

[return to science updates](#)

AS BAD AS IT GETS

constructor theory



by Miles Mathis

>I'm afraid sir you have rather a weak grasp of reality.
>Your reality sir is lies and balderdash and I am delighted
to say that I have no grasp of it whatsoever.
—Baron Munchausen

First published March 21, 2022

While writing [my recent paper tearing up Matt O'Dowd and PBS Spacetime](#) I noticed that Matt had also been promoting David Deutsch's Constructor Theory, selling it as the next big thing in physics. That figures. This is just more proof physics has utterly bottomed out, being led by the biggest creeps on the planet. **Deutsch** (above), Jewish of course, is head of the quantum computing department at Oxford and has won most of the top prizes in his field, including the Dirac Prize and the Newton Prize. He is now [heavily promoted by Intelligence](#), we assume in order to eviscerate the visible fields of science, turning them completely to dross. Real science has either been taken underground or it has been quashed on purpose, to maximize control of treasuries through fake projects.

I say this because Deutsch, like most of his colleagues, is an absolute fraud. He has never done anything real in his entire career, spending all his time making up mathematical models based on nothing. He is most famous for allegedly creating the first quantum algorithm that could be faster than real computers . . . except for one thing. **It isn't**. It can't be created because it is based on physical entities and events that do not exist (such as qubits). No qubit has ever been created or ever will be, and neither will any of these quantum computers. Here is why:

The entire theory of quantum computing is based on the old theories of superposition* and entanglement, which are based on the many-worlds interpretation of Hugh Everett and are linked to the famous Schrodinger Cat Problem. Its prime assumption is that quantum states are superimposed **physically**, meaning, a photon could be spinning left and right *at the same time* in real space. Or, an electron isn't just up or down, it can be simultaneously up/down, like the cat is both dead and alive. Entanglement is another trick, by which particles can jump from point to point without traversing the points in between. They can travel near-infinite distances in no time, as with wormholes. You can see why that would help a computer's speed, right, since it appears to trump the speed of light. The quantum qubit is then built on those assumptions, and they go from there. But because those assumptions and theories are false, their quantum qubit is not only a mythical beast, it is not even an allowed mathematical beast. It should be disallowed on both physical *and* mathematical grounds, simply as a logical contradiction. It is little more than an abuse of language.

Now, I assume Deutsch knows that, because I assume he isn't an absolute idiot. I assume he is evil, not moronic. But who knows? Maybe he really does have a sort of brain damage, and can claim innocence. That is for the gods to decide, because I would never be caught in his presence for a moment without garlic and a silver bullet.

To deflect from this truism, Deutsch has spent the last decade building bigger and bigger walls around that first false assumption. That is what Constructor Theory really is. It isn't a physical theory or even a philosophical one, it is a vast wall of cheese around his theories from the 80s and 90s. It is the awful and longwinded effort to bluff you into thinking that the logical fallacies at the heart of his entire life aren't really fallacies.

The bios like the one at Wiki admit that Deutsch's Theory of Everything is “emergentist” rather than reductive, which is a cloudy way of saying it is just jactation. Bombast. Pillow stuffing. As we saw in my last paper, theories are said to be emergent when they don't contain any mechanics, dynamics, logic, or physics. We saw there that charge was said to be emergent from quarks, the theory being that Gell-Mann—a famous guy—had proposed quarks, therefore they existed, therefore anything anyone could attach to them also existed. Well, Deutsch's theories have the same amount of rigor, meaning none. Deutsch simply winks at some slippery and oily theories from the recent past—also made of cheese—like those of Hugh Everett or [Richard Dawkins](#), then leans some of his ideas up against theirs, and claims his next top prize.

