

Collider Folly
Vertner Vergon
vertvergon@yahoo.com

Recall New Year, 2000? Everybody was excited about the arrival of “the new millennium”. Advertising on TV was full of it, so was radio and the print media as well as the general populace. “The new millennium, the new millennium, the new millennium” – that’s all you heard. The only trouble was, the year 2000 was NOT the start of the new millennium but the end of the old. The new millennium starts with the year 2001. Was everybody wrong? You bet. Has “everybody” been wrong before? Yup. What about the flat earth, or Ptolemy’s epicycles, or the earth as the center of the universe? We might also mention phlogiston and the luminiferous aether (There are poor souls still hanging on to that one as well as mass-less photons).

But the above is only the tip of the iceberg. The real problem is that today the “accepted model” – or what I call “the party line” is a group of concepts that are widely, almost universally, recognized as the correct state of the art and it is flailing up dead ends, wasting vast amounts of time, effort and money. What is even worse is that when something different (something “outside the box”) is offered it is immediately and peremptorily dismissed with prejudice, is not given consideration, usually not even read. So the state of the art flounders.

Specifically (though not exclusively) we mention so-called “high energy physics” or “particle physics”. This is a major dead end in understanding our universe – though the opposite is claimed. Let’ take a closer look. If you take two pieces of china and smash them together violently, what do you get? Small shards of china flying in all directions. If you take two protons and smash them together violently, what do you get? Small shards flying in all directions.

The difference is that in the case of the protons the shards are standing waves with charge, etc., – but shards nevertheless. However, as standing waves, they are not in resonance and so are unstable. Thus they immediately reduce to resonant frequencies and become other stable particles. This is known as “decay”.

IN NO WAY ARE THESE SHARDS FUNDAMENTAL PARTICLES.

Classifying the plethora of shards became a project – a not too successful project. Gell-Mann attempted to find common denominators to the “atomic zoo”. Thus was born quarks – which were extended to ridiculous heights and declared super particles that were the composition of protons and neutrons, etc. Folly at its best. In order to keep their jobs, the accelerator operators laid on the biggest con job in the world. After all they had to keep the money rolling in or they were out of a job. Besides, they had an unearned prestige to maintain. Below is a sample of their technique.

“The machine could cost more than \$6 billion, would measure roughly 20 miles from one side to the other and would require so many advanced technologies that no single country could supply them all. Its goal would be to mine the areas opened up by evidence indicating that ultra-powerful new accelerators may be crucial in explaining not just the nature of matter and energy but also the birth of the universe and the structure of space and time themselves.

According to some theories, the machine could see evidence for previously unknown dimensions, beyond the usual four, lurking right under humanity’s noses. Elusive particles that account for most of the mass of the entire universe — the so-called dark matter — could also turn up. Scientists also hope to test theories that describe how the universe may have behaved in its first explosive instants and to work out the detailed properties of a particle called the Higgs boson. Believed to be the key to why other particles have mass, the Higgs, if it exists, may be discovered by accelerators now operating or being built.”

Can you believe that? What smoke! Snake oil hucksters and hawkers of the great white way were amateurs by comparison. What we have here is a plethora of very definite maybes and qualified perhaps:

“May be crucial in explaining”
“the machine COULD see”
“COULD also turn up”
“also HOPE to test – and work out”
“ Higgs boson --- BELIEVED to be”
“Higgs, IF it exists”
“MAY be discovered”

To get a better feeling for the waste, click on the following link:

<http://lhc-machine-outreach.web.cern.ch/lhc-machine-outreach/>

This one collider will cost more than the trip to the moon! The sad part is that it is not only colliders but such concepts as curved empty space, tachyons, worm holes, black holes, string theory with its multiple dimensions – and best of all, quarks. It's bad enough that the big bang is not firmly confirmed but there are those that dain to tell us what happened a nanosecond after the explosion. Flimsy theory is heaped on flimsy theory – and the whole taken as authentic.

Let's take a quick look at quarks. Gell-Mann sought a common denominator to the atomic zoo. He wound up with a few mathematical parameters that he didn't know the real meaning of so he called them quarks from a piece of literature and gave them meaningless names such as up down top bottom and as having color, and other nonsense. The simpletons came after him and decided these were basic constituents of particles and have built up a whole fantasyland of quark hypothesis.

Dare you mention anything contrary today and you are immediately dismissed. The dogmatism and desperate clinging to the party line exists with the peer journals as well that by their nature are considered the last word. So where do new ideas, new theories go? Where can they receive exposure? There is only one place I know of, and that is in the on line “General Science Journal”

that can be found on the following URL: <http://www.wbabin.net>. This author's works can be found there in the LIST OF AUTHORS under Vertner Vergon.