


B. F. Poltoratsky

FROM PHYSICS TO HYPOTHESES



Moscow 2008

Boris Fedorovitch Poltoratsky

FROM PHYSICS TO HYPOTHESES

This brochure contains the results of investigations of very large falsifications in theoretical physics, which have been accumulated during the 20th century and up to the present time. It includes the attempt to outline out the circle of basic hypotheses that have not been proved and are not able to be proved in principle but which are manipulated by modern physics destroying the base of own theory.

At first the essence of factors reducing the efficacy of the known statistical methods has been considered for verification of those hypotheses that have been assumed in principles of field theory and matter constructing. Technical and logical reasons for the limiting circumstances have been found. Then the exclusive reliability and productivity of Aristotelian, Newton's and Maxwell's visions have been demonstrated on the particular examples. It has been shown that now the experimental data is sufficient enough to solve current physical problems without the sophisticated hypotheses and construction of fantastic images and models.

One of ways of counteraction of total degradation of theoretical physics is brought to attention of readers in the conclusion.

CONTENTS

1. Problems of hypotheses test method

<i>One successful experiment</i>	4
<i>Insidious denominator and the method limits</i>	7
<i>Bounds for physics from Aristotle to Maxwell</i>	8

2. Examples of hypotheses for physics of 20th century

<i>Landau's hypothesis in base of quantum mechanics №1</i>	12
<i>Landau's hypothesis in base of quantum mechanics №2</i>	14
<i>Landau's hypothesis in base of field theory</i>	17
<i>Academician Okun's hypothesis</i>	18
<i>Academician Higgs's hypothesis (Royal Society of London)</i>	21

3. Conclusion

<i>How many knockouts the physics has received</i>	23
<i>Stupidity or intent</i>	24
<i>What is the next</i>	26

References	27
-------------------------	----

1. Problems of hypotheses test method

One successful experiment

The problem of hypotheses test became very interested for me suddenly. It happened at old “Soviet” time. We were going to hunt to Smolensk region. In the cabin of the motor van near the driver the head of the hunting community was sitting and in a tin body we were freezing i.e. about five men and a hound which our chief had taken away during the hunt i.e. had stolen simply in any other region last weekend. The frost was being felt, a dull lamp at the ceiling was lighting over our table. Soon the high road covered by transparent shell of ice couldn’t carry our car. Our vehicle began turning around the vertical axis fast but then it turned a somersault around the longitudinal axis rapidly for more than one turn and at full speed it fell sideward into the road ditch. We had no scratch because were wearing the warm clothes. Even “vodka” and some snack were in our hands. The dog that rolled over walls, ceiling and floor together with a rucksack was not injured in my opinion. But she had something soul-stirring, she looked shy if as she apologized for its awkwardness. I looked more attentively and saw she was very old, by human standards she was about 70 or 80 years old. We had already put our car on the wheels and started but she continued to be shy for she’s awkwardness and old age. Its kind put working capacity under doubts and has wakened in us a sense of guilt that has not helped during the difficult moment for it. But it calmed down and we came to the base.

In the morning we were in the forest. I knew this area and had experience of hound training. So my friends took my personal care of the dog as a natural situation. And we have torn ahead with dog. I couldn’t give any decrees because the dog was old and experienced and knew what to do. Unknown place was not obstruction. At that moment I could only follow she rightly or damage everything. At once it was seen the hound was at its place. She checked the trace powdered with snow, the direction was determined correctly – the sense of smell was. But she did not follow the trace because the trace was too old and the dog was too old to wind after that nimble animal through the thicket. And she turned from the trace and went straightly through the almost open gully with width of about 70 meters to the ordinary large bush lying under which before I had already killed hares. It was my secret place. The dog kept going purposefully to that place. There were no traces, there was no smell at such distance and the dog was not excited – she couldn’t react to the smell so calmly. But she was going straightly to that place as if it was of she but not my secret hare place. I should have hurried and run ahead and aside to cover the distance that was longer than the distance from the dog. I needed to run quickly through the snow and bushes to the possible shooting position. She was already in front of the bush, then in

the bush and I hardly had time to kill the first hare starting from the depths of the forest at the limit distance.

After that such situation was repeated some times, the dog searched confidently all my hare places, directing hares for shooting. It was interaction almost like with a gun dog. However the gun dog uses an organ of smell. But this old dog found perspective places exclusively by the appearance of bushes and wood. It was already the analytics. I have rejected the offer to make hunting more showy for others: "You would release though one, let the dog to make a circle, and differently to us it is inconvenient before the chief." I gave reasons: "Firstly, she sometimes looks after me (and it was the truth) and can take offence in case of bad mark of my work (as many dog-skin do) and to stop hunting or to run worse. Secondly, she cannot get through the whole circle with such snow and bad physical form because she is old enough and maybe she hurt in the car body." States were kept and we went on our amusements. The dog was perfect. I don't remember the emotion peaks attributed with the hunt but I remember the most serious demonstration of perfect exact work of the central nervous system of the clever dog that was more than adult but had not lost its talent. I was able only to watch, run and sometimes shoot. The old dog did all the intellectual part of the work. And I was glad that I saw such natural wonder so closely.



