

[return to updates](#)

A DEFENSE OF ERIK ANDRULIS



looks like a nice guy to me

by Miles Mathis

Jesse Emspak just published [an article at Space.com](#) titled “Crackpot Theory of Everything Reveals Dark Side of Peer Review.” Unfortunately, the article only reveals the dark side of modern science propaganda.

The slur “crackpot” is aimed at Erik Andrulis, whom I had not heard of before today and whose article I have not read. I don't need to read it because this defense is not a defense of Andrulis' theory, it is a defense of Andrulis' right to publish his theory without being called a crackpot by mainstream gatekeepers and propagandists. Emspak's article is clearly a hatchet job by a paid insider, and I don't like poorly done hatchet jobs. I say I have a bigger and sharper hatchet than Emspak does, and I will now prove it by shredding his article at Space.com.

Erik Andrulis is a university biochemist who got a paper published in the peer-reviewed journal *Life*. Apparently his paper was interesting enough that it was taking attention away from this year's mainstream talking points, and someone in some endowed chair somewhere decided it was dangerous. They then hired Emspak to come in and rough Andrulis up a bit. Who is Jesse Emspak? A top physicist or chemist? No. He is a freelance journalist who is a mutual funds reporter for *Investor's Business Daily* and other such places when he isn't providing agitprop for *Discovery News* or Space.com. Sounds fishy to me already. I am just going to assume he is with some government agency until he proves he isn't. This is a good bet, since most of what you read under major mastheads—on the internet and off—is written now by government agencies or at their behest. The tone of his article leads us in this direction as well, since he doesn't argue in a straightforward way. He argues like a second-string debate team member, and this is about the best mainstream science can come up with these days. The “scientists” aren't capable of debating anyone, so they hire these goons like Emspak to

do their dirty work.

Emspak leads by telling us that Andrulis “got a lot of attention for positing that inanimate objects, from planets and water to strands of DNA, are alive.” This, Emspak assures us, is “bunk.” Just reading the rest of Emspak's article leads me to doubt that thesis is central to Andrulis' paper, but even if it is, I think the idea might merit a little more analysis than that. “Bunk” comes in the second sentence, so Emspak's knee couldn't possibly be jerking any faster.

Proof that Emspak is a poor debater and hatchet man comes very quickly, since by paragraph three he admits that,

He [Andrulis] doesn't say that everything is alive, exactly, though he says gyres have "lifelike characteristics."

So Andrulis *doesn't* say what Emspak just told us he *does* say? Wouldn't that be a misquote, then? And wouldn't that be an example of dishonest journalism? Emspak's thesis is unwinding already, and he is doing the unwinding for us. He is grabbing his own hatchet from the wrong side. At first Andrulis was telling us everything was alive, but now he isn't? Besides, if saying that something has “lifelike characteristics” is proof of crackpottery, then a majority of scientists who have ever lived would immediately have to be defrocked.

I would argue that no matter how wrong Andrulis may or may not be in his physics, his paper is less dangerous than wildly dishonest journalism. Being wrong is one thing, being a propagandist is another.

But Emspak was unwinding even before that. In paragraph two, he tells us that Andrulis uses his gyres to explain lots of things, “including a few that aren't familiar, like quantum gravity (a theory which hasn't been invented yet)”. Emspak seems to imply that Andrulis, fool that he is, is explaining things that aren't admitted to exist, but this cuts back on Emspak and his masters much more than on Andrulis. We have gotten articles on quantum gravity from the mainstream journals like *Scientific American* and *Physics Today* and so on at a pretty brisk pace over the past decade, sometimes more than one a month. Physicists like Lee Smolin (and many others) have made a career out of writing and lecturing about quantum gravity, so it is not clear why these people are allowed to theorize and Andrulis isn't. One can only guess that Andrulis is stepping on some toes or not playing by the rules. This fracas looks like politics, not science. Andrulis probably forgot to kiss someone's hem or forgot to send in his party dues.

