometary Antitail”, including results for Antitail and Comet tail? Out of 27,300 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup> after Wikipedia.

How about “Pound-Rebka”? Out of 128,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup> after Wikipedia.

How about “Bending of Starlight”? Out of 425,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, ahead of Wikipedia, Wired, PBS, UCLA, NewYorkTimes, Forbes, and NationalGeographic.

How about “Planck Relation”, including results for Planck-Einstein Relation? Out of 2,360,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup> after Wikipedia.

How about “Schiehallion Experiment”? Out of 8,100 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, not including a video, above phys.org, physicsforums, Harvard, and the Royal Society.

How about “Saturn Anomaly”? Out of almost 300,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, ahead of Space.com, Nasa, msn.com, Nature, arxiv, Earthsky, and NationalGeographic.

How about “Rainbow Curve Down”? Out of 6,900,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>. That paper also comes up 24<sup>th</sup> on the search for “Rainbow Alexander's Band”.

How about “Calculus Simplified”? Out of 23,900,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, ahead of MIT, Amazon, Googlebooks, and Quora. [Of course my paper is the only one on the web that actually simplifies it in any meaningful way, which may explain my popularity.]

How about “Galactic Magnetism”, including results for Galactic Magnetic Fields? Out of 329,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 2<sup>nd</sup>, ahead of Phys.org, Sciencealert, Arxiv, Springer, NationalGeographic, and Space.com.

What about “Moon's Ionosphere”, including results for Lunar Ionosphere? Out of 499,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 3<sup>rd</sup>, ahead of Wiley, Nature, and NationalGeographic.

What about “Earth's Dark Matter Halo”? Out of 1,170,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 4<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wikipedia, Forbes, NewScientist, pbs, quora, EarthSky, and phys.org.

How about “Phosphorus-Hydrogen Bond”? Out of 380,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 4<sup>th</sup>, ahead of phys.org, sciencedaily, chegg, chemistryworld and sciencedirect.

How about “Cause of the Solar Cycle”? Out of 2,910,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 4<sup>th</sup>, ahead of

Wikipedia, Phys.org, Space.com, ScientificAmerican, iopscience, NationalGeographic, Almanac.com, and Nature.

How about “Manhattan Metric”? Out of 1,800,000 results, including results for Taxicab Geometry, my [paper](#) comes up number 4, just behind Wikipedia and Mathworld.

How about “Newton/Newton's Lemma”? Out of 436,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 5<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Jstor, mathforum, Springer, arxiv, archive, and academia.edu.

How about “Yuri Milner”? My paper on Milner and the FPP (Breakthrough Prize) comes up 5<sup>th</sup> on a Google search on his name alone.

How about “What Causes the Earth's Heat”? Out of 49,300,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 5<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Spinons don't exist?” Out of 19,600 results, [my paper](#) comes up 5<sup>th</sup>. Likewise, a search on “Spinon orbiton” brings up [two of my papers](#) at #10 and #11.

How about “Ice Caps on Mercury”? Out of 1,890,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 5<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Nature.com, Sciencedirect, Wiley, PopularMechanics, Astronomy.com, Caltech, and NationalGeographic.

How about “Levitation by Heat”? Out of 2,260,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of ScientificAmerican, LiveScience, and NASA.

How about “Diatomic Hydrogen”? Out of 618,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of hyperphysics, aps.org, Sciencedirect, and all Googlebooks.

How about “Hadronization”? Out of 125,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of cern, iopscience, aps.org, Sciencedirect, and Springer.

How about “Designer Electron”? Out of 2,780,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of stanford, github, nih.gov, acs.org, and aip.org.

How about “Born-Einstein Letters”? Out of 4,870,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 6<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Orbiton”? Out of 117,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 6<sup>th</sup>, ahead of yourdictionary, aps.org, physicsstackexchange, and Sciencedirect.

How about “Metacinnabar”? Out of 108,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 7<sup>th</sup>, ahead of merriam-webster and dictionary.com.

How about “Wilkes Land Anomaly”? Out of 67,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 8<sup>th</sup>, ahead of ScienceDirect, Cambridge, New Scientist, Nature, Quora, and Oxford.

How about “Uranium Tetrafluoride”? Out of 56,400 results, [my paper](#) comes up 8<sup>th</sup>, ahead of merriam-webster, aps.org, nih.gov, and avs.org.

How about “Light Clock”? Out of 334,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 8<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wiktionary, physics.nyu, and the Thunderbolts.

How about “Variable Acceleration”? Out of over 5 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 9<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Susskind Smolin Debate”? Out of 59,400 results, [my paper](#) comes up 9<sup>th</sup>, ahead of mathforums, preposterousuniverse, scribd, revolv, and gizmodo.