The Russian whippet (<http://www.hunter.ru/dogs/standart/harrier.htm>)

But, how are hypotheses connected with this situation? And such connection takes place. Let's take simple arithmetic: we searched by that way the part of land about $3 \text{ km} \times 3 \text{ km} = 9 \text{ km}^2$. In total we seek through about 20 secret hare places with sizes not more than $10\text{m} \times 10\text{m} = 100 \text{ m}^2$ each and with total area 2000 m^2

correspondingly. Thus the hound selects from 9 km^2 for searching not more than $0,002 \text{ km}^2$. And hares were at almost half these places. The dog's hypotheses were proved in about 50% of cases. The total efficiency is surprising but such figures are more than wonderful. Experience and correct assessment of the situation limit the field of search for the old dog at 4500 times! There we need in serious analysis of reasons of such high confidence level of its hypotheses. Because the dog didn't go to Delphi to the drunken oracles, she calculated all itself.

It is known that the natural talent is not revealed spontaneously. The talented person should go through the process of familiarity with action field named as learning. But how was it? The dog left me behind not because it had read more books about hares than me. This was not so. It is evident the dog achieved superiority because of the skills i.e. it used the contact with reality more effective. Let's follow her learning. Once, the dog as a puppy played among trees and bushes. Then it could run after a fuzzy little animal. Maybe there was motivation from the master or more experienced hound. The dog was interested in that little animal. It became to learn and improve gradually. Naturally, mathematics and the same hypotheses tests began.



Thomas Bayes (1702 —1761)

More exactly there were variations on a theme of Bayes formula (*Thomas Bayes, 1702–1761*), which is used by all live beings to find ability to perceive the reality and to do from this conclusions. It is written simply (see, for example, Wikipedia or [1, 2]):

$$P(A | B) = \frac{P(B | A) \cdot P(A)}{P(B)}, \quad (1)$$

where $P(A)$ – a priori probability of hypothesis A ;

$P(A | B)$ – a posteriori probability of hypotheses A in case of occurrence of event B ;

$P(B | A)$ – probability of occurrence of event B in case of validity of hypotheses A ;

$P(B)$ – probability of occurrence of event B .

Probably, presence of a hare under a bush is hypothesis A for a dog. The dog had to estimate the value of $P(A | B)$ and to make a decision after seeing the bush (event B). It is clear that if the dog was taken into the forest, it means there were hares and $P(A) > 0$. It remained to understand what is $P(B)$ and $P(B | A)$. And here the dog has spent more than 10 years for studying of these two parameters. She resolved this problem perfectly using the method of artificial cognition. And this method is based on spatial integral operations (integral convolutions) like correlation functions. Thus, the dog became the silent qualified professional who is capable to surprise people.

However, the dog was very clever.

Let's notice, that people use too the formula (1) sometimes intuitively, but is sometimes quite conscious, for example, in radars and at planning of “star wars”, and they do it generally very successfully.

Insidious denominator and the method limits

The question arises: how people can check the hypotheses, using simple Bayes formula also? Especially, physical hypotheses. However, however Everything is not so simple. The human nature is disposed to extravagance of problems and to do something that is not connected with the theme to which this hypothesis belongs. And in addition, there is this denominator. After all it is kind of dimensionless value, and it is difficult to put in doubt, but it can sometimes not be combined with a hypothesis absolutely, in no way. But it is a denominator!

Here is the first example. Three men sit down to play cards. In case of equal qualification and honest game the average result will depend on cut of cards. And *Bayes formula* will help to prove the hypotheses connected with this game as a whole and a talon in particularly. However, as a rule there are two men who don't like the third without any reason. And they will begin play against him unintentionally. And the third man is also not a fool, he knows that he should secure himself, and he has any handicap against these two men – maybe he has a big fist or a proved image of the feisty and successful duelist. And here we go again. In addition, they will order

alcohol. No cuts of cards won't influence on the game results now. Try now to apply the correct formula (1) when the arguments with hypothesis have changed their original sense.

Or here is an example from natural science: it is closer to biology. They say there was a beast called as "basilisk". In the book [3] we read: «There one kind of basilisks is which can fly, however, they don't leave their kingdom borders, There another kind of basilisks is, but the corresponding information see in the book about the feathered tribe in section on cock's: "A decrepit cock enfeebled by age lays an egg from which a basilisk hatches. However, it is necessary for that end to get concordance of many things. The cock lays its egg in plenty of hot manure and there this egg is heated as by parents. Long after a chick appears and grows itself as a duckling. This animal has a snake's tail and a cock's body. Those people who say that they have seen this creature coming into the world tell this egg has no shell but skin, which is so strong and firm that it is impossible to pierce. People say that the egg laid by the cockerel a snake or a toad incubates. But we think it's doubtful and indefinitely, because the ancient writings say only that any kind of basilisk hatches from the egg laid by "the cock enfeebled by age".» How can we try the hypotheses about a basilisk? Where can we find of the decrepit cock laying eggs? Any Bayes is not helping here exactly.

