

[return to updates](#)

THE LIE-GO CONTINUES



by Miles Mathis

November 2, 2018

I find I am not the only one who hasn't bowed out of this fight. The guys at Niels Bohr *seem to be* still all-in as late as November 2018, which is (at first glance) encouraging. [See this month's *New Scientist*](#), which has an exclusive entitled "Grave Doubts over LIGO's Discovery of Gravitational Waves". This comes after the awarding of the Nobel Prize, which makes it somewhat surprising, at least to me. I thought we had heard the last from Denmark on this one, but I was wrong. [I reported](#) on their "doubts" before the prize, predicting they would lead to the fall of LIGO, but so far LIGO is still standing.

But even the article at *New Scientist* is propaganda posing as news, since the first paragraph undercuts the article itself and the announcement. Here are the first two sentences:

THERE was never much doubt that we would observe gravitational waves sooner or later. This rhythmic squeezing and stretching of space and time is a natural consequence of one of science's most well-established theories, Einstein's general relativity.

Strange to see a science article lead with two non-scientific sentences, isn't it? They are the assumption of data, data which we still do not have. Or, those sentences aren't just non-scientific, *they are lies*. There always has been a lot of doubt and still is. If there were no doubt, we would not have spent any money searching for proof, would we? It is also not true that gravity waves are a "natural outcome" of General Relativity. As we have seen before, Einstein himself told us twice there were no gravity waves. So even he had doubts, didn't he? This has all been a mad rush to a conclusion, and this article continues the unscientific rush, by leading with the assumption of a result *before* reporting on the questioning of that result. So already you should be on high alert. Only a propagandist would lead an article in such a way.

The title is also misdirection, since we soon find that these physicists at Niels Bohr don't have "grave doubts". They think the detection is hogwash, and say so. They have proven the results were pushed, which is far beyond a "grave doubt". They argue convincingly it was an illusion in the data, a bad misreading, ignoring all normal protocol. So why water that down with a misleading title?

[The press releases at other sites](#) are also misleading, since they say something like “Danish physicists *claim to* cast doubt on detection of gravitational waves”. They aren't claiming to cast doubt, they are casting doubt, so again, why water it down with squishy wording? *ArsTechnica* then quickly adds a rebuttal before even reporting what the Danish physicists have to say. At that link to *ArsTechnica*, the subtitle is

LIGO responds: "There is absolutely no validity to their claims."

Shouldn't we at least hear the claims before we get a response? The form of the report by itself proves we are dealing with dishonest reportage, and therefore propaganda.

We have seen the same thing all along regarding this LIGO claim. On October 11, 2017, someone [posted the response to LIGO from the Niels Bohr team at MathForum.org](#). The discussion was shut down less than 24 hours later. No new posts were allowed on this thread after October 12, 2017.

It is also worth mentioning that despite being at Niels Bohr, this team was forced to publish at JCAP and ArXiv, the first of which is not a premier journal and the second of which is just an open site—used for republication by some and as a platform for marginalized characters by others. I don't mean to trash either place, I am just pointing out that anti-LIGO papers have not been welcomed by the big mainstream journals. JCAP has only been around since 2003, and is a publication of SISSA, a research institute in Trieste, Italy.

In fact, the more I research this whole fracas, the fishier it smells. A search on the Niels Bohr team's opinion pulls up almost nothing. We had the press release back in June of 2017, led by the article at *Forbes*. Then pretty much nothing until now, when we see this watered-down propaganda from *New Scientist*. So the Niels Bohr team is starting to smell like controlled opposition. Their niggling complaints about the signal to noise correlation keeps your eyes off much larger problems, which I have listed [in my papers](#). They don't want you to realize the entire LIGO project was a scam from the beginning, with the expensive antennae having no purpose but to burn money. The 2.5 mile tunnels in vacuum and all the rest should look like a joke to any real physicist or astronomer or engineer, and I showed you exactly why. All the other “discussion” of this event I found on the internet also looks like controlled opposition, since no one ever states the obvious. They limit their discussions to signal or YARK or Michelson-Morley or something, utterly ignoring the deeper problems here, and with physics in general.

This is also strange: a [Phys.org article](#) from September 4, 2018, about “boosting gravitational wave detectors with quantum tricks”. The title is again a clue, since we get that word “tricks”. It should put you on alert. But what turned my head is that the article comes from. . . the Niels Bohr Institute! In this article we are reminded of something else: the LIGO international team of thousands included “experts from NBI”. That stands for Niels Bohr Institute. So it is sort of strange to have one prominent team from NBI now attacking another prominent team from the same place, isn't it? That would confirm my suspicion of controlled opposition, wouldn't it? Why would NBI both support and attack LIGO? Does that make any sense?

The team working on gravitational wave detectors at NBI is led by Eugene Polzik and F. Ya. Khalili. The team working against LIGO is led by James Creswell, Andrew Jackson, Sebastian von Hausegger, Pavel Naselsky, and Hao Liu. Since the NBI is quite small, we would not expect these scientists to be working crossways to eachother. [According to their own website](#), the Institute for Physics has only

four teams of scientists. For this reason, I now suggest the Creswell/Jackson team is a mirage, created to be the losing opposition here. I suspect they agreed to be part of the con at *New Scientist*, where their argument is watered down and squashed on purpose. If you were one of these physicists, would you put up with such schenanigans? I wouldn't. I would call out Michael Brooks at *New Scientist* as the propagandist he is (as I just did).

I also draw your attention to something else spooky. In the sidebar at *New Scientist* on the page we have been looking at, we find one of three “Popular Articles” being promoted: **Why Memories are an Illusion and Forgetting is Good for You.** Do you still want to tell me *New Scientist* isn't a propaganda rag? Do you believe your memories are an illusion? I don't. Do you want to forget them all? I don't. But whoever is publishing *New Scientist* apparently wants you to. Why? Probably because they would prefer you forget all the times you have been scammed, including this time. That will make you easier to scam next time. People with no memories are ripe for anything. They are babes in the wood.

My readers coming here from my other site should notice something else: the *New Scientist* article is dated October 31, 2018. Halloween. Another subtle sign of the conjob—one I nearly missed—but one we have seen many many times in our research.

However, even this con looks to be backfiring, since a number of mainstream physicists have accepted the initial argument while tossing the spin. In other words, they have *not* accepted the LIGO results as genuine. None have gone as far as I have—since in their positions that would be difficult to do—but many are refusing to buy the promotion. Therefore, I think there is still a possibility this scam will ultimately fail. Logically it has to, since it has no scientific merit. And they aren't trying to pass this conjob by addled great-aunts or drugged-up highschool kids—they are trying to con trained scientists. Surely it can't last much longer.