

[return to updates](#)

Higgs Boson Found under Bigfoot's Paw



by Miles Mathis

Many of my readers have been begging (yes begging—using that word explicitly) me to comment on the developing Higgs boson fiasco. But, honestly, I can barely get past a yawn. I have been busy painting, and the published announcements I have scanned haven't excited me enough to pull me away from *Gilligan's Island* reruns, much less away from my easel. I know this is just one more manufactured media explosion, of the same form as the recent [Neutrino muddle](#), and I can't be bothered to take it seriously. It isn't yet a fiasco, but I predict it soon will be, given time. It is just a matter of weeks or months before someone resigns, is re-assigned, or before the whole underground team retires to take up professional badminton.

New Science has begun to remind me of a Douglas Adams or Kurt Vonnegut novel, but with the humor unintended. Physics has become like Vogon poetry: a device of torture for anyone with any residual sense. I am continually surprised when the lead researcher at the LHC is *not* named something like Zaphoid Beeblebrox, and I have to remind myself whose manufactured text I am in.

Therefore, to save precious time and energy, I have decided to print one of my readers' analyses, which, though neither comprehensive nor authoritative, is nonetheless amusing and to-the-point. This is from “Tidewater.” I am told that is his moniker on some sites he contributes to, if you wish to search for more funny and poignant comments from him. Anyway, this is just a reprint of his email to me yesterday, published here with his permission:

The announcement this week [July 2012] regarding the discovery of the elusive Higgs boson is making worldwide headlines, though in a way that CERN claims was unintentional. Specifically, we are told by the organization's press office that a video of the announcement —“one of several videos we pre-recorded to account for all scenarios”—somehow found its way into the public domain (by way of CERN's *own website*, [as first reported by Science](#)

[News](#)).

Let me see if I have this straight. CERN had a professor of physics pre-record several videos—we don't know how many videos (or professors). In at least one video, the professor says, "We've observed a new particle... we have quite strong evidence that there's something there." We can only speculate as to what the professor said in the other recordings—maybe "Enjoy the conference in Melbourne," "I've got voices in my head," or, "We've observed nothing—hey, why is this video recorder on?" That is, we can only *imagine* what other "scenarios" were described in other videos.

While we are imagining, we can imagine that the physicists at CERN said to themselves, "Let's take the video in which the professor says that CERN has observed a new building block of the universe, run the footage through post-production, and put it on the CERN website. Let's then call that whole process an 'unfortunate leak,' and act embarrassed that this video—which was intentionally recorded and produced by CERN and posted to CERN's own website *by CERN*—was somehow put out there "for reasons not yet understood." *Hey, how did that get out there? Must be one of those mysteries.* Let's then time the "leak" to coincide with the actual announcement of the discovery at an international conference in Melbourne.

"Finally, let's pretend that if this particle (which 'almost could be a portal to an entirely new dimension, if you will') wasn't observed by the end of 2012, its existence would have been *excluded*. [Why shouldn't they have given themselves until Saint Meinrad's Feastday, at least, or Groundhog's Eve?] Oh, and while we're at it, let's [pretend offense](#) at any use of the term 'God particle', writing it off as an unfortunate, layman's dramatization"—even though the term was coined by a Nobel-laureate physicist in the title of [his book](#) on the subject and has been used with exclamation points and big red letters on the covers of hundreds of glossy physics magazines.

That's one way of doing science. Big science. But Miles, I find your recent discussion of the [Schiehallion experiment](#) more compelling, to name but one, and I'm guessing it didn't cost taxpayers in twenty countries \$11 billion or more.

On the bright side, I guess we should all be relieved if it turns out the Higgs boson is no longer [traveling back in time](#) from the future to sabotage its current discovery. I guess the Higgs decided to be generous and throw us a bone just before its existence was "excluded."

Once we have a chance to review and to digest the data, we may learn more about what was or was not discovered in the detection chambers beneath the Swiss-French border. Maybe they've even discovered the origin of mass or other insights into the structure of matter—in which case I eagerly await the theory explaining why future "God particles" stopped interfering with CERN's experiments by way of backward causality. Perhaps the once and future God couldn't keep his hand out of the present funding crises.