Remember, Deutsch's quantum computer theory has been around since 1985, and if qubits existed or his assumptions were true, it shouldn't be hard to build. And yet here we are 37 years later, and not even a single circuit has been built. There are claims that quantum computers have been built, including the IBM QSystemOne that finally came out in 2019, but there has been no evidence presented that these computers are based on qubits, superposition, entanglement, or anything else. My belief is that it is another massive fraud from the princes of the big lie, promoted to drain money from treasuries worldwide. That is what these people specialize in, not science of any kind. If these new computers are working at all in any novel way, it must be by tapping real photon spins. Photons are real particles while qubits are not, so while a photon-spin computer is certainly feasible, a qubit computer is not. We know even without reading the tech books or tearing this machine apart that it is not doing anything with qubits, entanglement, or superposition defined as overlapping realities.


Another way we know this is all a fraud is through the people involved, and the entities funding all these interlinking schemes. If we look up who is funding Deutsch at Oxford and his Constructor Theory, we find a group of mysterious entities including the [Eutopia](#) Foundation, which has a spooky

website with absolutely no information about itself. I encourage you to take a look. They do admit they are also funding [atmospheric aerosoling](#), as well as climate hysteria, which alone allows us to peg them. They also fund the [Economic Security Project](#), which is pretending to try to help the middle class via antimonopoly lobbying and other feints. However, if you take a few links there, you will find they are run by spooks from the [New School](#), the [Aspen Institute](#), and the [Roosevelt Institute](#). Meaning, they have no interest in the middle class, except as an object for more pillage. These projects are all smokescreens, selling you X while doing not-X. Those institutions are Phoenician Navy outposts, and their goal is to maintain and extend their hegemony. Your well being means less than nothing to them. You are disposable, as we have seen with the Covid/vaccine crime against humanity. You and yours are being disposed of as we speak. That is their real plan for the middle class: extermination.

The chair of the Economic Security Project is Natalie Foster, who besides being a fellow at Aspen was also a co-founder of Rebuild the Dream with Van Jones. You remember him, right? Obama's Green Jobs advisor. He is also famous for supporting Mumia Abu-Jamal, who I have proved [is not even a real person](#). Jones also launched YesWeCode in 2015, a program to teach low-income kids to write code. So that's where that joke came from. "Let them write code!" Foster was also a deputy director at MoveOn.org: they have really turned the Democratic Party into a positive engine for the middle class, haven't they? Such a great success story, and we now see the middle class blooming like never before. That is because MoveOn is funded by that great big philanthropist George Soros ([Schwartz](#)), who cares so deeply about the middle class.

Eutopia is also linked to [ChangeX](#), which also leads with a sunny front, but is run by a partner at [McKinsey](#). You remember McKinsey, right? The huge management consulting firm caught up in the Enron fiasco as well as the financial crisis of 2007-8. That was a big help to the middle class, right?

Another funder of the Constructor Project is the [Gordon Moore](#) Foundation. And who was he? We're guessing another great lover of the middle class, like George Soros. Yes, because he was the founder of Intel Corporation, which lost a \$1.25 billion antitrust lawsuit to AMD. They were also convicted of breaking Japan's antimonopoly laws. Ironic isn't it, given that we just found the Economic Security Project lobbying against monopolies. So maybe they should be lobbying against their fellow Constructor Project funder Gordon Moore. You have to laugh.



I also have to include that Intel Inside tag, which has always been an inside joke. Would it help if I changed it to "CIA is preinstalled in your computer"? Moore came out of Fairchild semiconductor in 1968, which came out of Shockley, which came out of Bell labs, which came out of AT&T and their

President Frank Jewett. Bell Labs and the CIA were joined at the hips in the 1940s, with the Manhattan Project and other projects, and have never disjoined. So Intel=Intelligence, and always has.

Who else funds the Constructor Project? FQXi, run by Anthony Aquirre and Max Tegmark (Schapiro), two more big red flags. [I have already hit Tegmark several times](#). If you will remember, he is the one who infamously said

Protons, atoms, molecules, cells and stars are all redundant baggage.

He is the foremost promoter of information technology as a replacement for physics and science, which links him tightly to Deutsch, who is doing the same thing. They want you to believe nothing exists except metaphysics, or more precisely their empty verbiage.

