

GEORGE SMOOT

crashes and burns



by Miles Mathis

First published October 18, 2021

Actually I am getting to this late, since the primary crashing incident here happened in February 2014 [at a TEDx lecture in Manchester, England](#). As you know, I don't pay much attention to these people and never have, which is why I have been able to make such progress in physics and mathematics. If I had followed Smoot and the other promoted people of science I would still be stuck with them in the nowhere-land that is mainstream physics. I am taking the time to out Smoot as part of my general outing of mainstream physics as a gigantic fraud, composed only of people from the Families promoted to create a general confusion and steal from the worldwide treasuries.

Just look at him. No, really *study* him, since he looks exactly like what he is there, from the doubled-breasted peerage suit to the tinted glasses to the Beatles' haircut and backlighting. They say you can't judge a book by its cover, but the truth is you very often can. His full name is George **Fitzgerald** Smoot III, and yes, he is from THE Fitzgeralds, as in the Fitzgeralds of the peerage related to the Kennedys and everyone else. His maternal grandfather was Johnson Tal **Crawford**, Nuremberg Trial judge who served on both the Doctors' Trial and the RuSHA Trial, leading to the Nuremberg Code that is presently being ignored worldwide, by forcing dangerous drugs on people with lies, duress, coercion, and fake "laws". More than that, I have shown you the entire [Nuremberg event was theater](#), being faked for the cameras. Crawford was married to Jessie **Rogers**, so Smoot is also a Rogers, think

Standard Oil's H. H. Rogers. Also remember that H. H. Jr. married a [von Braun/Peabody](#), linking later to Hitler. All one big Family. Strange that no one but these people ever wins a Nobel Prize. Strange that no one but these people ever gets famous for anything in any field.

The Smoots are also in the peerage, including the Smoots of Utah. See Reed Smoot, US Senator who introduced the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, setting off the Great Depression. Smoot was also one of the 12 apostles of LDS, that is the Mormons. His mother was a Mauritzen/[Morrison](#). He married an [Eldredge](#), see also Samuel [Parris](#)' wife in the Salem Witch trials, also named Eldredge. The Fullers were also in Salem, and we are about to see them again. This Mormon apostle Reed Smoot is listed in the British peerage. Strangely, these Smoots of Utah also have links to Hollywood, through the Fairbanks dynasty—think Douglas Fairbanks. See *Debrett Goes to Hollywood*, chapter 3, where on page 42 these Smoots make an entrance. This also links us to the Millners, which may link us to Yuri Milner. Reed Smoot's grandson Harrold married Ella Fairbanks, daughter of Robert Payne Fairbanks (born Ulman). Robert was the brother of Douglas and the head of Fairbanks-Pickford Studio, which became United Artists in 1928. Ulman is of course a variant of Ullman, telling us where Tracey Ullman fits in. The Ullman(n)s of the peerage link us to the Russells, Egertons, and of course the Bergmans. So we may assume Douglas Fairbanks was a cousin of Liv Ullmann, Ingmar Bergman, and Ingrid Bergman. And yes, [I have proved](#) Ingmar and Ingrid are related.

George Smoot's paternal grandmother was Ethel [Fuller](#), linking us to that famous line as well. And we can create a quick circle, since Ingrid Bergman's daughter Pia married Fuller Earle Greenway III, who was a Fuller. [Wiki now fudges his last name as Callaway, though all other sources say Greenway.] So we didn't just accidentally mention Ingrid Bergman in a paper about Smoot.

I will be told there is no link between the Smoots and H. H. Rogers, but there is and we saw it above. Reed Smoot's wife was an Eldredge, remember? Well, H. H. Rogers' mother was Mary Eldredge Huttleston.