I don't have much to add to that, since we haven't been presented anything solid, but I will make a couple of brief comments. *The Washington Post*, via the AP, [says](#),

Scientists have found evidence showing the footprint of the Higgs particle, which proves that it exists but *doesn't actually show it*.

Are we allowed to laugh outloud? Is that really the state of science and science reporting? Do major newspapers really publish sentences like that now? Critics of mainstream physics are usually dismissed as cranks and lumped in with Bigfoot hunters, but just imagine a Bigfoot hunter going to the *Washington Post* and saying, “Well, we have a footprint, which proves that Bigfoot exists, but we can't show it to you.” Why not? “Because we don't actually have a cast or a photo of the footprint, just evidence it exists.” What evidence is that? “A footprint.” But didn't you just say you don't have a cast or a photo? “Yes, but we have evidence of the footprint, which proves Bigfoot exists.” But if you don't have a cast or a photo, what do you have as evidence? “Well, we have this press release, which has been verified by a lot of top people.”

Right now we have nothing. They said at first that proof would be forthcoming on July 4, but yesterday [July 4] we just got more claims and no evidence. Now they are saying end of July, and hedging by saying that data from 2012 is still being analyzed. If it is still being analyzed, why the Earth-shattering announcement now? How about announcing your findings *after* you have analyzed them? We must assume they wanted to co-opt the fireworks of July 4th, and it didn't matter what the state of the research was.

But even if we end up with solid proof of a large transient particle at about 125 GeV, that won't impress me, either. Given what we know about quantum mechanics, there are dozens of theories that could and do predict large transient particles given enough ambient energy. I know this because [my simple quantum spin equation](#) predicts large particles, at 125 GeV and way above. It does this without any use for bosons or Higgs' theories or vacuum energy of any of that fluff. If you wish to read more about it, you can also visit my [meson paper](#), where I show how to actually build W and Z particles. The mainstream has never even begun to do this. They have always fit their theory around their data as it comes in, and they are still doing it with the Higgs boson. They have no firm math or equation that explains the construction of these large particles, which is why the search for the Higgs had such a broad opening (from 115 to 180 GeV, as they tell us in the current articles). But I have provided the equation that underlies particle construction, and all I had to do is show how to apply the equation to the known particles. I was able to apply the equation to ALL known particles from photon to Z, and it can also be applied to the so-called Higgs. My method is not difficult, and once you have read those two papers, you can probably figure out how to build the Higgs yourself, as well as even larger particles.

The current articles even admit that the proposed particle at 125 GeV is no proof of Higgs' theories or of a God particle or of a way to give mass to matter. Mainstream physicists have simply prepped their audience by telling them that *any* discovery of a large particle will be proof of their theories of mass creation. But do you think the large particle—supposing it has been found—has a sign on it that says “Higgs”? No. They have to show more than a large particle. They have to show some rational mechanism by which this larger particle gives mass to smaller particles. I would say that is impossible, and that most people can see that just from the form of the last sentence. How can the mass of a smaller particle be explained by the existence of a larger particle? Isn't that strictly topsy-turvy and inverted? Are we being told that smaller particles *are composed of* larger particles? And if not, what are we being told?

In the history of physics, larger objects were always composed of smaller ones: that was the definition of “composed.” A rock is composed of molecules, and the molecules are by necessity *smaller* than the rock. Molecules are composed of atoms, and atoms are by necessity *smaller* than the molecules. But now that is reversed. If the Higgs' theory is accepted, we will have larger particles defining the qualities or quantities of smaller particles. Rather than a physical theory, we have a sort of faux-

religion. Remember, in religions, smaller things are created by larger things. Humans and animals and rocks and tulips are created by God, and God is larger than all these things. So you now see a new way in which the Higgs boson is a “God” particle. It isn't a God particle just because it creates mass or because it is so important in the particle hierarchy. It is a God particle because it inverts the classical direction of physical composition. For centuries we had been composing larger things from smaller things. That was physics. But the Higgs' theory reverses that, and we now have smaller things created from larger things, as in religion. The Higgs boson “gives” mass to hadrons and leptons and so on, just as God gives life or form to rocks and dandelions and people. I doubt that you have thought of it like that, and I encourage you to do so. Science, while claiming to become “harder”, is actually losing any firmness it once had. Despite its claims to being the polar opposite of religious thinking, it is actually becoming only a variation of it. By this analysis, the Higgs theory is a return to sympathetic magic. Rather than providing a mechanism, it creates a “relationship,” and that relationship can bend to the needs of any data or funding.