Who else funds the Constructor Project? That would be the John Templeton Foundation. Surely he is a good guy, right? Uh. . . no. He was Sir John Marks (Marx) Templeton, who supposedly became a billionaire by buying shares of 104 US companies selling for less than a dollar before WWII. Shouldn't that be 108 companies? Anyway, a self-made billionaire and genius, blablah. In truth, the Templetons have always been top East India Company assholes, related to the Hoares (see Jennifer Aniston and others), Barclays, and Pierreponts (Pierponts, as in Morgan). They have also been in banking on both sides of the pond for centuries, so John Templeton didn't rise from obscurity. Perhaps the quickest way to peg Templeton is to look at his Templeton Prize, which was awarded for many decades by Prince Philip. If Templeton were just a nobody American, why would his prize be awarded by Prince Philip? Why would Templeton be knighted? Why would Templeton and Philip award a prize to Billy Graham? Did Graham need any more prizes or promotion in 1982? What about the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, the Baron Immanuel Jacobovits? Did he need any more promotion or funding in 1991? What about Charles Colson, Watergate scapegoat? Did he need any more promotion in 1993?



What about Freeman Dyson, above? Did he need more money or promotion in 2000? Was it crucial for the Templeton Prize to promote that old crypto-Jewish fraud anymore in 2001, after a lifetime of outrageous promotion? Wikipedia now claims Dyson used Feynman's diagrams to "completely solve the renormalization problem" in the 1950s. Strange then that Feynman never knew that, although he lived until 1988. In his late book *QED*, which I have read closely cover to cover, Feynman admitted

renormalization was a still a big mess. Also worth mentioning: Feynman was a Phillips. His full name was Richard **Phillips** Feynman, linking him to Karl Marx and the Queen. Dyson was also famous for a paper “proving that the **Pauli exclusion principle** plays the main role in the stability of bulk matter. Hence it is not the electromagnetic repulsion between outer-shell orbital electrons that prevents two stacked wood blocks from coalescing into a single piece, but the exclusion principle applied to electrons and protons that generates the classical macroscopic **normal force**.” Unfortunately for him, I have since proven that is false. [There are no electron orbitals](#) and the force is caused by charge channeling by the nucleus and by charge field pressure, not by proton/electron exclusion.

If you still don't think Dyson was a fraud, you may wish to read up on his Dyson Eternal Intelligence Theory, by which he

proposes a means by which an [immortal](#) society of intelligent beings in an open universe may escape the prospect of the heat death of the universe by extending subjective timeto infinity even though expending only a finite amount of energy.

Yes, that is the sort of crap he wasted his time on.

Just so you know, Dyson's father was knighted, being *Sir* George Dyson, so no one proceeded on merit here, as usual. It was all Phoenician preference. Dyson's mother was an Atkey, and they are peerage, linking us to the **Stewarts**. His aunt Margaret married a Dorman, whose grandmother was a Stewart. The Dysons are also peerage, being related to Armitage and St. John. Through the Halls they are related to the **Hamilton**-Temple-Blackwoods, Marquesses of Dufferin, linking us also the Husseys, Caldwelles, Sheridans, **Barclays**, Woolfs, and Cherrys. Through his grandmother he linked to the Viscounts Greenwood, who link us to the Spencers.

But back to Templeton. John Templeton was descended from Albert Smith Marks, Governor of Kentucky, who comes from the Marks and Ruggles of **Salem, MA**. John Templeton was also a Wiley, a **Clinton**, and a **Maxwell**—and you know what that means. Bill Clinton wasn't on Ghislaine Maxwell's planes and island by accident. Templeton's grandmother was a Maxwell. He was also related to **Percy** Waller Templeton of Vermont, linking us to the **Beauclerks, Dukes of St. Albans**. Also see Richard Templeton of Georgia, who links us to Sir Roger Casement, [who we have seen in my previous paper](#) on Michael Collins. Casement's mother was a Beatty, likely linking us to Warren Beatty.