How about “Helium 4 boson”? Out of 133,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 9<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Springerlink, RationalWiki, arxiv, and Cosmomagazine.

How about “Tired Light”? Out of 62,000,000 results, [my paper](#) come up 9<sup>th</sup>, ahead of quora, Scienceblogs, Harvard, and Cambridge.

How about “Cavendish Experiment”? Out of 693,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 9<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wikia, RoyalSociety, and encyclopedia.com.

How about “Vacuum Catastrophe”? Out of over a million results, [my paper](#) comes up 10<sup>th</sup>, ahead of scienceforums, physicsforums, vixra, academia.edu, Harvard, and all Googlebooks.

How about “Magnetism of Mars”? Out of 417,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 11<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Astronomy.com, Space.com, Wired.com, Nature.com, and Wikipedia.org!

How about “Bode's Law”? Out of 260,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 11<sup>th</sup>, ahead of dictionary.com, collinsdictionary, merriam-webster, scienceworld.wolfram.com, Oxfordreference.com, Infoplease, Springer.com, thefreedictionary, encyclopedia.com, Elsevier, Wiktionary, iopscience, Harvard, Oxford dictionary, quora, jstor, gizmodo, and WorldReference.com.

How about “quarks don't exist”? Out of 429,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 11<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Space.com, ScienceAlert, Guardian, LiveScience, physorg, and Discovermagazine.

How about “Electron Radius”? Out of 143,000,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 11<sup>th</sup>, ahead of iopscience, physlink, and Feynmanlectures.

How about “Goldbach's Conjecture”? Out of 69,100 results, [my paper](#) comes up 11<sup>th</sup>, ahead of encyclopediaofmath, PopularMechanics, quora, NewYorkTimes, Wiktionary, WorldScientific, collinsdictionary, freedictionary, Wired, and Dictionary.com.

How about “Axial Tilt”? Out of 817,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 12<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Space.com, encyclopedia.com, Wiktionary, Quora, and nih.gov.

How about “Why does hot air rise”? Out of almost 2 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 12<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Forbes, Learner, Socratic, Physlink, and ScientificAmerican.

How about “Coulomb's Equation”, including results for Coulomb's Constant and Coulomb's Law? Out of 692,000 results, [my paper](#) come up 12<sup>th</sup>, ahead of NYU, Wikiversity, physicsforums, and utexas.edu.

How about “Allais Effect”? Out of 196,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 15<sup>th</sup> (not including 4 youtube videos).

How about “Heliospheric Current Sheet”? Out of 60,600 results, [my paper](#) comes up 15<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Anomalous Magnetic Moment”? Out of 467,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 18<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Columbia.edu, nih.gov, iopscience, and Harvard.

How about “Unified Field Equation”, including results for Unified Field Theory? Out of one million results, [my paper](#) comes up 18<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Arxiv, AIP, and Harvard.

How about “Klein-Nishina Formula”? Out of 31,300 results, [my paper](#) comes up 14<sup>th</sup>, ahead of aps.org, Harvard, Sciencedirect, Springer, and Vixra.

How about “Mercury's Magnetism”? Out of 1,130,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 15<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Wiley, ncbi, ScienceDirect, physorg, and Smithsonianmag.

How about “Perihelion Precession of Mercury”? Out of 56,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 16<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Tycho, Universetoday, iopscience, Harvard, Vixra, Springer, Berkeley, Cornell, and Quora.

How about “Metonic Cycle”? Out of 251,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 16<sup>th</sup>, ahead of the Oxford dictionary, encyclopedia.com, Wiktionary, Wordreference, Harvard, Infoplease, and all Googlebooks.

How about “Strong Force” (including results for Strong Interaction)? Out of 32,400,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 17<sup>th</sup>, ahead of merriam-webster, Wiktionary, Physicsworld, Learner, Wikiversity, and Nature.

How about “Asymptotic Freedom”? Out of over 4 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 19<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Dictionary.com, Oxford, Princeton, Harvard, and Physicstoday.

How about “Pressure Flow Hypothesis”? Out of over 9 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 19<sup>th</sup>, indicating large numbers even for my papers that aren't straight physics.

How about “Stern-Gerlach”? Out of 289,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 20<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Nature, PhysicsToday, ScienceDirect, Springer, APS, and the Royal Society.

How about “Noether's Theorem”? Out of 510,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 21<sup>st</sup>, ahead of thefreedictionary, Springer, Oxford, Nature, Discovermagazine, Sciencedirect, and Britannica.

How about “Bottom Baryon”? Out of 45,400 results, [my paper](#) come up 21<sup>st</sup>.

How about “Aberration of Starlight”? Out of 97,700 results, [my paper](#) comes up 21<sup>st</sup>.

How about “Sr2CuO3”? Out of 17,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 21<sup>st</sup>.

