Why Sabine Hossenfelder is Still a TOOL





by Miles Mathis

First published March 7, 2025

A couple of days ago <u>I sent Hossenfelder some real hits</u> to go with all her fake hits given her by the CIA, but I didn't want anyone to think she and I were on the mend. Yesterday youtube promoted one of her video shorts to me, and <u>it happened to be on pi=4</u>. Hmmm, I wonder why she would need to make a promoted video on that? You can be sure it was to answer my paper on that, as well as Steven <u>Oostdijk's youtube video</u> on it, though we are told I haven't gotten any traction on that question in the mainstream. Obviously false, since that paper was viral until Google was instructed to delist it, and we can be sure youtube has been sitting on Steven's numbers. You have to wonder just how many hits they erase every week from his video, and how many they add to Hossenfelder's. Millions, you can be sure.

Like Google, Youtube is actively suppressing Steven's video, and you can prove that very easily just by searching for it without my link above. I searched on pi=4 experiment and pi=4 experiment Oostdijk, and got nothing, though his is the only pi=4 experiment on youtube. Dozens of results that don't address that search come up, with a bunch of people trying and failing to debunk it with bad arguments and worse math, but the video they are responding to doesn't come up. Youtube is actively hiding it, like Google actively hides me. Another trick I noticed is that there is something called a Raspberry Pi4 kit and other products, which they obviously named and promoted to get eyes off me. Youtube actually only gives you FIVE results on the given search term, all of them Raspberry PI, before shunting you off into results that have nothing to do with it at all.

The mainstream won't even mention most of my biggest papers or discoveries [like diagraming the

<u>nucleus</u>, <u>unlocking the Lagrangian</u>, or correctly <u>predicting a Solar Cycle</u>], but a few of them think my pi papers are a weak point, so they like to hit me there. My pi papers are *not* a weak point. They are just as strong as any of my papers, and there is no weakness in them. Which is why, when anyone like Hossenfelder addresses the subject, she has to ignore everything I say and shunt you off immediately into misdirection.

Anyway, we already know Hossenfelder has been assigned to the anti-Miles campaign, though she isn't doing much of a job of it. None of them are, to be honest, since all their yapping just ends up as backhanded promotion, sending more people to my papers. We saw that even with the qubit question of a few days ago, where she admitted I was right but forgot to mention me, instead promoting other mainstream people. I have been calling foul on the qubit and Majorana for over a decade, and those guys have just arrived, but she has been paid to misdirect away from that.

But on this question of pi=4, she ignores me while *not* agreeing with me. This is the usual response to all my papers: ignore my existence and ignore everything I say in the papers except the titles and then mock up some soundbite reply that wouldn't convince a teenager. That's precisely what we see here, where she shows the circle circumscribed by the square, then gives the square more and more steps until it meets the circle, showing you the circumference is the same: 4, not pi. She then says, that can't be right, and proceeds to blow smoke up your shorts. She says the proof works up to the last step, but that it only shows the areas approach each other. Wow. So she has diverted you into area here, though neither pi nor the circumference have anything to do with the area in this question, neither of the larger figures nor of the little triangles. In my papers on pi, I never talk about the area, and it is clear why: in this little demonstration she has repeated, you get the circumference by *adding* the x and y legs. But when calculating an area, you *multiply* the x and y legs. Addition and multiplication are completely different actions in any math, but especially in the calculus. So diverting you into area here is a really raw trick, which is why I rolled my eyes as soon as I saw Hossenfelder going there.

That's basically the whole lie right there, but she does fudge you a second time, and it is worth showing how. She says you can't approach the circle with x and y legs like that, you have to approach it with "line segments whose ends are both on the circle". Chords. In other words with the **hypotenuses** of those little triangular areas. Which proves she has ignored the whole basis of my argument. I don't just show that little demo she does and say "done". I go into great detail on why you **must** use the x and y legs, and **can't** use the hypotenuses, going all the way back to Newton's lemmas to do it. In short, it is because the hypotenuses are *slants* in the diagram. [Clarified March 10: Any slant here already implies the acceleration or curve, since when you go to the limit the slant become the curve of the circle. The chords approach the circle, by the mainstream analysis. The slant is therefore the integration of the x and y motions. So the slant is already implying that time is involved in the integration, making this a problem of kinematics.

In this way, the very use of calculus on the problem by the mainstream *proves* this is kinematic, since calculus is a rate-of-change math. You can't use a math of rates or changes on a static problem. Once you have applied the calculus, you can't then deny x and y are MOTIONS. x and y are velocities.

This is because you can't integrate x and y directly relative to eachother. To integrate, you have to integrate them both relative to t (or some other third variable). You are basically integrating them by their common denominator, or common background field. You aren't integrating x and y, you are integrating x/t and y/t. Which shows us why all use of calculus on geometry is a fudge.]

Notice that I just answered her by addressing what she actually says. So why doesn't she address

anything I actually say? Why does she ignore my paper completely, and every argument and demonstration in it, including Steven's experiment where you can see it with your own eyes?