Immediately after this, Emspak says,

It isn't clear exactly how this works, though, because he never explains it — at least not in a way that is testable. [[Twisted Physics: 7 Mind-Blowing Findings](#)]

Yes, I included that link on purpose. It is in the article like that. I will get to it in a moment. But first, we have to look at Emspak's claim that Andrulis' theory isn't testable. Maybe it is, maybe it isn't, but in this context Emspak's argument couldn't be weaker. Most of contemporary physics isn't testable, and that includes much of the most feted theory of the past six decades. String theory isn't testable, but that hasn't stopped it from steady growth over the last thirty years. Most of QCD isn't testable, since the quark and gluons and so on can't be isolated. Symmetry breaking is not testable, virtual particles are not testable, quantum tunneling is not testable, black hole theory is not testable, inflation is not testable, and so on. Leonard Susskind, one of the top dogs of string theory, [has told us](#) (in defense of his own postulates) that physical theories don't need to be falsifiable or testable. They are accepted

because top physicists accept them. I don't expect Susskind will include Andrulis in that defense. If you are at the center of the field, your pronouncements don't need to be testable, but if you are at Case Western Reserve, they do.

Now for that link. Some mischievous elf must have put that link in just that place, because it proves my point. We are linked to 7 examples of “spooky” science, including those quarks and gluons I just mentioned. In the first example, the scientists are calling their recent results a quark-gluon soup, but don't think that means they have isolated either one. They haven't. Nothing that matches the current definition of either a quark or a gluon was seen. Of course this won't affect the theory, since the theorists have already told us that they don't need a quark to prove quark theory. Another example of spooky science in this link is entanglement. Have they seen entanglement? No. What they see are phenomena that then then *explain* with entanglement. But you can't see or prove entanglement because it is only a bit of tricky math. You can't see or prove tricky math. You can only disprove it later, by showing a non-magic explanation of the phenomena.

Next, Emspak belittles Andrulis' explanation of perihelion and aphelion by telling us that

Newtonian mechanics does a good enough job of explaining it: As planets accelerate toward the sun they also move perpendicular to the direction of attraction, and trace out elliptical paths.

The only person less rigorous than a mainstream physicist is a journalist taking the word of a mainstream physicist. “We don't need Andrulis or anyone else theorizing about celestial mechanics, we already know everything!” But the only people who buy that are people who have never actually studied the orbital equations. The orbital math is so full of holes it barely qualifies as math. Just as one example, in order to get the orbit to sum right (connect up into an ellipse), the mathematicians are forced to give the orbiting body a variable motion “perpendicular to the direction of attraction.” That's right, the second vector Emspak mentions explicitly isn't constant. The orbiter speeds up and slows down. This is the vector that Newton called the body's innate motion. Here's a question for you: how does a body (that isn't alive—since that is bunk) vary its innate motion to suit sums? Is the Earth self-propelled? Can it speed up and slow down just to match the equations of the mainstream?

Mainstream physicists will throw up their hands at this point and tell me everyone knows the orbital velocity is variable. That is no problem, they will say. But I am not talking about the orbital velocity, and neither is Emspak or Newton. Emspak says, “perpendicular to the direction of attraction.” That isn't the orbital velocity, [it is the tangential velocity](#), which is Newton's innate motion. As such, it can't vary. But it is. *Both* the orbital velocity and the tangential velocity are varying in the current orbital equations. But they hide the tangential velocity from you, so that you won't notice this.

Emspak then moves on to electrons:

Andrulis writes that [electrons](#) are photons that decelerate in steps below [the speed of light](#) due to opposing forces – generated by gyres, and it is the reason electrons have spin. Andrulis doesn't mention how one might test this idea, and it doesn't match current physics, which says electrons are elementary particles.

