

[return to updates](#)

# Was PHYSICS taken over by the INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITIES?

*By Miles Mathis*

After writing my recent papers on [Hawking](#) and [Susskind](#), I was left with some lingering questions, ones that had remained in the back of my mind, unasked until now. We have seen that physics has been diverted into non-physics for many decades. Well, the scientific response to that is to try to discover *why*. I haven't seen this question come up, either in the mainstream or in the margins, so I guess it is up to me to research it myself.

Of course, the unstated assumption is that physics has gotten to where it is naturally, meaning it has gotten here because physicists wanted or needed to come to this place. And in the few instances that assumption is questioned, the answer is only stretched to include “natural” influences from culture. By natural influences, I mean that physicists were influenced by looking around them and responding to other things in society than just physics. We can see this kind of natural influence when an artist looks around freely, choosing subjects that interest him. His culture must influence him, because what he sees when he looks around are little pieces of that culture. In the same way, we would expect scientists to be influenced by the world around them. I would have no problem with that, and would consider it to be unavoidable and probably productive.

However, in my last paper [on Hawking](#), I saw some influence that no one would call natural. If the State comes in and asks or demands that you pursue certain projects in certain ways, or pays you large sums of money to pursue projects that you wouldn't otherwise pursue, I wouldn't call that influence natural. We might call it normal, in today's world, or common, but I wouldn't call it natural. Since I have cataloged many examples of unnatural influence on current physics, we may ask how far back that influence goes. We have seen a Brave New World in physics, but when did that Brave New World begin. And how and why did it begin?

For now, I will admit I have far more questions than answers. This first paper on the subject will be highly speculative. In it I will build a tentative theory, one that can be strengthened or falsified with upcoming research. In subsequent papers we will look at the fruits of the research I and others will do, and see if my first theory is too strong or too weak.

That is not to say that this first rough theory is based on nothing. It is based on a growing suspicion, and that growing suspicion is based on a growing list of facts and unanswered questions. Some of those facts were cataloged in my last paper.

To see the form of this suspicion, we will look again at Hawking. A quick look at his bio would leave anyone suspicious, since although it is long on awards and honors, it is short on achievement. His bio admits that Hawking was always more interested in math, and all his physics has been math. His first honors were given for his work on Einstein's field equations, which he extended into a lot of pretty meaningless work on the existence of singularities. It is fairly simple for anyone to prove that [singularities cannot exist](#) as physical entities, so it must be a mystery when Hawking is given major awards over four decades for theorizing what would happen if they did exist.

It is also highly suspicious that his book *A Brief History of Time* should sell 10 million copies and be on the best-seller list for four years. I once wrote that off as a confluence of factors, including interest in the fact that someone with Lou Gehrig's disease could be a top physicist, and the desire people have to look smart by having a book like that on their coffee tables. However, I am no longer convinced that is what happened. After studying the [Mark Zuckerberg phenomenon](#), I now understand that things like that can be manipulated. Just as voting machines can be hacked and the stock market can be rigged and people can be bought onto the cover of TIME magazine, book sales figures can also be faked. Almost everything else we are told has turned out to be false, so I don't tend to believe anything anymore.

Nor does this just apply to Hawking. It applies to all the top people of the past 50 years or more. Since after the second world war, almost nothing in physics has matched the old definition of physics, whereby the real world was studied closely. And the changes haven't been subtle. Perhaps the best example of this is the virtual particle, which made the mainstream via Dirac. Although Dirac was originally an engineer, wrote some fairly real early equations, predicted anti-matter, and swore off renormalization till the end, after the wars he jumped the tracks like the rest and began diddling with virtual particles and borrowing from the vacuum. Others took his ideas and corrupted them even more, and this corruption has affected post-war physics as much as anything else. This exemplifies the non-physical nature of new physics because any schoolboy can see that the virtual particle is a brazen cheat. Physics has been defined as the explanation of real things using other real things for thousands of years, and so virtual particles must be a fudge. The first person who so much as mentioned them should have been booted out of the lab, and yet we now see them everywhere.

How could that happen? Could it happen in a real field, one that was inhabited by real physicists and that was progressing naturally? I don't see how, not even in a century as corrupt as the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Honestly, it was studying the CIA's influence on the postwar media that led me to this suspicion that physics is also controlled from outside. If the CIA can control the media for decades, it can also control science. We know from Congressional testimony in the mid-1970's during the Church Committee hearings that the intelligence community began working with the media right after the war, and that they did this with the full cooperation of those they were infiltrating (see Operation Mockingbird). By the 1960's, the intelligence community had already assumed control of the major media sources. As just one example, the *Washington Post* had ex-CIA or army intelligence people in most of the top editorial positions, including managing editor Ben Bradlee.\* William B. Bader, former CIA intelligence officer, in briefing members of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said,

**There is quite an incredible spread of relationships. You don't need to manipulate TIME magazine, for example, because there are [Central Intelligence] Agency people at the management level.\*\***

And William Colby, the head of the CIA from 1973-76, said, "The Central Intelligence Agency owns everyone of any significance in the major media."