Now we could set about the physics, I thought. But it is early. There miracles are present in huge quantity, there the hobgoblin with gins have lost feeling of a measure absolutely. The Basilisk can relax. Without preparation the reader cannot understand everything and can get mixed. The dog success looks on this background less available than mirage on the horizon.

Improper use of free choice of the second event in Bayes formula by which the first event is tested sometimes lead to very serious consequences. Here the denominator can turn into "0" or lose its significance because of the conceptual confusion.

But this formula is necessary to physics in any way no less than to all animals. Animals lose chances to survive in this world without Bayes formula, and the physics loses the reasonable beginnings. Therefore the problem of application of this formula in a science demands of the most steadfast analysis.

Now we can only say that Bayes formula has high flexibility stimulated by zero dimensions of the probabilities included in it, but it is only at first sight. In reality it depends on the problem description very much. And this situation makes the problem of hypotheses test much more difficult. Optimization of fantasy set is not an empty phrase for this field of mathematics at all. As our examples have shown, Bayes formula has not protected at all against naïve legends and banal cheat. The consequence of this fact is a permanent risk of very bitter mistakes, which wait for a trustful explorer on the deceitfully smooth way of hypotheses test. History of theoretical physics of 20th century was especially tragic by this reason.

Bounds for physics from Aristotle to Maxwell

We should know for hypotheses test the domain of their addresses, application and existence, which defines fantasy frames after all. For the dog this would have meant that it should look around and understand whither it was brought. To the forest? To the farm? Or to the knackery? Do you agree that the answer will influence on the hypotheses choice in great degree? If somebody was going to build hypotheses in physics he or she should know what the essence of physics is.

It is considered, that the physics is a science about the nature. Here the full historically developed consensus is available at least in three world cultures: Islamic (Avicenna, etc.), Jewish (Maimonides, etc.) and Christian (Thomas Akvinsky, etc.). These cultures have recognized as correct and have absorbed in itself Aristotle's ideas. And he at the very beginning of the work of "Physicist" [4] has made such definition of a field of activity of this science:

«As knowledge and [including] scientific knowledge arise during every investigation which extends to sources, reasons and elements by their understanding (because then we are sure that we know any thing when we understand its first reasons, first sources and decompose it up to elements), it is clear *in natural science we need to try to define before what can be referred to the sources* (italics type is ours). The natural way to this goes from more clear and understandable for us to more clear and understandable naturally, because not the same is understandable for us and [understandable] in general. So it is necessary to move by this way, namely: from less clear and understandable naturally but more clear and understandable for us to more clear and understandable naturally. For us the solid [things] are rather more clear and understandable and only then their elements and sources become known by decomposition. So we should move from the things [acceptable] in general to the elements because the whole thing is rather understood by sense and a general thing is something whole as a whole includes many things like parts.»

It is evident here the point of issue is a source of natural science and components of natural phenomena. Let's consider it more detail – what the components of the natural phenomena as subject of research there are:


«It is clear therefore that in natural [phenomena] necessity is substance so called and its motions. And so a physicist should say about the reasons of both kinds but more about [the reason] “what for” because it is a reason of the [certain] substance but no substance is a reason of a purpose. Both the purpose what for [something occurs] and the source come from a definition and an argument as well as in [things] created by art: if the house [should be] of a such kind then if necessary that actions should take place and be available, and if the health is, then that action should take place and that thing should be available. Also, if the human is that creature then that action [should take place] and if something is this thing and that thing then that thing [should be necessary, in its turn]. Maybe, we need in the definition. Let's suppose

that sawing is defined as any division but division won't occur if the saw has no teeth of the certain quality and these teeth won't be of such quality if they are not made of steel. And in this definition some parts are as its substance.».

And conclusion: «This is one way of definition of nature: it is the first substance that is in base of each of [subjects] having in them the source of motion and changes».

Not it seems to be clear: the scope of physics is nature i.e. substance and its motions because of its reasons. And how can we explore the reasons of substance and its motion existence? Let's read the same book but below a little:

«When learning the reasons of beginnings the following way is applied mostly: *they observe what appeared earlier and what appeared later, what the first was to make and to experience [any actions], and so on all the time according to order* (italics type is ours). Sources causing the physical motion are of two types: none of them is natural as no source includes the beginning of motion itself. That is something that causes motion without moving; for example, absolutely immovable thing that is first for everything, that is also “what is” and a form because they are a purpose and “what for”. Therefore, if nature of things is “what for” this [reason] should be known as well and it is necessary to answer the question “Why” completely, for example {1} because this is a necessary consequence of that (at that, it is consequence of that in general or in most cases), and {2} if something must happen it will be as consequence of the premises; and {3} because this is an essence of existence; and {4} because it is better however, it is not better in general but as for essence of every [thing] ».



Aristotle (384 - 322 of B.C.)

