

[return to updates](#)

QUANTUM MECHANICS EXPLODES AGAIN

by Miles Mathis

First published January 13, 2020

About once a month now, experiment shows something that shouldn't be happening according to the standard model of particle physics. This month it is an experiment at Princeton by Wang and Yu [published at Nature](#) concerning monolayer Tungsten diTelluride. Although the experiment blows all standing theory in condensed matter physics, they don't admit that of course. They try to spin it positive, by making it about the exciting discovery of a new particle.

But the problem is they don't have any *old* particles in this theory. Only *quasiparticles*, abstract interactions, and make-believe architectures. Their reading of the experiment depends on Landau quantization, which is a strictly arbitrary technique used to map the Fermi surface of a substance like this. In other words, rather than studying the particles they know are there, they instead create an imaginary set of non-interacting particles which they call a Fermi gas. Except that. . . [there is no evidence of a Fermi gas, and never has been](#). There is however [a huge amount of evidence against it](#), and we can just add this newest experiment to the long list. The biggest evidence against has always been that real particles interact, especially fermions. Protons and electrons are fermions, and the real ones are charged: which means they must interact via charge. So as I have said before, creating a gas of non-interacting fermions is just perverse. It is like creating a group of non-lying politicians. It is a contradiction in terms.

What this experiment is telling them is what they should have always known: their entire pseudo-architecture is false from the first word. None of this can be modeled on fermions, especially not the electron, since it is charge streams causing everything, not electrons. Charge is photons, which are not fermions.

The commentary around this experiment by those involved all but proves that, since they keep talking about *neutral* fermions, neutral electrons, or neutral spinons. Note the word *neutral*. Photons would seem to be neutral here, though they aren't, for the same reason they seem to be neutral in a lot of magnetic experiments: they are far smaller and are moving far faster than the fermions, so they don't interact in the same way. They seem to be non-interacting with a magnetic field, *in some ways*.

So once again, the problem is that mainstream physicists insist on trying to track electrons (or worse, electron holes), when they should be tracking charge photons. At the quantum level, NOTHING is determined by electrons. Electrons are just along for the ride. If you want to understand any quantum experiment, you have to [track charge streams through and between nuclei](#). But the mainstream has never been able to do that, because they don't know anything about nuclear architecture. You can't track charge streams without knowing how each element channels them.

And they insist on saying stuff like this:

Wu noted that there are no current theories to explain this phenomenon.

False, since my theory has been around for years, highly ranked by Google, so if Wu doesn't know about it, it is because he doesn't want to know about it. Or maybe, as an assistant professor—who I guess may be young—he has been shielded by his superiors from my ideas to protect their own pathetic theories and streams of funding.

Because they know nothing about nuclear architecture and charge channeling, they can't even talk sensibly about these experiments in their papers or reports. Everything is a garbled mess from the first word. For instance, here is the start of their abstract at *Nature*:

In strongly correlated materials, quasiparticle excitations can carry fractional quantum numbers. An intriguing possibility is the formation of fractionalized, charge-neutral fermions—for example, spinons¹ and fermionic excitons^{2,3}—that result in neutral Fermi surfaces and Landau quantization^{4,5} in an insulator. Although previous experiments in quantum spin liquids¹, topological Kondo insulators^{6,7,8} and quantum Hall systems^{3,9} have hinted at charge-neutral Fermi surfaces, evidence for their existence remains inconclusive.

But I have news for them. That isn't an abstract. An abstract is a condensed report of the experiment and findings. What we have here is just propaganda and salesmanship, since they are selling you spinons and excitons by the second sentence. And by the fifth word, we are in fantasyland. Quasiparticle excitations can't carry fractional anythings, because they don't exist, by definition. If they existed, they would be particles, not quasiparticles.

Next they tell you previous experiments have hinted at charge-neutral surfaces, but that isn't true at all. What they should say is that all previous experiments have been heavily **pushed** to conform to the ridiculous theories of promoted people, all the way back to Landau, ignoring far more sensible theories. As just one example, [I already destroyed this theory of spinons](#) years ago, and any honest and decent person would now be embarrassed to speak of it. [I went on the destroy the orbiton as well](#), which of course doomed all other fake particles like the exciton. I have explained many of the newer experiments with charge channeling by the nucleus, including [Graphene](#), the [Hall Effect](#), the [Stark Effect](#), [Anderson Localization](#), the [Quantum Spin Liquid](#), [Vanadium Dioxide](#), [Ballistic Resonance](#), the [Electron Paradox](#), [superfluidity](#), [Solid Light and the Meissner Effect](#), [Helium4](#), and many other similar problems.

Here is another piece of idiocy from the mainstream report at SciTechDaily.

Nearly a century ago, researchers observed that a magnetic field, coupled with very low temperatures, can cause electrons to shift from a “classical” state to a quantum state, causing oscillations in the metal’s resistivity. In insulators, by contrast, electrons cannot move and the materials have very high resistivity, so quantum oscillations of this sort are not expected to occur, no matter the strength of magnetic field applied.

So they admit they are relying on a misunderstanding of the quantum field from the 1920s, which has never been cleared up since then. In this interpretation, oscillations in resistance are caused by electrons shifting from a classical state to a quantum state. You have got to be kidding me. How can such pathetic theory stand for almost a century, never questioned by thousands of people who claim to be intelligent? Even before I knew what was really causing the oscillations, I knew this old theory had to be false, since it flouts all the rules of logic. Nothing can shift from a classical to a quantum state,

since “classical” and “quantum” aren't states. They are just broad terms that apply to the *history* of physics. You can have “classical” and “post-classical” theories, but you can't have classical and post-classical states. For electrons or anything else to shift, they have to shift in response to other particles, and they have to do so for a reason. A state-shift is not a physical reason, since it explains nothing. It is just empty words.

To start with, the oscillations aren't caused by electrons at all. The oscillations are caused by the charge field shifting, and it is shifting because the spin of the nucleus is shutting down. The key words are “magnetic field” and “very cold temperatures”. So we have competing influences here. This is an applied magnetic field, which tends to spin up the nucleus. But the very cold temperature tends to kill the spin, since the ambient charge field becomes torpid. The charge densities are too low to maintain the nuclear spin. The analogy would be an engine with an idle set too low: just before it quits it may sputter. A sputter is an oscillation. But what we are probably seeing with the quantum oscillation is individual photons being channeled through the nucleus. The charge density is so low at that temperature, only one photon is channeling at a time. As it channels, the oscillation is on the up cycle. In between photons, the cycle hits its low. As the photon passes through, the nucleus is spun a bit, and as the photon leaves, the nucleus spins back down.

But the reason no new and better ideas like this can get through is that physics and science in general have been replaced by propaganda. We see that in the sidebar at SciTechDaily, where we are assaulted with fake stories about Covid, the Mars Rover, quantum entanglement, Egyptology, and every other conjob currently in the news. You might as well be reading *The National Enquirer*.

This is confirmed again by Wu directly, who is quoted as saying:

It's possible that neutral fermions could be used in the future for encoding information that would be useful in quantum computing.

You have to laugh. All Wu really has on his hands is an experiment that falsifies all the models in his field, but in response he not only pulls a new particle out of his ass, he suggests the unknown new particle can be used in quantum computing. Yeah, and it can also probably be used in DNA sequencing, SpaceX boosters, and Bitcoin storage.