So why would the CIA want to control science? I don't think that is hard to answer. The government doesn't want private citizens or unsupervised university people discovering anything, because that would be dangerous. Suppose they discover the next new weapon? If they weren't patriotic, they might try to keep it for themselves, causing "havoc". For this reason, we may assume that physics was split after the war into real physics and physics for mass consumption. The best people were culled off the top of the physics departments, handpicked by insiders, and put to work for the military or industry. Those with some perceived public relations skills, like those in wheelchairs or those with good hair or those who could write salable books or those who could speak well in public were drafted to lead fake physics. But they were instructed to stay off-topic. Don't do any real physics. Don't try to solve any real problems, even if they don't at first seem to have any military application. Talk about airy, unprovable things like black holes and the first seconds of the universe and the edge of time and strings and vacuum fluctuations. As much as possible, push physics into sci-fi topics, since people love that stuff. Time travel and wormholes and backward causality. Study *Star Trek* and *Star Wars* for examples. Look at Asimov.

This has the added benefit of misdirecting those who can see through the fake physics and math. If they spend all their time responding to the absurdities of the fake physicists, they won't spend any time actually solving physical problems. This will act as insurance that they never accidentally catch up with our boys in the military, or surpass them.

This would also explain the chorus of abuse that independent researchers run up against. The government doesn't want any independent research because, again, it is dangerous. Those heckling the independent researchers don't really care about protecting the fake physicists, since those guys are just a front. They are protecting the military physicists you don't hear about, the ones doing the real work. Again, if the independent researchers spend their time arguing with internet trolls, they have less time to do actual work, and it is less likely they will discover anything our boys in the military haven't already discovered.

So have the real physicists already discovered all the things I have written about? Maybe. I assume that all the real brains are hidden away somewhere—since they certainly aren't in plain sight—so maybe they have already unwound everything I have and more. But possibly not. These guys are going to be kept very busy with applied physics, since it will be thought that new weapons are more likely to come out of applied physics than theoretical physics. In my experience, physicists pressed to create new hardware, software, or industrial products, including weaponry, are very unlikely to think to tear apart the old equations and start over. It probably won't occur to them to tear apart Newton's *Principia* like an old watch and rebuild it, as I have. It won't occur to them to rebuild Laplace and Lagrange, comb Relativity from the ground up, or to look for mathematical flaws in QED or QCD. After all, I have done all that and haven't yet developed a better pop-gun, so what do they care? They would say, "Give me something I can *use*."

If that is the case, it also explains my freedom, and my lack of competition. The type of problems I am working on apparently only interest scientific purists, and we are a dying breed, it would seem.

Just getting to the end of this paper leaves me thinking, "*Of course* physics has been diverted by the government. It was diverted by the Manhattan Project and never un-diverted. How could you have missed this for so long?" Which leads me to two other realizations. One, a lot of mid-level physicists in the universities apparently haven't yet had this epiphany that I just had. It appears that only the top physicists are "encouraged" to misdirect the field, and the field just goes along with it. This suits the

government just fine, because it limits those they have to control. The government controls the top, and the top controls the middle, and so on. Two, if mainstream physics is utter misdirection, then I don't have to waste any more time debating it. If you debate propagandists, you are just falling for their tricks. After all, how can you debate something like virtual particles? As I said before, you don't debate physicists who start talking about virtual particles, you boot them out of the lab as a nuisance. I suggest the mid-level physicists at the universities do just that. I can't be bothered to sully my boots.

Finally, I suggest that I have uncovered a fantastic journalism project here, if there are any real reporters left in the world. Operation Mockingbird was eventually uncovered by Deborah Davis and Carl Bernstein and others. This Operation Ostrich, where the biggest brains in physics are taken permanently underground after the Manhattan Project, would be an even bigger nut to crack. Piecing together a bunch of disparate facts like I have done will start the stone rolling, but the theory won't be proved until we get what these previous reporters got: interviews or documents. Research like that isn't really my forté or interest, so unless someone dumps some documents in my lap, I will probably leave it to others.

\*<http://old.disinfo.com/archive/pages/article/id1415/pg2/index.html> or Deborah Davis, *Katharine the Great*. 1979

\*\* "The CIA and the Media", Carl Bernstein, *Rolling Stone*, 1977