So physics is competent observation of the nature and substance, and in that quantity and quality which it itself allows to do. Then the results of these observations can be discussed and instruments can be improved. And so you can do many times. Well, now where shall we find the scope of application of hypotheses? If only for instruments and that's all. So Aristotle's physics has no place for hypotheses – observe only those things that exist in reality. For fantasies there is metaphysics. Otherwise you can be like a biologist who had been watching old cocks for two thousand years but has never seen of a basilisk. Но и НЬЮТОН сказал тоже: “Мы не измышляем гипотезы”. But also Newton has told too: “We do not invent a hypothesis”.

It should be noted that all it's so simple for a philosopher only on base of good sense. But also Newton has told: “We do not invent a hypotheses”. From the known exact sections of physics we need to test only electrodynamics [5]. Firstly, it is large in five times as mechanics; therefore, probability to find the hypothesis is more. Secondly, its author, John Maxwell had been living not enough and, maybe, he had been late to correct any mistake, which was considered later as hypothesis.

So we are looking through electrodynamics. And we should find any doubtful places, which can be accepted as a hypothesis.

Let's begin from dielectric and magnetic constants— ε and μ . It is considered that anywhere in vacuum atmosphere these constants are equal to one. However, this state is not more valid under its senses than: “There is an opinion that an egg laid by a cock, is carried by a snake or a toad” in this legend about the basilisk. We know exactly only that $\varepsilon = 1$ and $\mu = 1$ in conditions of these experiments (observations) in which they were being conducted by Faraday and other experimenters. The point of discussion is the earth conditions and weak fields. On the neutron stars or in case of great fields, for example, near an electron or proton nobody knows what will be. So it is only a doubtful statement but nothing more. Of course it is not electrodynamics hypothesis because it is not connected with electrodynamics principles. There any values ε and μ are suitable.

The second suspicious place in electrodynamics is a story with magnetic-electric and electric-magnetic inductions i.e. excitement of electric field with variation of magnetic induction and vice versa, excitement of magnetic field with variation of electric induction. Here Maxwell sometimes used simple analogy in formal writing of hydrodynamics laws and laws of behavior of (flows) force lines of Faraday and got a result which can be demonstrated by any physics teacher on a small table. Therefore, here are no wonders born by a hypothesis or a reveal but a form of presentation of results of experiments carried out by Faraday and others and, in addition, headpiece of mathematician Maxwell. So, leaving the personal influence we can say that electrodynamics supported and will support on the proved experimental base (experience). That is there is no such place in electrodynamics, which we could point at as hypothesis. So, mechanics and electrodynamics could be vital without hypotheses, and therefore, remained within the frame of physics, and more exactly of Aristotle's philosophy. We are not assured yet, whether it explains triumphal procession of these disciplines. But they were included into fund of so-called classical physics. And they are very reliable and effective in course of the last learning of a modern nature as tools for this learning.

So, it's worth trying to find and analyze any other science that is as effective as mechanics and electrodynamics but reasoned outside Aristotle's philosophy. The attitude to a hypothesis will be the key. Simplicity of the analysis imposes: it is possible to examine hypotheses, and then and to learn, whether they possess any value or absolutely on the contrary.

Bayes formula has prompted us by idea, and the hound who has perfectly coped with natural experiment in wood has helped. And always wise Aristotle has helped to order thoughts and definitions.

As guidance for start, we selected the collected works by L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits. It is casual - they always near at hand, and is not casual - very much authors are simple-minded. Others sometimes conceal the doubtful places of their works managing to present obvious nonsense in a form of legends and trying to make readers miss the substitution. But our authors are frank, since have been assured of backwardness of the reader, because time then in our country encouraged the

backwardness, and punished ingenuity more and more by a death by firing squad. So our famous authors laid everything on surface.

Now, let's read Landau's works, and E.M. Lifshits's.

2. Examples of hypotheses for physics of 20th century

Landau's hypothesis in base of quantum mechanics №1

Here we'll discuss a hypothesis, in which the doubt concerning that fact is expressed, that the known physics (mechanics and electrodynamics), that we are proud of, can be used also for investigation of microcosm.

In the beginning of Landau's manual [6] we read: «Classical mechanics and electrodynamics when attempting to apply them to explanation of atomic phenomena cause the results conflicting with experience. We can see it best of all from the contradiction resulted in case of use of ordinary electrodynamics to an *model of atom* where electrons move round a kernel according to classical orbits. At such motion as at any accelerated motion of electron charges the electrons would emit electromagnetic waves continuously. By emitting the electrons would lose their energy and that should cause their falling in the atomic center finally. Hence, according to *the classical electrodynamics the atom would be instable* (italics type is ours), but this fact doesn't correspond to reality».

Let's pay attention: Landau tell the world that «*Classical mechanics and electrodynamics*» and considered by it «*model of atom* » somehow in disagreement among themselves, even they contradict the friend the friend. We will reflect, and why?

Firstly, it is necessary to think what the word “model” means. It has too many meanings. We read: “Physical model is a model created by substitution of subjects by modeling devices which simulate certain characteristics or properties of these subjects”. (Wikipedia). That is here this word is applicable in sense of a visual aid for students or in the sense that is close to mentioned above.