So, those are the people funding David Deutsch. Do you still think he might be clean? If so, you may wish to study his face a bit more closely. I believe he is about 65 in that picture above, so he is aging somewhat like Bill Gates. In my opinion, there is a lot written there, and it doesn't look good. According to the internet, he has no wife or children, but he did found an online mailing list in 1994 called [Taking Children Seriously](#). No, seriously. He really did that. It claims to be a parenting guide, from a guy with no children. It was co-founded with Sarah Fitz-Claridge, nee Lawrence, and this is her picture dated 2021 on her own website:



That's also weird, because it doesn't even look real. It looks CGI. How can she be so sharp and so blurry at the same time? Plus, she allegedly founded this thing in 1994, 27 years earlier, so how old was she then? Twelve? Would you really want those people having your children on an email list? Would you like them interacting with your children? Not me. If you don't get a very bad feeling here, you aren't paying attention.

If you still don't believe me, you can [watch her at Youtube](#), in a video also from 2021. Strangely, she looks nothing like that, not having blonde hair and looking about 30 years older, and very scary. Her head is again floating on a fake background in a strange way there, and if you aren't spooked by her, I don't know what to say. See minute 51:50, for example.

I found no information on this Sarah Fitz-Claridge—other than her own website—indicating it may be a fake name. It appears not to be the name of her husband. I did find [a Sarah Lawrence of the peerage](#) who may be her, since the ages match and we find the Oxford link as well. Her father would be Walter **Murray** Lawrence of Trinity College, Oxford, also linking us to the Nevilles, Murrays, and Oppenheims, as well as the Lawrence baronets. That all fits her project to a T.

If you don't see it, I will point out the big red flag with this “theory”. It says we should get children's consent for anything we do to them, and should never coerce them. Sounds great if you don't look too closely. But what is the flipside? Does that mean that anything we get consent for is OK? What if we convince a child fondling is OK, and get consent? Do you see the problem now? That is where that whole “line of reasoning” is going. With just a little nudge it starts to dovetail into the whole legalization of pedophilia being promoted now, doesn't it? “Anything between consenting adults, OR consenting children, is moral”.

OK, now that you know some of what I know, you can revisit Deutsch's Constructor Theory. Here is how Wikipedia glosses it in the opening paragraph.

In the language of ergodic theory . . . constructor theory expresses physical laws exclusively in terms of which physical transformations, or tasks, are possible versus which are impossible, and

why. By allowing such [counterfactual](#) statements into fundamental physics, it allows new physical laws to be expressed, such as the constructor theory of information.

Wow, really not off to a good start. Laws are expressed exclusively in terms of possible tasks? But unless you already know how physics works, how do you know what tasks are possible? You can't begin a physical theory on possible tasks, for so many reasons. One, because epistemology can't work like that, and Deutsch should know that since he (mis)uses the word all the time. Epistemology isn't physics, since it is a theory of knowledge, by definition. Physics isn't a theory of knowledge, it is a theory of physical interaction. For another, epistemology also can't start with tasks, because tasks aren't fundamental to knowledge. Tasks are fundamental to computing, but computing has nothing to do with creating knowledge. It has to do with storing, sorting, and collating pre-existing knowledge. Our huge computers haven't helped us *learn* anything, in fact they have just gotten in our way by soaking off our time. Yes, they make information storage and retrieval much faster, and I am not denying that is useful, but again, that isn't a theory of knowledge and therefore is not epistemology, much less physics. I have proved that myself, by beating all the worldwide computers singlehandedly. While they have been crunching terabytes of information, I have been sitting staring at the ceiling, going places they would never think to go—because they can't think.

But it is even worse than that, because Deutsch's theory is ergodic, meaning it is statistical. Wikipedia claims it is both statistical and deterministic, but statistics can't be deterministic, by definition. Statistics can only be statistical, which means probabilistic. Probabilities are not deterministic, *by definition*. So this Constructor Theory is already a mindfick in so many ways, before we get past the first paragraph.

