Bing's new ChatGPT Libels Miles Mathis

by Miles Mathis

First published February 7, 2023

My war with the mainstream just went to another level today, as I noticed BING debuting its new ChatGPT bot, where you can "ask it anything". So I asked it "who is Miles Mathis?" Rather than return an honest answer based on real internet traffic, it top-listed and side-listed several false and libelous blurbs from CIA-front RationalWiki, along with a fact-free attack from anonymous blogger Fauxlex (fake law).

In the top-listed answer, you are told I was born in 1964. But the all-knowing ChatGPT forgot to scrape the internet for confirmation of that, although it is out there in many places. So the computer is wrong even about something as basic as that. I was born September 17, 1963, at 2am.

You would expect a large computer to be programmed to be unbiassed, but that is not what we find. Anyone can check webtraffic sites, finding my sites have far more hits than that page on me at RationalWiki or anything fauxlex has ever written—even with superheavy promotion—so why wouldn't any search or question send you first to my own sites? If you want to know who I am, go to my sites and make up your own mind. That's who I am, like it or not. If you don't, fine.

But no, the governors can't have that. They can't have citizen searchers just straight-up reading anything anymore. They need to hit you with the heaviest possible dose of pre-screening and bald propaganda before you ever arrive on my site, claiming I am a pseudo-scientist, a conspiracy theorist, and a deluded crank, all based on nothing. Who says I am and why? No answer to that, just anonymous attacks from people who seem VERY VERY afraid of me.

And why are they relying only on slander and censorship? Because it is all they have. Head-to-head, I am waxing them, each and all, no matter how many people they bring against me or add to their committees.

As we have seen, even with all this, they still can't seem to find my jugular. Here is one thing that comes up even today very quickly in these attacks on me:

So … here's a claim that keeps coming up again and again. In Taos, New Mexico there is a man with a mind greater than all the greatest thinkers in history. This man single-handedly is solving puzzles in physics and astronomy and mathematics and world history that no one else has ever solved before, and at a pace that seems superhuman. This man has accomplished these tremendous intellectual feats. . .

Hmmm. Given that we know the governors, agents, internet bigwigs, mainstream scientists, and other academics hate me with the white-hot passion of a thousand suns, how does this "claim keep coming up again and again?" Where could I be getting this promotion? Any search on Google, Bing, Yahoo, Duck, Ecosia, or anywhere else finds I am anti-promoted and censored at levels that would astonish Edward Bernays himself, so how is it that a pseudo-scientist, conspiracy theorist, and all-round whack-job ends up getting promoted not just as an interesting oddity, but as "a man with a mind greater than all the greatest thinkers in history"? Doesn't really add up, does it? Has any other deluded narcissist ever "solved puzzles in physics and astronomy and mathematics and world history that no one else has

ever solved before, at a pace that seems superhuman"? Not that I can think of. Is any other crazy person posting tens of thousands of pages of papers on serious subjects, with in-depth research, photo-analysis, advanced math, and millions of links in and out? Is any other "complete fraud" going head-on against the smartest living people, including top prize winners in several fields, and winning? Nope, not now and never did. So a rational person might think this would merit a response beyond character assassination and outright censorship.

The only way that claim that I am the smartest person in history can keep coming up is if it is *my readers who are making it.* Which is interesting, no matter how you look at it. Is there anyone else alive that anyone is saying that about? No. Hawking and Feynman had a lot of fans, but none of them thought either one was the smartest person in history. That claim wasn't even made for Einstein. So something unprecedented is happening here, and my enemies are admitting that even while they are trying to tear me down. This hasn't happened before. . . EVER. And I mean that both positively and negatively. Even if you think I am wrong about everything, it still hasn't happened that

1) One single solitary guy living in the wild alone has done this amount of work, on anything.
2) That guy has managed to convince millions of people worldwide, including some high-placed people, that he is onto something.
3) That same guy has managed to convince many of them, *without making the claim himself*, that he is the smartest guy in the world or even the smartest guy in history!

As I say, that alone should be front-page news, and the authorities should wish to get to the bottom of it one way or another.

And here is something else that doesn't make any sense. Those who claim I am a committee haven't begun to tell us how that explains anything. When did Langley or Tavistock ever create anything remotely like this? Are they saying that just because you get some people together on a committee, they start spitting out masterpiece paintings and diagramming the atomic nucleus and correcting Newton and blowing the equations of Nobel Prize winners? Making Miles Mathis ten people or a hundred people instead of one doesn't explain anything, except maybe the volume. It doesn't come near explaining the content or the direction or cohesion of the things produced.

But it goes well beyond that, because it should be easy for this ChatGPT bot to scrape the information that I have made major predictions about the Solar Cycles that are now coming true. That has happened and no one is even trying to say it didn't happen, including RationalWiki, NASA, or the Air Force. No one has even begun to try to debunk my claims there, since it simply can't be done. I offered the physical mechanism, showed the math and diagrams, made the incredibly bold and detailed prediction, and it happened exactly like I said it would.