It's nice. In this case the resume is very simple. Landau created this model-hypothesis could test it easily himself by direct experiment. For that it is necessary only to put this model of an electron onto a needle connected with the rotation axis. There the electron model wouldn't have fallen on the proton model and you could rotate it till you are blue in face. Such a model could be made and without a needle but with a light spot. Certainly for this purpose you should go to a planetarium to learn this technique there. As for emission, you can use balls without emission because it is a model. And a light spot emits nothing at all. In general we have no claims to a model after all, we are discussing it. The great theories are not discussed here; here a model is discussed. For some reason this model got off on the wrong foot for Landau. But he made a conclusion “*according to the classical electrodynamics*”. After all in any work can be so. A screw nut is not turned. What's the matter? Maybe,

it was seized because of corrosion and maybe, the hands are crooked and cannot hold a wrench.

So Landau's conclusion is completely inappropriate: "Such a deep contradiction of *the theory with the experiment* (italics type is ours) proves that the construction of theory applicable to atomic phenomena, that are phenomena connected with particles of very low weight in very little parts of space, requires fundamental changes in principal classical ideas and laws" (in the same source). We should note that *theories with experiments* themselves Landau even didn't discuss anywhere.

And in general, how can such things be called as serious scientific documents? For example, it happened that we couldn't reanimate a human model in form of Barby Doll. What of it? Really we cannot admit this fact as the proof of the fact that there can be no alive girls.

Landau shows the dishonorable logic – even it is a shame before a dog. However we concern here with something big, than logic of the single person. Indeed illiterate pseudo-scientist compares two entirely non-comparable objects – the real law of the real Nature and mythical properties of a completely fictitious "model". And conclusion is such: "model" is more main than Nature. I.e. the subject makes choice between figment and reality for the benefit of figment. And this surrealistic position is maintained by the Academy of Sciences and international organizations. Here for the first time we collide with the whole layer of surprising culture, so strange and mysterious, as a smile of the cannibal.

No, with an ulterior motive here L.Landau has abrogated the science, which has not pleased to primitive model. Any doctor will not make the diagnosis on the basis of the models analysis of blood or urine - originals are required for it. But Landau's model has such magic force that can even cancel nature laws. It can absolutely and not model, but the apanage of a voodoo cult? But where here a science is?

Therefore, 1st Landau's hypothesis for base of quantum mechanics was completely inappropriate, because it refers to a model but not to mechanics or electrodynamics as sciences. And when you get down to it Landau was wrong when he took the burden himself of the problem of refusal from normal sciences. This problem is very difficult above all. It is very difficult and rather it is impossible to give reasons for it. But how can we say: "Put off, forget science!?" And in addition, there is mechanics and electrodynamics. He was able to distort mechanics (see the following point). But for electrodynamics he was not enough force in any case.

As for electrodynamics in particularly, it is at its own place in microcosm since only it explains everything there [7, 8, 9]. Moreover, the requirement for defective, absolutely naive model with orbits round a finger disappears if to address to this exact and faultless theory. Orbits are not present; there are gyroscopically steady conditions. And for that we need to know only a part of electrodynamics within theory Mi [10, 11], published in 1908. It is described there surprisingly intelligibly as the

electromagnetic field round any particles is formed. It was necessary to finish, check up only calculation some features of their interaction.

Landau's hypothesis in base of quantum mechanics № 2

The second Landau's hypothesis in base of quantum mechanics doubts existence of elementary particle trajectory in particularly trajectory for electrons. We shall say, here we are going to discuss the matter. Does it go to nowhere some times or does not? Aristotle, for instance, second-guessed Liuvill's continuity principle (phase volume conservation) by this way: «We say in return that substance and nonexistence are not the same things because one of them, namely: substance is not essence by coincidence and nonexistence is not essence itself and that substance is close to essence and in any sense it is essence, nonexistence can not be essence in no case».

For philosopher substance is not able to transform into nonexistence, i.e. it is not to disappear even pro tempore. In short, Landau opened a very fundamental question connected with world-view. There we should follow his arguments very attentively.

Here they are:

«As it happens, at transmission of a homogeneous electron beam through a crystal the picture of alternative intensity maximums and minimums is found that this picture is quite analogical to diffraction pattern which is seen in case of electromagnetic wave diffraction. So, in some conditions behavior of material particles such as electrons has features attributable to wave processes.

How deep this phenomenon contradicts with ordinary meaning of motion it is better to understand using the following mental experiment that is idealization of the experiment with electronic diffraction in case of transmission through a crystal. Let's image a screen that is not transparent for electrons and has two notches cut. While observing the transmission of an electron beam ¹⁾ through one of notches when the other notch is closed we see any pattern of intensity distribution on the solid screen located after the notch; by this way we also see other pattern opening the second notch and closing the first one. Watching the transmission of an electron beam through both notches at the same time we should anticipate on base of ordinary concepts to see the pattern that is only simple superposition of both previous patterns, as every electron moving along its path passes through one of the notches without influencing on the electrons passing through the second one. However, electronic diffraction shows that in reality we are watching the diffraction pattern, which is not only sum of the patterns for each notch due to interference. It is clear that this result can't be combined with a picture of electron motion along their trajectory.

