

Walking Around the Hound of Hell



by Miles Mathis

September 19, 2024

Last week a [very important class-action lawsuit](#) was filed against the big-six scientific publishers [ELSEVIER, WOLTERS KLUWER, JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC., SAGE PUBLICATIONS, INC., TAYLOR & FRANCIS GROUP, SPRINGER NATURE] for collusion, racketeering, **violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act**, and general malevolence to scientific progress. This lawsuit is decades overdue, and the fact that it hasn't been filed until now is just one more indication of the weakness of the field and of the scientists that inhabit it. Scientists should have revolted against this system from the start, refusing to be a part of it, *as I did*, but even now they aren't. This one lady neuroscientist at UCLA is filing a lawsuit, which is a start, but hundreds of thousands of scientists worldwide should have gone on strike decades ago. They didn't and aren't, telling you a lot about the field of science and the modern human in general.

The reason I am publicizing this lawsuit should be obvious: it confirms everything I have been saying since 2000, while also making more conspicuous the players arrayed against me. Even I wasn't aware of the full extent of it, or the entire array of facts. If you read the [linked lawsuit](#)—and I highly recommend you do—you will see that Google has probably NOT been censoring me *mainly* on their own behalf or at the behest of top physicists or physics departments, as I had somewhat naively assumed. That may also be the case, and almost assuredly is, but given the money involved, I now see it is far more likely I am being censored and attacked *primarily* at the behest of these major publishing houses, who see me as a threat to their racket. The last thing they want mainstream scientists to see is the level of my success in driving around these publishers and the other rules of “doing science”. The fact that I have been able to outrank not only these publishing houses but the university sites and even

Wikipedia and Britannica must burn up their CEOs, boards, and investors. If scientists figure out they can reach a far bigger audience far faster by doing so directly, as I do, cutting out these publishers, they roof will cave in.

This also allows us to explain my [incredible success online](#): being the first to exploit this loophole, I filled a void no one else had even known was there. While everyone else was bogged down in this manufactured swamp, I was jetting ahead at full speed on my hovercraft, unencumbered by fake peer review and all the other nets of this scheme. And this was no accident. I didn't just get lucky. My freedom was a result of my choice. As soon as I came in contact with this beast I knew it for what it was and wanted to have nothing to do with it. It made no sense from the beginning to me that I should sell my work to some publisher for free (or more likely *paying them*), even gifting them the copyright, while getting nothing in return. What kind of fool would sign up to be raped like that? My first encounters with peer review were equally negative, since I found these reviewers and editors weren't just wildly hostile to any new ideas, but were incapable of [following basic logic or highschool algebra](#). It was like trying to reason with apes. More than one of them actually argued that a previous textbook equation ($x' = x - vt$) with zero provenance was a “self evident truth”. I have since been proved right on that question and most others, but don't expect these bozos to ever admit it. They will go to their graves insisting science is “what we learned in our textbooks in college”. Whenever they encounter something they don't understand—which is hourly—they default to that.

What is most incredible, and putrid, is that most scientists don't just fall prostrate at this corrupt system, they actually support it and even sell it, insisting that peer review and academic publishing is a great boon to science, keeping it pure and healthy. The same sort of inverted sales pitch we get from mainstream medicine, by the way. The mainstream, which is preventing all progress in all fields, sells itself as the great defender of progress. The usual fascists hiding behind democracy.

Rapine of both the producers and the public by a cloaked middleman, sold to you as freedom, independence, and health. Same thing we see with agriculture and food production, healthcare, art, and governance in general. Everything is upside-down and inside-out.

The text of this lawsuit is very extensive, but there are many things this Dr. Lucina Uddin missed nonetheless, one of them being that progress isn't just being stalled in science, the entire field has been pre-gutted by this very scheme. No one with any self-respect would sign these contracts, leaving only those with little or none, and those people aren't the cream of the crop. They don't have the mental make-up to come up with new ideas in any field. I first came across this phenomenon in art, since it is the same there. The galleries and auction houses run the show there, their strings being pulled by the usual dark government entities, and the critics and magazines do the bidding of the galleries. So the producer—the artist—is defined out of the game from the start. To get anywhere, a young artist has to do what he is told, which of course can't lead to real art. Real artists won't put up with that, so they bow out from the beginning, or are tossed out with violence, leaving only the toadies who will. Toadies don't make art, they only make the simulacra of art that can be used as the tokens of a vast [money laundering](#) and scam. *Mutatis mutandis*, it is the same in science, where all real scientists quit the field at a young age, refusing to make the required bows to Mammon and other false gods, and the field is left to pretenders.

Nor is this an accident or side-effect. It is the desired outcome. For the financiers to control a field, they first have to decimate it, bombing it down to bare Earth. Think of it like corporate raiders of the Richard Gere type in *Pretty Woman*, who buy a failing company at a bargain price, then fire everyone and sell the parts. Only after that will they rebuild it on their own terms, terms of corruption and

predation. We just saw it in the news today, as NPR reported on the bankruptcy of Steward Healthcare and the refusal of its CEO Ralph de la Torre to testify before Congress. A Senate committee just voted to find him in criminal contempt. This all started in 2010 when **private equity firm** Cerberus Capital bought out Caritas Christi Healthcare. They even told you who they were with that name Cerberus, since Cerberus is the three-headed hound of Hell.