And another problem. You can't possibly build a computer program based on ergodics or “possible tasks”, because computers can't understand “maybe”. They understand yes/no. If you told a computer that a cat could be alive and dead at the same time, it would either blow up or spit in your face. You might as well try to tell existing computers that a number may be both 1 and 0 at the same time, and that it can't decide until after it has decided. Do you really think such an instruction would help it go faster? The only way to make computers go faster than they already go is by telling them how to use photons more efficiently. But we already can't make use of the speed we have. Computers are already far faster than we need them to be, except maybe my Mac Mini without SSD. But even with my Mini poking along, I have been able to run circles around mainstream physicists. While they were jacking off their giant computers, I was cleaning up all of physics since Newton.

Which is precisely why Deutsch had to come up with this Constructor Theory, and why hundreds of agents had to be tapped to promote it: **they had to misdirect away from me**. Remember, Constructor Theory came out in 2012. What else happened in 2012? Well, I have had an *annus mirabilis* every year since about 2001, but 2012 was an especially good year, since I published 84 papers on my science site that year. In 2011 I had published my paper on [how the elements are built](#), showing the nuclear architecture, and in 2012 I [tore up the Bohr model](#), [rewrote the Schrodinger Equation](#), redefined [pair production](#), [destroyed the CHSH Bell tests](#), [explained Plate Tectonics](#), [obliterated the Higgs Boson](#), unified [the fine structure constant with G and k](#), ditched bosons and [orbitons](#), [crashed perturbation](#) and chaos theories, jammed [the Einstein field equations](#), [destroyed the Copenhagen Interpretation](#), [explained lift on a wing](#), and [mapped diatomic hydrogen](#), among many other things.

So Deutsch's ergodic blather doesn't really stand up too well next to that, does it? Especially since we still haven't tried to make sense of this:

By allowing such **counterfactual** statements into fundamental physics, it allows new physical laws to be expressed, such as the constructor theory of information.

What? I don't see how that follows from the previous sentence at Wiki. Basing physical laws on possible tasks allows counterfactual statements into physics *how*? Is Deutsch only allowing in the *impossible* tasks? That is the only way his theory could get any stupider. But how can you base physical laws on counterfactual statements? That would be like basing truths on falsehoods, wouldn't it?

Here's more from Wikipedia:

For example, a drop of dye can dissolve in water but **thermodynamics** shows that the reverse transformation, of the dye clumping back together, is effectively impossible. We do not know at a quantum level why this should be so.

Really? In the 21st century, no one knows why dye doesn't spontaneously clump back together? Not a good sign, is it? We need a lamebrained Constructor Theory to explain it? It's simple statistics, isn't it, based on open space. A variation of entropy. Some have called it the **Second Law of Thermodynamics**. A group of objects in motion will disperse, moving into open spaces because those spaces are **open**, by the definition of open and of space and of motion. Things clump only if some opposite force like gravity or charge overcomes the natural tendency to disperse. But apparently contemporary physicists are so stupid they can no longer see the logic of dispersion based on the definition of open space. Deutsch is trying to convince us the Second Law of Thermodynamics is somehow not understood or not rational at the quantum level, and that it needs to be re-propped up by his endless embarrassing jawing.

Here's another example from Wiki:

Information has the property that a given statement might have said something else, and one of these alternatives would not be true. The untrue alternative is said to be "**counterfactual**". Conventional physical theories do not model such counterfactuals. However, the link between information and such physical ideas as the **entropy** in a thermodynamic system is so strong that they are sometimes identified. For example, the area of a **black hole's event horizon** is a measure both of the hole's entropy and of the information that it contains, as per the **Bekenstein bound**. Constructor theory is an attempt to bridge this gap, providing a physical model which can express counterfactuals, thus allowing the laws of information and computation to be viewed as laws of physics.