Therefore, mechanics that controls atomic phenomena, so called *quantum or wave mechanics*, must be based on the motion concepts differing principally from the

classical mechanics concepts. In quantum mechanics there is no concept of a particle trajectory. This case is a content of so called *uncertainty principle* that is one of the main principles of quantum mechanics discovered by V. Heisenberg in 1927²⁾».

Footnotes:

¹⁾ *The beam is assumed so expanded that particle interrelation does not play any role.*

²⁾ *It is interesting to note that complete mathematic tool of quantum mechanics was created by V. Heisenberg and E. Shredinger in 1925—1926, before discovering the uncertainty principle opening the physic content of this tool..*

In passing, but while there is yet time, let's comment the hypothesis author's notes (co-author's). The first footnote requires the quantitative evaluation. It means Casimir's force between elementary particles and, therefore, between electrons is observed at distance of some microns (10^{-4} cm). Electronic density in flow with such distances is so little that at those times nobody would have registered these flows and diffraction as well, naturally. Therefore, the distance between electrons was lower and interrelation was stronger, the other is falsehood.

The second note is connected with mathematics that itself is not authority for physics. As far as physics, as we found above, is science about matter but not about formal logic that is mathematics. Other books are dedicated to logic, for example, as Aristotle's. So, this note is interesting but is not connected with deal. Though we are thankful to V. Heisenberg because he under his mistake in calculations (by several orders) failed Hitler's plan connected with atomic bomb.

Let's return to classic again. Watch how Aristotle looked at motion in general: "As nature is a motion and change source and a subject matter of our investigation is nature we mustn't leave without clarification what motion is, because in fact, if we don't understand motion it causes ignorance of nature. After defining what belongs to motion we need to try to approach to the following things by the same way. Well, then, motion is [something] continuous evidently, but infinite things are appeared as continuous after all; so, while defining continuous things we often have to use the concept of infinite as continuous thing is divided infinitely. In addition, motion is impossible without space, vacancy and time. It is clear that so and also because these concepts are general for everything and parts in any [thing], each of these concepts should be considered previously as learning of specific things must follow learning of general things. And, first of all, as we said, [the question] will refer to motion».

And how much attention Aristotle paid to motion continuity which was described after him by trajectory: «As moving things move from something to something and any value is continuous, movement follows the value because due to value continuity the motion is also continuous and as consequences of motion, time is continuous; since how great the motion [was] so long the time was, as we also think. And as for the previous and following things these concepts are initially connected with a place. Here, of course, they are connected with a position, but as a value has the previous and following things so it is necessary that motion has the previous and

following ones on the analogy with those things. But time also has the previous and following points because one of them always follows the other one. The previous and following points exist in motion and they are identical with motion by substrate, although their existence is other but not motion».

So, Aristotle would not estimate disappearing of trajectory for material bodies, in my opinion. We don't discuss Newton else because there is something special, and we tell about it a bit later. In electrodynamics, in the field equations all the time derivatives also are written down in an explicit form. In result we see that Landau and Co achieved a very outstanding innovation. Maybe, were there such analogs anywhere else? Maybe, was there such precedent anywhere else?

Such precedents were, they are described in the book [12] by the following way: «Mythological theme of the god being died was revealed in images of some heroes of Chinese myths. Khung-dung (Chaos Center), Chaos God must die to have cosmos created. Gung must die as far as he ripped off the god. God Kuafu was punished by death for his arrogance. God of War, Chi-You was put to death after beating in titanic battle with Huan Di (Yellow World Ruler). But though gods and goddesses die in myths they keep living in other forms through metamorphoses. Nuy Va drowned herself in the Eastern sea likely because she had sinned or because she was a daughter of Yan Di (Great God of Flame), and her divine power disappeared. She transformed into a bird named Jing Vey (Spirit Security), and in revenge she always tries to partition the Eastern sea». It means, the trajectories have already been interrupted but only in myths and only through metamorphoses.

These characters also had no solid trajectory – they also as this unfortunate electron were lost anywhere, but only at the moment of transformation. But it is nothing. A big deal, electron was not transformed. So let his myth to be more wonderful than Chinese myths. This is a question: was it worth making unnecessary fuss for these quasi - theorists? Was there possibility to explain by other way? Isn't this a logical dead end again as in case with Barby Doll? Sadly, ... but yes, this is Barby Doll again, because there was non-mythological explanation of a long-range order in electron stream. There were even two explanations such as mechanistic and electromagnetic.