Just so you know, Cerberus Global is run by former Vice President Dan Quayle. They forget to mention that in these Congressional proceedings and reports. The Chairman is former Treasury Secretary John Snow. The CEO of Cerberus Capital is Steve **Feinberg**. I guess none of those guys knew what was going on at Steward, since Congress is leaving them alone. I wonder why? And Steward isn't only in trouble in the US, it is the center of a huge scandal in Phoenician center Malta, where de la Torre and others are being charged with bribery, theft and **money laundering**.

Anyway, Cerberus drove the company into the ground, cutting costs and services while making huge profits. The only difference between that scheme and the one of scientific publishing is that the publishers have found a way to make their rape of the producer and the field permanent, by crushing scientists to the extent they no longer remember they are being crushed. They have trained the slaves to defend their own servitude.

It is also worth pointing out that the current scheme is vanity publishing, or worse than vanity publishing. The mainstream scientists pay the publisher to publish them, sign away their copyright for nothing, and get nothing but (perhaps) a few bones thrown to them by their departments and the glossy magazines. A few of them have to be made famous, to manufacture the appearance of living field, so everyone clamors for those few spots. But even those at the top of the field are still toadies to the system, promulgating the long lie that science is healthy, productive, and moving forward. Which makes it all the more ironic when I am accused of vanity publishing for putting out my own website and books. The difference being, I own my own copyrights and take all my own profits, while having to bow to no one. The mainstream scientist has to bow to his department, his colleagues, his co-authors, his publishers, his reviewers, his editors, and all the other various academic police. His freedom to do anything new is zero, while mine is infinite. Which is precisely why I have done it and he hasn't.

Which allows us to answer another question. Many of my readers haven't understood why I have no

support from mainstream physics. Even after they delve a bit deeper and come to see the incredible levels of control and coercion in the field, they still don't understand it. Eric Weinstein—a hedgefund guy promoted in 2013 as the next Einstein—admitted that coercion recently in [one of his long interviews with Chris Williamson](#), even explicitly labeling it as **fear**. He was visiting some of his friends in the math department at Harvard (if I remember correctly), and one of them was complaining that no one felt free to speak (about the perceived death of physics). Why? Weinstein admits that, too: “there is an entire community of PhD trolls hunting people who dissent”. Weinstein says they are hunting people like Sabine Hossenfelder, but that is misdirection. She is a troll herself, so she has nothing to fear from those people. Everyone—including Eric Weinstein—knows I am target number one of this community of trolls. But Weinstein can't mention my name because [I have also outed him as a mole](#). It is turtles all the way down, you know.

[**Added October 23:** After my recent visit to the Unz forum or pit, I realized that Weinstein's claim of people being hunted by PhD trolls is also false. No one is being hunted by PhD trolls with names, least of all me. We are being “hunted” by these anonymous orc armies from the dungeons of Langley—by low-level nobodies who know nothing, not even how to debate or cut. I put “hunted” in quotes because these people have no arms or ammunition. They are just paid to yap insensibly on some shallow talking points and try to keep people on the defensive. But when up against me the whole charade goes transparent and backfires, because in my presence they dissolve into a zombie mist. The named PhDs don't come against me because I already made many of them look stupid years ago, and that was before growing to my full height. I have never seen a substantive critique of my top papers, including my nuclear diagrams, my successful Solar Cycle predictions, my Bode solution, my rewrite of the Rayleigh equation, my unification papers, my quantum spin equation and meson unification, my rewrite of rainbow theory, my corrections to Relativity, or hundreds of others. All I have seen is transparent shallow hatchet jobs that are embarrassing to witness. Nothing is a clearer sign of the depths to which mainstream science has sunk than its responses to me, its sad and unsuccessful attempts to bury me in faceless slander. Ultimately it won't matter, since the papers have been written and cannot be unwritten.]

One of my readers and supporters who has a background in the sciences but is retired and not a name in the field, said this to me two days ago, at my birthday party. He said he could understand why working physicists, chemists, or mathematicians would be afraid to mention me: their careers were in jeopardy and they had families to feed. But what about a retired professor emeritus? He has less to lose. Why hasn't one of those people said a word in my defense? Well, we can now see it is because a professor emeritus in science was of this type to start with. It is why he progressed in the field. He did not ask questions and was not galled by being a slave to these publishers and other overseers. He and I are completely different types of people, and his retiring will not bring him closer to me. He has embraced his servitude, or buried it deep, and—short of some sort of major conversion—will not relish having to transcend that. To put it simply, their years in the field under this rubric have brainwashed most scientists to any alternative, so much so that most of them can't read my papers without actual pain. A self-protective flight response is triggered, since reading any further would be to admit their entire academic lives have been wasted. [More than one of them has admitted that to me in those words.](#)

The strange thing about this new lawsuit is that Dr. Uddin has no co-authors. She calls this a class-action, but no co-plaintiffs are listed. No one had the cojones to join her, which is typical. The field has been completely eviscerated, and not one person with any backbone remains. I even have my doubts about this Dr. Uddin, since it occurs to me this lawsuit—like many others we have researched—may be a planned fail. If she loses this, they can then use her loss to further discourage the field, and warn off any other scientists from trying this.