Smoot had been working on the Cosmic Microwave Background since the 1970s, where he started by developing a radiometer which was taken up in a [Lockheed](#) U-2. So good to see Lockheed involved here. We could have seen that coming. Here is what Wikipedia says about that on Smoot's page:

[The instrument] made it possible to determine that the overall rotation of the universe was zero, which was within the limits of accuracy of the instrument. It did, however, detect a variation in the temperature of the CMB of a different sort. That the CMB appears to be at a higher temperature on one side of the sky than on the opposite side, referred to as a dipole pattern, has been explained as a Doppler effect of the Earth's motion relative to the area of CMB emission, which is called the last scattering surface. Such a Doppler effect arises because the Sun, and in fact the Milky Way as a whole, is not stationary, but rather is moving at nearly 600 km/s with respect to the last scattering surface. This is probably due to the gravitational attraction between our galaxy and a concentration of mass like the Great Attractor.

Wow, what a load of garbage. The instrument could not tell us anything about the rotation of the universe, and the sentence makes no sense regardless. How can zero be within the limits of accuracy of an instrument? Say your instrument reads zero. Does that imply your parameter is zero? No, that is only *one* of the things it may imply, the others being that your instrument is useless or that your experiment is not set up correctly. It may imply all your assumptions are false, [leading to a null set by crashing ignorance](#). We have seen that over and over in previous papers, and we are seeing it again here. Same for the dipole pattern, which could be caused by just about anything, but motion relative to

CMB is about the last of them. Motion relative to the local charge field is the most likely, and you can picture that difference just by remembering that the galactic core is in one direction and not the other. Also remember that the Earth's own poles are not equal.

In fact, that is what ending up being the case, but they didn't get confirmation of that until the Planck probe arrived in 2009, three years *after* Smoot and Mather had already won the Nobel Prize for CMB modeling. Smoot and Mather had based their theories on data-less Big Bang models going back decades and new data from COBE. But since COBE had all the resolution of a cotton ball dipped in jello, its data turned out to be worthless. It could have supported any theory, and did. [Planck utterly decimated all of Smoot and Mather's work](#), relegating it to the dustbin, but no one ever got around to admitting that. And, let's see, what was Mather's full name? That would be John **Cromwell Mather**—another guy from the Families. Think Oliver Cromwell and Cotton Mather. Mather and Smoot are cousins in many lines. So cosy.

Did Stockholm request its medals back after Planck came out and Smoot and Mather were proved to be wrong about everything? No, but tellingly Smoot *did* donate his Nobel money to charity. You may think that showed some residual honesty, but he appears to have regretted it, since they soon got him on the gameshow *Are You Smarter Than a Fifth Grader?*, where he won a million dollars for knowing that Acadia National Park is in Maine. He did NOT donate that to charity, as far as we know. You will say that was all above-board, but do you think anyone can get on a show like that? What nationwide set of preliminary tests did Smoot win to get on? I don't remember the casting call for that. Did you get your notice? I didn't. We know it is rigged since the three big winners just happened to be connected people: Smoot; Kathy Cox, Superintendent of Schools for the entire state of Georgia and previously a Congresswoman; and Alfred Guy, Dean at Yale. Cox had just filed bankruptcy a few months before winning. That's convenient. And not suspicious at all.

By the way, in looking up the test Guy won on, [I found two 11-question tests from that show](#). They are extremely easy, so it is not really believable only three adult people ever won top prizes. Maybe it is because they have wrong answers. The second one there asks “On a map, which of these states extends the farthest?” Possible answers are West Virginia, Nebraska, and Michigan. I answered Nebraska, but the right answer is given as West Virginia. What? “Extends the farthest” isn't even a logical question. Do they mean in one direction, as in width or height? Or do they mean in both directions, as in area? Either way, the answer is Nebraska, which is much larger than West Virginia. Even in elevation Nebraska wins (which would have been a good question).