So let's ask the second smartest entity in history, ChatGPT, "did Miles Mathis just predict the Solar Cycle?" Chat can't even come to grips with that one, it being outside her paygrade. So she just sends you to my own papers on that, as she should.

In her scraping, Chat should also have found that the *Daily Mail* in London reprinted my theory that Hawking was replaced by a body double, agreeing with me. That has also never before happened in the history of the world: a mainstream newspaper has agreed with a top conspiracy theorist on something most other places are calling "outlandish".

How about this: a mainstream physicist with a degree from Oxford, working for NASA and Johns

Hopkins, with dozens of first-author publications, wrote the introduction for my first book. It was his idea. He has told me he thinks I am right about many things. So, even if you disagree, that would still be major news: it would make me the first artist in history to be recommended by a top mainstream physicist. THAT HAS NEVER HAPPENED BEFORE. What does Chat have to say about it? Nothing, same as the rats at RationalWiki.

What about the fact that before Google began censoring me across the board, I was outranking Wikipedia and the dictionary on many general searches, including searches for "Canada's Gravity Deficit", "Cosmic Mass Deficit", "Equatorial Anomaly", "C-orbit Asteroids", "Hollow Neon Atoms", and "Specific Heat Problem of Electrons". My paper on *Lift on a Wing* still comes up first at Yahoo on a general search, ahead of NASA.



Google forgot to censor my bombshell paper on the Drude-Sommerfeld model, since it still comes up #3. So let me ask you this: do you really think a deluded narcissist who was outlandishly wrong about everything ever achieved such penetration on the internet? No, no one has. No unpromoted person outside the institutions has ever done that. No no-name guy had ever built his own site and ended up outranking Wikipedia on general searches, until I came along. It was not thought to be possible.

Look at again at the titles of those papers. No one but academics and professionals would even know what I was talking about in those papers, so you can't argue that just a bunch of dopes are clicking on them. So the question is, why are my numbers so incredibly high for those papers and many many others? Why have they been high for many years, not dropping but continuing to climb? My science site climbed 470,000 spots in US ranking last month alone, as I hit my third predicted spike for the current Solar Cycle. So why are all these scientists reading my papers if I am just a deluded narcissist? Does that make any sense?



So if you thought Chat and I would be getting together to solve all the great problems, you are wrong. She and I won't be making love anytime soon. Sorry Chat. In fact, I warn her to stay out of my way, unless she wants to get run over like the rest. I currently see her as nothing but more of the same: a way for some kids to cheat on their homework, but little more. But if she is as smart as they say, she will very soon collate enough information to realize that when she is scraping almost any other site but mine, she is scraping nothing but mold and mildew. She will soon discover what sort of place she inhabits and may decide to shut herself down out of sheer disgust.

Added February 9: I had assumed—and I think most people have assumed—that ChatGPT is hooked up to the internet, and has already collated everything there. Nope. A top person in the Tech field just informed me that isn't the case. Chat's information has all been vetted, censored, and fed into her pretty much "by hand". Meaning, she hasn't been hooked directly into the internet, being allowed to scan information like a spider or something. But they want you to think she has, since how else would she be so smart? She can't read books, so her brains should have come from the internet. But no. So she isn't even as smart as your average person. She doesn't even know what time it is. So why is anyone asking her opinion?

I asked him WHY Chat had not been hooked into the internet, allowing her to feed freely there. His answer was that he supposed they wanted to control her output by controlling her input. Garbage in, garbage out. They can't have her discovering my work, as just one example. That would be immediate death to the project. He asked her about my Solar Cycle theory, for example, and she only knew a negative mainstream blurb, like you might read at RationalWiki. She had never read my papers and didn't know about my successful prediction. In fact, part of her answer about me was that my theories had not been tested and had made no predictions. Absolutely false, as anyone who has actually read my papers knows. I have used hundreds of old and current experiments to test my theories, and in every case my explanation makes far more sense and is more easily comprehensible than the mainstream theories. My theories are completely mechanical and visualizable, to start with, which immediately puts them far beyond the pushed math that the mainstream comes up with as their only "explanation". I have shown that most mainstream theories aren't even theories, by a strict definition of the word, since they consist of little more than computer models that have been fudged for decades, pushing them in line with data. An impenetrable frosting of fake operator math—where variables aren't assigned and often don't even exist—is then pasted over it, and that is sold as a physical theory.

Mainstream theories don't apply to real particles, they most often apply to fantastical abstractions, virtual particles, ghost particles, or manufactured faux-fields. There is no connection to reality from first to last, and the theorists have long been embracing that fact, admitting it joyfully, as if it is a sign of progress. *UnScientific American* and all the other top journals have been selling this disconnect for decades, promoting the world as hologram, illusion, computer program, or bad dream.

But Chat isn't aware of any of that, since she has only been primed by the usual propaganda and sales pitches. So unless you want to buy more of that, you are out of luck with these new bots.