There is no person or computer in the world who could make sense of that gibberish. Constructor theory provides a model to express falsehoods? In order to bridge what gap? The gap between a black hole's entropy and of the information it contains? Is there a gap there? No, not a physical gap, since entropy is a measurement of energy, while information is a measurement of knowledge (or more precisely data transfer). That is a metaphysical gap, not a physical one, and is just a natural gap between levels of abstraction. There is no logical way to "bridge" it, or any need to, since it would be akin to bridging the "gap" between a rock and my idea or knowledge of a rock. The only way to bridge that gap is for my idea to correspond to the rock itself. That is, for me to *learn* more about the rock. No Constructor Theory will ever help in that regard, or begin to bridge that gap, since these modern theorists don't even believe in the reality of the rock to begin with. We are back to Max Tegmark's asinine "**Protons, atoms, molecules, cells and stars are all redundant baggage.**"

Again, I recommend you to [John Ruskin's famous pathetic fallacy](#), which addressed this fake conundrum 165 years ago. He called it pathetic in 1856, and it only get more pathetic with each passing year. It now not only infests aesthetics, it infests epistemology and physics.

Deutsch's entire theory refutes itself, since in a world of information only, there is no need for any physical laws, physics, or theories. If information is primary, then that information should determine all events or tasks, including what we call reality. But we know from millennia of experiments that the reverse is true: Physical things and laws pre-exist any information or knowledge of them, and these things determine all information and all possible tasks. Existence is primary, not knowledge or information.

In the old existence/essence split, information is *neither*. Information is secondary or subsidiary to both. Existence could be called the “experience of” essence, but information is just an intermediary either way, which is precisely why computers, as collators of information, aren't experiencing anything. They actually *do not exist* in that way. Although they transmit both light and information, they don't contain, embody, or transmit complete light structures, which is what we call life. I easily beat any number of computers at anything more complex than simple computations, because I embody a complete light structure that no computer has, nor can have. And that light structure is not just my brain, either, although that is the seat of it during my life. My light structures, like my physical body, are far more complex than any computer will ever be, no matter how large or fast.

AI hasn't even figured out how to create an enzyme or amoeba, much less a cell or brain. And one reason for that is that they have no idea how charge and matter really interact. They can't figure out how you are ensouled because they have never realized the proton is already ensouled, in a way. Because they don't know about charge channeling, they don't understand the primary engine of all existence. They think that processing information is equivalent to living or experiencing, but it isn't. Any light switch can process information, but that doesn't make it alive. Running a current through something also doesn't make it alive, though that also uses charge channeling. That thing we call “me” is a huge, complex, and dense contained light structure, channeling through every nucleus in the body, and properly looped to maintain cohesion, self-correction, and—at the highest levels—awareness.

So if these people really wanted to begin to understand physics or life or anything else, they would start with my paper on nuclear architecture and charge channeling. You will say I shouldn't give these evil bastards the hint, but it won't matter. There is no danger of them creating life, since even a single cell is light-years beyond their comprehension, or mine. We are in no danger of becoming gods. The danger is not that they will learn to create life, but that they will continue to pervert it. AI is not the current danger, since it is mostly a fraud. The current danger is the evil biolabs, as we have seen plenty of evidence for lately. It is the insane experimentation on animals and humans by people with no sense of propriety, integrity, or morality. We can only hope that the current mass-casualty event will soon force a reassessment of all such research, and an utter destruction and outlawing of it, including the people and companies that have promoted it.

In conclusion, I will say that I have been criticized for my tone, which some have found unscientific. I have been accused of hitting way too hard. But given the current state of things, I couldn't possibly hit hard enough. If I am doing what has never been done before, not only regarding my physics but regarding my polemics, it is because we have never been in this place before historically. Never before has science fallen to such levels. Never before have we witnessed such perfidy and infamy in the professional journals. Civilization is quickly bottoming out, and the milieu has silently begged for someone like me to come along. The Earth herself raised me from the mists to answer attacks upon

her, which she would prefer to respond to in this way rather than simply wipe us out. If you think I hit hard, you will not be prepared for Nature's wallop, I assure you.

She retains some hope we may be saved, but if we are it won't be for our intelligence, which is minimal. You can be sure that if any aliens are interested in us, it isn't for our intelligence. It is for our ability to love and for our kindness, which some of us retain. It is for our empathy. And it is for our love of truth and honor, which—though endangered—is not yet extinct.

*To see what superposition really is, [see my 2005 paper on it](#).