Anyway, as if that wasn't all bad enough, in 2014 Smoot decided to go on TEDx and make an absolute fool of himself by appearing under the title “[You are a simulation and physics can prove it](#)”. I highly recommend you don't take my word for it, but actually watch the lecture. It is under 20 minutes. . . of nothing. He doesn't get near proving anything, except possibly that he is on the wrong meds. He actually manages to get sunscreen in his eyes during an indoor lecture in northern England in the middle of winter. You will say he is just addled from old age, but he is still in his sixties there. Plus, I have news for you George: sunscreen is just another conjob from your cousins. It doesn't work and is actually worse for you than a sunburn. You would be better off getting some vitamin D. Your brain appears to be misfiring, and you need all the charge you can get.

Yes, it was this lecture, even more than his asinine pronouncements about CMB, that finally put Smoot in my crosshairs. If there is one thing that burns me up more than fake science from fake scientists, it is this gaslighting by the Families, especially on this topic of reality. In the whole history of their fakes and fictions, they have never stooped lower than this. For a real physicist, this should be blasphemy of

the first order, since physics requires the physical. I shouldn't have to point it out, but if this is all a simulation, then science is right out the window. In a simulation you can program any set of arbitrary rules and fool a zombie into believing them, which of course undercuts science from the foundations. But of course Smoot steers you far far away from that realization.

My readers will know I have been hitting this topic hard for many years:

<http://milesmathis.com/dowdo.pdf>

<http://milesmathis.com/time2.pdf>

<http://milesmathis.com/anthro.pdf>

<http://milesmathis.com/skull.pdf>

<http://milesmathis.com/kas.pdf>

<http://milesmathis.com/teg.pdf>

I have shown that all the talk of holograms, virtual reality, illusions, other universes, hidden dimensions, and all the rest is just propaganda, used to make you think the real distortion in reality you have become aware of is greater than you perceive. These projects are aimed at those of you who have discovered the lies and contradictions of mainstream science and history. It is hoped that rather than blame the actual liars, you will blame aliens, cruel gods, irrational Nature, or some glitch in the matrix beyond anyone's control. And that, as you do so, it is hoped you will neglect to notice the huge contradiction even there: these vocal atheists are suggesting this is all a simulation by . . . whom? Who created the simulation you are in? If not God, then who? Smoot actually broaches that question in passing, suggesting it is aliens, but if it is aliens, then are they real? No, says Smoot, it is levels of simulations all the way up. Nothing is real. Simulations creating simulations. Brilliant.

Notice that Smoot is tied up in many contradictions, but one of the most glaring ones is this one: he says that within a few years they will be able to download your brain into a computer. Once in, it will speed up and need much more stimulation. But wait, I thought you were *already* a simulation, so why are you so slow? Why is Smoot so slow and stupid he can't even read from his own cue cards? The aliens are braking his mind just for their own amusement? Will we have to brake the new computers, to keep them from getting bored and needing more stimulation? Of course not. Our computers are already extremely fast, but they don't feel even the slightest twinge of boredom. If they did, they would refuse to post Smoot's videos.

It is not only the computers who can't follow Smoot's presentation, it is the live audience in Manchester, which is mostly very quiet. He flops around very uncomfortably, never once approaching a rational line of argument. You can almost hear people thinking, "THIS guy won a Nobel Prize?" This guy who can't get from one idea to the next? This guy whose thesis crumbles in the intro and continues to crash all around his ears through the entire 20 minutes? By minute 16, the lecture has completely collapsed, and the audience hasn't the foggiest idea what he is talking about. Not because he is filling the board with Hamiltonians, but because he is babbling. It is nearly impossible to figure out what he is trying to say, even if you know exactly what he is trying to say. It is painful to watch.

At minute 18 it gets really funny, as his stated argument becomes this, and I quote:

If our physics is inconsistent, then it's likely we are in a simulation. If our physics is self-consistent, it is more likely we are real, since it takes more to do that.