Speaking of funding, anyone could have predicted that the Higgs would be found. It *had* to be found. Given the amounts of money that have been spent and the amount of ink that has been spilled, failure was not an option. With over 10,000 scientists working on the project, the job loss could not be countenanced. Too big to fail, remember? It was going to be bailed out one way or another, and apparently it was decided that the bailout would be led by a media blitz, burying the world under one more huge pile of propaganda and horn-tooting.

Anyone who knows anything of history knew it was a *certainty* that all the current theories would be claimed to be confirmed, with great fanfare and months of celebration. That is the way things work. No one in history—working in any field—has ever said, “Yes, we were catastrophically wrong about everything. We give up.” History is full of failures, of course, but the failures play out like this: those running things realize they have hit a wall and that they have nothing left, so they gather round and agree to go out with a bang. They have only one option left—the big bluff. They think there is a small chance they can spin out the charade for one more year, so they risk everything with a big lie. Although they have nothing, they all yell simultaneously, “Eureka, we have everything!” The crowds gather, and because crowds are stupid, those running things may run things for another few months or years, playing on nothing but phony excitement. [If you don't believe me, study the recent Facebook IPO, which was precisely this sort of stunt.] But eventually the truth comes out. Those running things don't ever admit the truth, but *the opposition* discovers it anyway. To say it another way, those at the top never quit, they are only *defeated*, from the outside.

This is why science as an adversarial system is so important, and why I write my papers in a polemical style. We have seen over the last century that science as a unilateral mission cannot advance. We have been taught that science, like every other modern thing, is about agreement and consensus; but it isn't. A healthy science is a science of disagreement and competition. It is an agon. With science as consensus, there is no “outside” from which to defeat the *status quo*. Only with science as a multilateral argument, with many conflicting views, can entrenched falsehoods ever be jettisoned. That was science for centuries, and for centuries science advanced. Only in the 20th century, the century of consensus and standard models, did science stall.

In closing, I will suggest one final reason for the timing of this Higgs announcement. In April [*Science Daily announced*](#) with much less fanfare that no dark matter had been found in the vicinity of the Sun, out to a distance of 13,000 LY. This experiment mapped the motions of over 400 nearby stars, then applied current field equations to these motions. The result indicated the presence only of accepted matter—stars, planets, dust and gas. No dark matter. Not only did the calculations fail to find 95%

dark matter, as we are now told by theorists. It found *no* dark matter. Zero percent. This would mean that dark matter not only “weakly” interacts on the quantum level (as a matter of E/M), it *fails to* react gravitationally. It doesn't enter the field equations. But of course if it doesn't enter the field equations, which are mass equations, then dark matter doesn't have mass. If it doesn't have mass, it can't compose 95% of the mass/energy of the universe, can it?

This experiment is much more important and decisive than the CERN experiments on the Higgs, and more important than any of [the dubious WIMP detections](#) in various places round the globe (which are nothing more than “non-discounted background effects”). Which is why the mainstream needed to drown out the publication of the experiment and bury it in the much larger noise of the Higgs boson celebrations. This is the current *modus operandi*: good news is manufactured while bad news is buried. Science as entrenched protectionism.

Beyond that, the Neutrino Debacle is still fresh in many physicists' minds, and that also needed to be drowned out. It was just March of this year that the Gran Sasso team self-destructed, with Dr. Ereditato resigning in shame and so on. Since March 2012 was the Neutrino Debacle and April 2012 was the Death of Dark Matter, we should not be surprised to see bold damage control in the form of this Higgs announcement in July 2012. The field of physics found itself falling headlong into a pit, and decided that only the Higgs could save it. I predict that the Higgs boson will not turn out to be much of a cushion. The pointy head of physics will pierce that cushion like a sharp knife, causing an explosion mainstream physics may not survive.