Let's begin from mechanistic concept of long-range ordering in elementary particle streams. It seems to be clearer, a bit more demonstrative, I think, but it could save from mystics. In stream mechanics everything is connected with eddies (vortexes) as in a whistle, a trombone and a toilet bowl. And now there are such sciences, which deals with this. It is mechanics and such its sections, as aerodynamics, hydrodynamics and a new subject – etherodynamics [13]. It is necessary to say that etherodynamics misapplies by hypotheses also. But they have been forced there without serious reason, maybe in conformity with the latest fashion or under constraint through the permission for publication, for instance. Such demonstration of modesty we can see as if he says: “I also have hypothesis”, - and with eyes bent on the ground. This corresponds to the logic, which was explained clearly by Schopenhauer: “Modesty is

a good support for idiots to whom it is good to say “I am the same idiot like you”. There are plenty of idiots like fish in the sea but mechanics without hypotheses is over there. You should only execute the observations by little formulas and construct from them a nice science of physics, as Aristotle and Newton had thought. Why is etherodynamics worse?

It is naturally, etherodynamics in any case could explain waves or periodic structures in electron streams. But then we had to consider eddies (vortexes) which for Landau himself are tabooed through imitation of mechanics that (imitation) he give to students in the first Volume [14]. And this imitation differs from Newton’s mechanics by the fact that it does not start with experiment as Newton’s but it starts with Landau’s hypothesis or vision i.e. with the principle of least action which itself requires to be proved by Newton’s mechanics. Landau’s imitation has been defined only for potential systems, and so it mustn’t be applied to eddies (vortexes). It’s like a knackered male cat, which should not be forced to make kittens. This is the reason why the mechanistic chance was lost through mechanics falsification.

In any case, the pyramidal ignorance stood on the way of mechanistic problem definition that could lead to understanding of long-range order in electron streams through statistics and through the order to real vision of diffraction reasons and many other things. Plenty of exciting discoveries waited for theorists.

Now let’s look at electrodynamics. From the electrodynamic nature of Casimir’s forces follows by natural way; and we wrote about this fact long ago [7, 8]. And this is a long-range order in electron streams. Moreover, in [9] nature of all quantum forces was written in details, and by such way that no reader doubt in this respect no creates. So, for electrodynamics this problem connected with electron diffraction looks not more difficult than the simplest demonstration of its capabilities such as the disappointed Landau’s dream – a model with bicycle spokes. In such situation there is no reason naturally to think of disappearing of the trajectory or flickering arrhythmia of substance. Theorists have forgotten about an electromagnetic field somehow absolutely inopportunely. Great Maxwell has opened it for them very much for a long time.

Landau’s hypothesis in base of field theory

In the foreword to 4th Edition of “Theory of field”, Landau L.D. and Lifshits E.M. the following text is written [15]:

«This book is devoted to description o theory of electromagnetic and gravitation fields. According to the general plan of our course “Theoretical Physics” we do not concern to matters of electrodynamics of continuous mediums in this Volume and are restricted by description of “microscopic” electrodynamics i.e. electrodynamics of vacuum and point charges.

The *complete theory of electromagnetic field logically connected includes special relativity theory* (italics type is ours), so the latter is assumed as a description base».

Here Landau says about the *theory of electromagnetic field logically connected* (with something), which (somehow) *includes special relativity theory*. Why this inventor of Barby Doll logic concocts such deep interconnections? Is there the other doll? Or maybe, aught is wrong with Maxwell's electrodynamics?

However, in newspaper MK dated 24 November 2008 we can read: «Testing of interplanetary Internet made of National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA) USA. For connection with a satellite located at distance 35 MIO. km from the Earth scientists used special technology DTM ("delay-tolerant network"). Tenth photos have flown up from the Earth to the satellite for a few minutes. Technologies have been creating for 10 years». And there is no word about *special relativity theory*.

How could they do without this *special relativity theory* as it were needed urgently? And in billions of mobile phones also ordinary electrodynamics works normally. And in telescope "Hubble" electrodynamics observes everything at distance of 10 billion light years. And Hertz's vibrator, and television, and all radiolocation absolutely, and Ballistic Missile Defense, and "stealthy", and "Star Wars" are usual electrodynamics.

But according to Landau, electrodynamics not only "must include" but also *includes special relativity theory* long ago and for keeps. Isn't it strange?

However, as far as we have Landau's work in front of us, i.e. "jaw-jaw" of a very unreliable author (see also [16]), it is necessary to find out where are well-known sources and formulas of relativity theory from. But sources of these theories are based on the idea of invariance of nature relative to transformations of Poincare group offered in 1905. In its turn these transformations are the result of friendly discussions between Poincare and Hedric Lorentz who formulated Lorentz's transformation in about 1900. But it happened 36 years after publication of famous the Maxwell's work [5], which contains the completed and comprehensive theory of electromagnetic field. So according to chronology neither Lorentz, nor Poincare, nor other authors of relativity theories couldn't influence on Maxwell's electrodynamics. Maxwell's theory can be only developed and completed without changing the foundation. Nothing can be forced into this theory so that it *contained* this thing too. For example, Sergey Nikolaevitch Pukhov adapted Maxwell's equations for moving mediums [17]. It does not mean that he included *the theory of moving mediums in the theory of electromagnetic field*. Though, for electrodynamics and physics his work gave much more use than all relativity theories. It is obtained that chronology is also against Landau's statement.