That is all Emspak has to say: It doesn't match current physics. But has current physics tested the idea that electrons are elementary particles, or has it just run with it? In fact, we already have some evidence that electrons are not elementary. One very strong piece of evidence is that when a positron and electron “annihilate,” we get several gamma ray **photons**. That's not really annihilation, is it? Annihilation infers that *nothing* is the result, by the meaning of the word embedded there, *nihil*, which

means *nothing* in Latin. Several photons are not nothing. Might not these photons be pieces of the electron and positron? Which would mean that they were made of photons to start with, which would mean that Andrulis is right. So the idea has *already* been tested, and the test confirms Andrulis.

Empak then tells us that Andrulis hasn't responded to phonecalls. Maybe he figured out you were writing a hitpiece, Jesse, and didn't want to be involved. More points to Andrulis, since we now see that *is* what you were doing.

Empak then quotes Ethan Siegel, who shames himself by saying,

"Crackpottery doesn't even begin to describe just how dreadful this is, and how much shame should be heaped upon CWRU for this."

Zero content and *ad hominem* remarks, as we are used to seeing from the mainstream. Not one word about any specific content of the paper. If the paper is really dreadful, show us something dreadful. I haven't seen anything dreadful mentioned here yet, except from the mouths of the mainstream. For instance, is anything in Andrulis more dreadful and untestable than symmetry breaking, virtual particles, renormalization, backward causality, spooky forces, phonons, action at a distance, quantum tunneling, quark color, strings, the existence of the singularity, wormholes, one photon taking two paths at the same time, messenger photons, borrowing from the vacuum, quantum smearing, multiverses, many worlds, exponential inflation, gluons, asymptotic freedom, anti-screening, and on and on?

We then find that a bunch of people at *Life* are either resigning over this or hiding under the bed. That is not surprising, since scientists tend to have the courage of a wet kitten. All the agencies have to do is sic one little puppy like Empak on them and they crumble into tears and letters of apology. Of course Case Western isn't backing its man, either. Modern institutions are pleased as punch when one of their people gets some attention, but if one old lady writes in and says she is offended, they start dictating the reprimands. Science talks about independent research, but there isn't any independent research in the universities, as this proves. The scientists are controlled by the administrators and the administrators are controlled by the institutions and the institutions are controlled by higher institutions. The federal agencies that control funding run the game, and if your theory offends one of their top guys, they will squash you like a bug, as we are seeing. That is why the only interesting ideas now come from the margins.

Empak then tells us he is going to show us how peer review works, to show how it failed in this instance. Instead he accuses Andrulis of writing the paper as a hoax. He even quotes an anonymous source as saying the paper is "too obviously nonsense" to be genuine. So Empak has progressed from signed slurs to anonymous slurs. I am just surprised he doesn't interview Andrulis' neighbors, one of whom might have seen Andrulis take out the trash in his underwear or yell at his dog.

Empak doesn't need to tell us how peer review works. We know how it works. It is meant to protect insiders from competition with outsiders, and in this case it failed. Young biochemists like Andrulis aren't allowed to theorize about physics, or to have grand ideas about life or gyres or anything else. That is the territory of Hawking and Penrose and Susskind and Smolin and the other endowed and sanctified and berobed people at the major universities and thinktanks. It has already been decided for us whose untestable theories we are going to be hit over the head with week after week and year after year, and they don't want us to sneak a peak at anything else. That's also why they don't like the internet. They can't control what information goes into your mind there. You might think about

something they don't want you to think about. You might become interested in something they aren't selling.

Some, upon reading my response here, will say, "Wow, that's a pretty vicious hatchet job for a guy who just claimed to hate hatchet jobs." I never said I hated hatchet jobs. I said I hate *poor* hatchet jobs. I hate hatchet jobs with no content. I hate hatchet jobs that are all slur and innuendo, that never address solid points. I hate hatchet jobs that read like transparent propaganda. But I *like* hatchet jobs that are direct and to the point, that successfully cut the legs out from under some jerk that has overstepped. I like reading them, and most of all I like writing them.