My whole point has always been that this has historically been oversimplified, but Hossenfelder and the mainstream just ignore that and continue to oversimplify it, assuming they are right and I am wrong without making any effort to understand what I am saying or to address it honestly.

Let's start over from the beginning. I have proved this in about ten different ways, but I am going to try to simplify it as much as possible one more time, so anyone can follow it. I ask you this: is there a difference between a length and a distance? Yes, there is. A length is a static measurement, one that doesn't include time or motion. A distance is a kinematic measurement, one that includes time and motion. Given a length, there is no idea of having to travel it, by walking, driving, or flying. It just is. To say it another way, it isn't a vector. But a distance is a length you have to travel, so there is motion and time.

So that isn't a metaphysical question, or handwaving, as some claim. It is a question of math, of mathematical definitions and rules.

In math, you have to be careful not to mix up these things. Not all numbers are the same, especially in the calculus. One number may be an acceleration while another is a velocity. That's why they use primes and double primes, for instance. If you mix up velocities with accelerations, you will get the wrong answer, since the rates of change are different. You have to be very very careful. Well, it is the same in this problem. You can't treat a distance like a length, since one is a static 3D and the other is a kinematic 4D. Historically, this circumference question has been a question of geometry, which is static 3D. It doesn't include motion. Pi comes out of this static 3D geometry. But in most real physical questions, the circumference we want isn't that circumference. It is a distance traveled, like by a spaceship in orbit, not a raw length.

Is an orbit a 3D geometrical circumference? Historically it was assumed to be, and that you could therefore find it with pi. I have shown you can't. An orbit is a motion, which changes all the math.

It changes it by roughly 20%, which is a huge amount. All due to a basic substitution error. The substitution error Hossenfelder just made once again, by trying to draw slants in a geometric problem that doesn't allow them. As soon as you draw the slant (in this problem) you are in 4D and have to do all your math by those new rules. You cannot draw a slant and pretend you haven't just gone kinematic, because the slant is preparation for integration using the calculus. That is why, in real problems of motion, physicists get the wrong answer for these curved distances. They are distances, NOT LENGTHS.

Yes, this mainstream solution using slants goes all the way back to Archimedes, but that doesn't prove it is right. Does that mean I think I am smarter than Archimedes? I never said that. My only claim here is to have discovered something new. Things happen. Times change. Progress is made. New people see things old people didn't hundreds or thousands of years ago. That's the way science works. Or used to work before the Nains took it over.

They know there has long been a problem here, because it has come up over and over in real life, and they know that. It <u>came up in rocketry</u> and it also came up in quantum mechanics, where they had to import the Manhattan metric to correct equations at the quantum level. In the Manhattan metric or taxicab geometry, pi is 4, and they admit that. They admit that and have sold it as interesting with their

hero Hilbert, but when I prove it is true in all kinematic situations, they lock down and pretend not to be able to follow me. They suddenly forget how to read the English language once they get past my titles.

I have proved that many times since then, by using 4 to correct dozens of famous and important quantum mechanical equations, ones that neither Hilbert nor anyone else ever thought to look at. By jettisoning pi from these old equations I was able to clarify and simplify and connect them, seeing things no one has ever seen before. See for example <u>my paper on the light equations</u>, where I replace pi with 4, to correct a 6% error embedded in Planck's constant. I make a similar correction to the <u>Stefan-Boltzmann equation</u> and <u>my unified field equation</u>. What does Hossenfelder or anyone else in the mainstream have to say about that? Nothing, of course.

If you aren't convinced, you can go to my papers, where I prove it in several different ways, with full historical and mathematical explanations. My theory isn't based on a youtube short or a lame compressed argument from a single illustration. It ties into my larger theories and proofs concerning the calculus, <u>orbits</u>, <u>Newton</u>, and acceleration. I worked on it for years, unlike these people who make one crap video and claim victory.

But Hossenfelder isn't just a tool for trying to snow you with this 30-second video. She is a tool for being hired as opposition control, mainly to address my success. We know this because a large portion of her output now flanks my work, blowing smoke over and around it on purpose. In my opinion, she didn't leave academia several years ago to pursue her own ideas at Youtube. Going by her output there, she doesn't have any ideas and isn't promoting them. She is always responding to the ideas of others. I think it is clear she was hired by someone to pretend to be against-the-mainstream, so that she could better control the opposition. They give her some street cred by allowing her to criticize some mainstream ideas, but as we see whenever she gets near any of my subjects, she is still mostly orthodox. She strafes a few outlying buildings in the mainstream city that have probably already been condemned, while passing by the big structures and even pointing you up at their magnificence. But as with this pi video, she is often replying to me without replying to me. It is all very dastardly, but that is what these people do. Their hegemony in all fields, not just physics, relies on this long game of misdirection, distortion, and suppression. It has worked very well for them for ages, but it isn't working so well these days.