Update, July 6. Despite the fact that no data has been released and that we have been presented with no real indication of anything yet, Stephen Hawking is already saying publicly that Higgs should get a Nobel Prize. *The Washington Post* published [an article today](#) with the title, “After Higgs boson discovery, what’s next for physicists?” The *Post*, the CIA's favorite paper and always the leader in propaganda, has borrowed its mind-control template from its political pages, and we see science now sold in the same terms as everything else. What do I mean by that? I mean that the use of the phrase “what's next” is not-so-subtle mind control, because it implies that the issue has been decided and we can now move on to the next phase. It takes the Higgs as a given, and moves your questions on into the future. This article, like all the others, slides right by the real questions—such as whether anything has actually been found, what it is, and how it fits into any theory—and leaps directly into a discussion of prizes and celebrations and more funding. You should find that very suspicious. For example, we are told that the University of Edinburgh has already created a new Higgs Centre for Theoretical Physics with an initial budget of 1.2 million dollars for academic staff and research programs. Wow, that didn't take long, did it? We are four days in, and already a major university has created a new program in response? Is that at all believable? Do institutions really work that fast? Is it possible to create a program, develop a budget, and elicit major funding in four days? You should ask yourself if this had all been planned ahead of time, including Hawking's canned response. As [I have shown](#), Hawking has now devolved into nothing more than a mouthpiece of institutional propaganda (if he wasn't all along). By all means, give as many people Nobel Prizes as you can—tomorrow, if possible—before this all hits the wall and we find it was a terrible hoax.

This quote from the article is also amusing and terrifying:

The particle is the final piece of the jigsaw in the Standard Model, a theory explaining how the universe is built, and its existence would help scientists gain a better understanding of how galaxies hold together.

Besides being extravagantly false as a whole, the sentence contradicts itself. If the Higgs is the final

piece in the jigsaw, then scientists should have a *complete* understanding of *everything*. The final piece in a jigsaw doesn't "help" you gain a "better" understanding. At that point there is no need for partial adjectives or verbs. The fact is, physics knows next to nothing about how the universe is built, or even how the galaxy holds together. As I mentioned above, they are still larking about with dark matter, for which they have zero data locally. Current physics can't even explain the varying differentials of the Moon's orbit, but they expect you to believe that they have just discovered "the final piece in the jigsaw."

None of this is an accidental overstatement, or giddiness in a moment of celebration. Physicists have been talking about complete knowledge and final pieces of the jigsaw for decades. Hawking notoriously claimed that physics would be over in a decade (about 25 years ago), and no doubt he will confirm that it now is. He will then claim omniscience and disappear in a flash of light.

Update, July 10. Interestingly, by July 10, the mainstream had decided the Higgs' announcement was failing like a flabby balloon and that it needed to be joined with a second media blitz. So CBSnews.com, among other places, [reported that](#) a new major dark matter discovery had just occurred. Predictably, this announcement was just as thin as the Higgs' announcement, and it too reads like bald propaganda. The discovery claims to find a gravitational lensing anomaly among galaxy clusters Abell222 and 223, and then immediately assigns that anomaly to dark matter. But as with the [bullet cluster](#) hullabaloo from a few years ago, this data is pushed in hamhanded ways. Astronomer Jorg Dietrich says,

It's a resounding confirmation of the standard theory of structure formation of the universe. And it's a confirmation people didn't think was possible at this point.

Astronomer as used car salesman. The data isn't a resounding confirmation of anything, except of a force that doesn't fit our current equations. Since I have shown our current field equations are compromised in dozens of ways, this means nothing. The data may indicate a field anomaly or it may indicate nothing more than another equation failure. But you see we *needed* a "resounding confirmation" of something this week, so the mainstream information finessers simply found someone somewhere who could go on camera and spit out some exclamation points. They then inserted it immediately into the worldwide fake news machine, hoping it would make readers forget both the Higgs' dud and the *Science Daily* news from April.

[You may now link to my newest paper on the Higgs, called [The Higgs Boson Parade gets Rained Out](#). In it, I analyze the *Physics Letters B* announcement of September 17, 2012, line for line, showing at least a dozen major pushes and fudges, both in the math and in the diagrams.]