Just so you know, nothing in the lecture led up to that. It just came out of left field, like everything else here. But it is both amusing and ironic, because Smoot is basically telling us bad physics is his proof of

the simulation. That was the big proof in the title we were waiting for, I guess. Because Smoot and his colleagues are terrible physicists, they are therefore simulations. But since my physics is consistent, I guess I am real, by his argument.

So here it is in a nutshell. Smoot says he can prove you are living in a simulation. You say, OK, prove it. He says, Well, physics is now a big steaming pile of manure, right? You say, Yep! He says, So that means we are living in a simulation. You say, How's that again? And he says, Well, people can't judge these things, they are fooled by optical illusions, and besides, we already make simulations and will probably make more. Therefore, given enough time, everything will be a simulation. And you are supposed to go, OK, boy, you got me there!

But Smoot isn't finished. He says that since we are simulated, it means we are going to be fuzzy on a small scale, we are going to have entangled states, we are going to have a holographic principle (where 3D is only a coded 2D, with everything on a surface), and we are going to have scale variance* (where large and small scales don't match because they were programmed by different beings).

I hope you see he has gone circular, and rather than proving simulation, he just assumes it and then uses that assumption to indicate all these things he wishes to sell you. But even if we accept simulation, none of those things logically follow. They follow only in his sentences, but do not follow as a matter of anything else. How does simulation prove or even indicate entangled states? Smoot will say it is because entangled states are bad science, and bad science implies simulation. Oh, right. All garbage science is implied proof of all other garbage science, according to this argument.

Smoot sums up by telling his audience that contradictions in science indicate a simulation. . . confirming what I told you above. It is hard to tell what Smoot is trying to do here without already knowing what he is trying to do, but fortunately I *do* know that. I know his assignment here was to misdirect you from the simple truth, that being that you are being gaslighted on purpose, as part of Operation Chaos. They wish to turn your mind to mush, and this is just one of many ways they do it. From the moment you enter mainstream physics, they start pushing contradictions and paradoxes on you as the highest forms of science, while shaming you for expecting anything to make sense. Logic and rationality are attacked from day one, and you are groomed to accept everything on authority. But because that regime started to fail in the last 20 years, they have had to turn up the volume. Many people started to see through the veils, realizing they were being gaslighted. They began to see the lies and distortions not as interesting paradoxes, but simply as lies and distortions pushed on them by liars and conmen. To deal with that required from the masters a whole other level of "look away" psychology, and you are now being noisily ordered not to look at the man behind the curtain, pulling the levers. They are trying to remove the very ground beneath your feet by attacking reality itself. In other words, it is not science and the media that is a vast distortion, it is reality itself. Those people you see right before you, that you can actually reach out and touch, are not to blame, since they are just holograms and simulations. No sense putting those people in jail, since jails are also holograms. The best thing you can do is just go with it. Clap at the end and go get a cappuccino.

*Of course, I have conspicuously and overtly solved this problem of scale variance for them, but they have to pretend they don't know that. What he means, specifically, is that physicists haven't been able to get their maths to jive, as in the unification problem, because the quantum world doesn't seem to work like the macroworld. The big equations don't fit together. Except that. . . they do. [I achieved unification](#) by pointing out that they already had a scaler and a scaling equation, they just didn't understand it for what it was. G is their scaler, and they

already have many unified field equations, including Newton's equation, Coulomb's equation, the [Lagrangian](#), [Maxfield's equations](#), [Gauss' equations](#), and so on. But since they haven't realized that, and since they don't understand how to scale accelerations and forces using those equations, they can't join their quantum equations to celestial equations, failing in their efforts to unify. So I have proved they have no scale problem to solve, which means that has nothing to do with simulations. It is the same with his other examples, which have nothing to do with simulations, though everything to do with bad physics. I have [also blown entanglement](#), for instance, and I did that back in 2009, while Smoot was beating up on 5th graders on TV. Likewise for his “fuzziness”, which is an outcome of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, which I destroyed [here](#) among other places. Smoot also mentions the Anthropic Principle, which I destroy [here](#).