How about “Friedmann Metric”? Out of 220,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 23<sup>rd</sup>, ahead of Springer, einstein-online, ncbi, physicsforums, Nature, iopscience, aps, quora, cern, and Harvard.

How about “Rydberg Formula”? Out of 231,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 26<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Chemistryworld, aps.org, academia.edu, Arxiv, and Vixra.

How about “Gauss Gravity Law”? Out of 639,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 26<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Why do Stars Twinkle”? Out of 1,740,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 27<sup>th</sup>.

What about “Birkeland Currents”? Out of 87,200 results, [my paper](#) comes up 28<sup>th</sup>.

How about “South Atlantic Anomaly”? Out of 384,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 29<sup>th</sup>, ahead of stsci.edu, oxfordreference, dict.cc, spacetelescope.org, arxiv, astronomynow, Springer, and nsf.gov.

How about “Evanescent Waves”? Out of 132,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 29<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Bohr Magneton”? Out of 190,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 33<sup>rd</sup>, ahead of Caltech, Quora, aps.org, Springer, and Nature.com.

How about “Gravity Waves Bicep”? Despite the recent media blitz on that and over 141,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 35<sup>th</sup>, ahead of NewScientist, Space.com, nih.gov, independent.co.uk, sciencemag.org, USAtoday, kavlifoundation, caltech, kipac.stanford.edu, and dcc.ligo.org!

How about “Reduced Mass”? Out of 251,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 33<sup>rd</sup>.

How about “Zeno's Paradoxes”? Out of 73,800 results [my paper](#) come up 31<sup>st</sup>, ahead of Cornell, Jstor, BBC, arstechnica, and Proofwiki.

How about “Fine Structure Constant”? Out of 19 million results, [my paper](#) comes up 36<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Enceladus Brightness”? Out of 133,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 36<sup>th</sup>, ahead of Slate.com, Cornell, Phys.org, Earthsky, PhysicsToday, Sciencedaily, Astronomynow, Smithsonianmag, hyperphysics, popsci, and Astronomy.com.

How about “Virial Theorem”? Out of 337,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 38<sup>th</sup>.

What about “South Atlantic Anomaly”? Out of 557,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 38<sup>th</sup>.

How about “Two Envelopes Paradox”? Out of 464,000 results, [my paper](#) comes up 43<sup>rd</sup>.

How about “Gravitational Lensing”? [My paper](#) comes up 47<sup>th</sup>.

And if you search on “Charge Field”, but disallow results containing “electric” or “electrical” in the title, [my paper](#) comes up 1<sup>st</sup> out of 342,000,000 results. That is proof enough the mainstream doesn't realize there is any difference between the charge field and the electrical field, doesn't it?

Notice that all the searches above were on general topics, not slanted my way at all. We could also look at topics like “physics is corrupt”, but that is no longer neutral, I admit. Of course on topics like that, my papers almost always come up first on a search.

Now, do you honestly think any other private individual in the world can claim rankings like that, on a broad array of scientific subjects? Of course my critics will claim I have some way to cheat the rankings. I don't. I just put the papers up and let them fend for themselves. I am not a computer geek, as you can see by my website formatting. I wouldn't know how to boost my rankings if I wanted to. But that doesn't stop my critics from whining. We saw one of them complaining that I cheated the rankings by putting the subject of my papers in the titles. No, really, he actually said that.

Others will claim that only stupid people visit my site, but do you really think stupid people are surfing the internet on those terms above? Do stupid people commonly search on terms like “Drude-Sommerfeld”, “Klein-Nishina Formula” or “Rydberg Formula”? Of course not. What these rankings indicate is that mainstream physicists are secretly mobbing my site on a broad array of topics, taking what they can from it.

To make this even more interesting, while doing these searches on my own papers, I was notified at least a dozen times by Google that their systems had “detected unusual traffic” from my computer, forcing me to prove I was not a robot via reCAPTCHA. Anyone want to tell me what that was about? My guess is someone monitoring my computer was not happy I was finally getting around to doing this: searching on my own papers. Until now I guess I had better things to do, and this is the first time I have done it in all the years the papers have been up. But if you think it was fun, you are right.

It would be even more fun if those mainstream physicists causing these rankings would revolt tomorrow. Or if they would at least drop me an anonymous line now and again, telling me they wish they had the balls to do it. I guess I should take solace in what I have, though. The numbers above tell me—and should tell you—that the revolution has already taken place. It is already done. We just haven't heard the report yet. Those in charge are holding the presses, but I guess it doesn't really matter. I know, you know, and they know, so a report isn't really necessary.

I can't wait to see how my critics respond to this paper. I am sure it will be amusing, providing many pounds of new fertilizer to my fields.

There is now a follow-up to this paper, called [\*More for my Critics and Allies\*](#).