We have seen this many times: they fake a court case and a judgment, and all those who were thinking of suing along the same lines—in this case the Sherman Antitrust Law—will think again. They won't be able to find attorneys, since attorneys will see this fake judgment and beg off.

But it doesn't matter, because as I have proved, the way around these publishers wasn't via a lawsuit, it was via the internet and direct publishing. You can lose decades fighting these huge companies in court, and that is how they want it. It is one more part of the beast. But you can walk around the beast with no effort, no matter how many scary heads he may appear to have.

Addendum: I got an interesting email today, Sept. 21, confirming my analysis above once again from someone in the jaws of the beast. Here it is:

Hi Miles, Today's "Walking Around the Hounds of Hell" was terrific. It cuts close to home for us academics who haven't had the balls or brilliance (yet!) to cut ourselves free from the abominable institutions we work for and that fund our research. . . .

With postgraduate degrees in mathematics, I got in via your calculus papers -- how I first found you, on an alternative health site where one of your fans posted a link to your article arguing that Leibniz/Newtonian limit calculations were wrong. Then I read your corrections to Newton, Einstein, the pi paper, etc, before discovering your "All updates" page. I'd already noticed I was more skeptical about current events like 9/11 than most of my colleagues -- and that many questions were off-limits in the academy, even asking basic questions of logic, physics etc.

Your critiques of "us" sell-outs and mostly mid-wits, not smart or insightful enough to have ever had a real shot at making significant contributions to science/art/knowledge are spot-on. The most mediocre, unimaginative and willing-to-lie amongst us are the ones promoted into leadership positions for the most part. Some smarter ones carve out niches where they can do some "interesting" work within prescribed boundaries or do insignificant stuff where the world leaves us alone while the salary continues. That failure in moral reasoning, turning away from the desire to know by accepting so many boundaries and power-plays (including from the journal publishing industry), deserves your criticisms. It's cathartic to read about your freedom, having 'walked around' the beast rather than tried to compromise or become part of it.

I forgot to mention (because I didn't want to go on and on) that your unification of the Lagrangian and the charge field were supreme moments of inspiration for me. Although physics is not my field, I do work with mathematical 'dynamical systems modeling' with 'emergent phenomena' and think I'm in a good position to see the validity of your critiques about obfuscation with math modeling that doesn't represent the real-world phenomena of interest and appreciate your singularly important contributions to physics. Makes me want to 'walk around' too.

2nd Addendum, Oct. 5: I published a representative positive reply, so I thought I would publish a representative negative reply from my inbox. This is what I would call a typical response from those who take exception to my work.

On Sat, Oct 5, 2024 at 10:16 AM, <purelived> wrote re Walking Around:

read between the lines. You're being made fun of. Dirty anti semite pig you are. Keep writing clown man. You must be the smartest idiot there ever was. You clearly have no understanding of the internet. Sad, considering you've been using it for so long. Bye. And because I don't respect you I must be a gay Jewish agent, right? Do you enjoy your sexual frustration? Do you enjoy your life alone? I haven't read many of your papers because they are just so damn good. The coding of your website is trash btw might want to update it so you can pull in more audience members.

I don't really need to read between the lines, do I? So I am not sure what he is talking about from the first word. There was no prior communication. You might assume this is just some strung-out zombie on a free connection

at the public library, but that is not my assumption. Although this communique is anon, I get the same level of argument when the email has a university heading. So my guess is this is some upper-level physics prof at a major university, writing from home on a temp account, after way too much giggle juice. Or since he keys on coding, it may be a PhD in computers, wiped on Smirnoff Ice instead of giggle. One of many guys I have embarrassed by name, now close to a mental breakdown. Who else would key on this paper specifically?

He sounds just like the people I talk about in my papers, doesn't he, crushed by decades in the system. If he weren't so drunk, he would realize he is just providing proof of my thesis, down to his being too broken to write under his own name. What he appears to mean by the "read between the lines" thing is that, beyond any question of arguing facts or theory, he isn't capable of saying anything cutting or clever, so I should do it for him, inserting any meaning between the lines. Which I have. Though not in the way he was hoping.

But this is [the level of my opposition](#), and has been from the beginning. Though the "dirty anti-Semite pig" *is* a step further on in the expected direction, telling us again where this is coming from.

Funny, since even with my lack of understanding of the internet, inferior coding, and near-complete censorship by Google, my papers often outrank Wikipedia, the Dictionary, and all the university sites on general searches, on real search engines like Yandex. So it appears he and Google are the ones that don't understand how the internet (and life) works: hiding numbers doesn't mean they aren't there.