Therefore, Landau overdid. He deviated from the truth very much! But let's soften intonations and call it as Landau's scientific hypothesis, because all other words that we can say in relation of his proclamation are very rude.

Not it is necessary to understand how far this Landau's hypothesis was profitable, how far it was useful for physics as a part of natural science. In §95 «Equations of gravitation field» of the same book [15] at page 355 we read:

«Energy-momentum tensor of electromagnetic field has the same property that $T_i^i = 0$ [see (33,2)]. According to (95,7), it follows here from, that in case of only electromagnetic field without any masses the scalar curvature of space-time dependence is equal to null». And what does “the scalar curvature of space-time dependence is equal to null” mean in relativity theory? It means expressly, that gravitation «in case of only electromagnetic field” is equal to null.

It is obtained, that plenty of clever words and tensors including the main energy-momentum tensor were shovel-run, balls of formal logic were wound and in result only negative statement was obtained: electromagnetic field has no capability to create gravitation. But it is certainly wrong statement because has energy volume density and therefore, mass volume density exactly. And masses and mass density must gravitate.

And everything started with certainly false hypothesis declared in full voice that could not support the right result obtaining in no case. So, in principle there is no necessity to search mistakes in manipulations with tensors including energy-momentum tensors. However, we can note that these tensors are principally and certainly wrong, as they do not contain Maxwell's equations promised in the book.

Maxwell's equations must contain both field strengths and field inductions. So experimental formulas obtained by Faraday and Ampere showed that they are a base and center of Maxwell's equations. Let's be exact and say that in Maxwell's equations the time derivatives of induction take place but in the mentioned above tensors are absent such derivations. There you can see sometimes derivatives of fields but they are not the same. For example, the time derivative of induction differs from field derivative by not only constant but a derivative of medium permeability that for this field theory is not indifferently at all [7, 8, 9]. So we must justify with certainty that in “Theory of field” written by Landau there are no Maxwell's equations, which are a base of electrodynamics. Also it is very basic fact.

So, in Landau's “Theory of field” there is no electrodynamics. It is easily to see that Landau in his textbook turned everything on its head as far as electrodynamics is nothing but concentrated and absolutely reliable doctrine of fields, i.e. the true “Theory of field” [7, 8, 9]. Moreover, it is senselessly in general to argue about physical fields without this science. It is impossible to ignore this theory checked up by practice for a long time. But also other, sadder conclusion follows already from here: results of Landau's destructive activity in field theory are not less disastrous than in mechanics.

The exception of electrodynamics from the field theory has deprived of theorists of all prospects to learn the true reason of gravitation, a dark matter, forces of quantum interaction and spatial determinancy of all connections in the world

surrounding us [9]. Usual opened by Maxwell [5] in the middle of 19th century the electromagnetic field ignored by Landau, is a basis of all these physical riches.

Academician Okun's hypothesis

Naturally, Landau had students. They were diligent excellent students. Among them there was Lev Borisovitch Okun. He is Academician and writes in his book the followings [18]:

«Processes where elementary particles take part are countless and various. But all processes which were observed before covers fundamental interactions of only four types such as gravitational, electromagnetic, weak and strong. Gravitational interaction is unified because all elementary particles take part in this interaction. *The source of gravitation field is four-dimensional energy-momentum tensor* (italics type is ours).

It's time to think what is what. Here it is raining. There somebody threw a bottle out off the fifth floor. And everything fell down. Why? In sense – they did not fly up or aside but fell down. Genies with demons and dragons fly where they want but material bodies fell down. It is obtained: gravitation is such the matter property. And what the property is! Moreover, it is the law of nature! Stars and galaxies obey. And what is a *four-dimensional tensor*? It is such a table of 4 x 4 elements. It is less than a month calendar, which is 5 x 7. This is as for material things. But in general this is an ordinary element of ordinary linear algebra i.e. abstract element of abstract logic. And it is nothing more than this. Well and how the table can generate gravitation? For example you, reader, have forced your logic (have waved by your tensor mentally or naturally) and have sent your neighbor to the moon at midnight together with his musical center. What do you think it will be obtained? Your logic will work? It is in sense as a gravitation source. The neighbor will depart? Will he fly away? Ah, you doubt! But the Academician has no doubts.

There are such people without doubts at all. It is beauty itself. Usually their physiognomies are red, fingers are as a fan and there is reek of alcohol. And he plows ahead without thinking. But for Academician such image does not correspond. And maybe, did he work for any dirty service? He had any debt. That's why he blabs intentionally. In general, a riddle is rather connected with the Academician himself but not with tensor. And in any case, hypothesis about a magic tensor ever can't be connected to science about nature such as physics. But if it is connected with the Academician, let's look at him more attentively. He also writes in his book the followings:

«*The relativity theory is one of two pillars upon whom the modern physics is based. Second such pillar is the quantum mechanics* (italics type is ours) created in 20th years of last century by works of Bor, de Broglie, Heisenberg, Dirac, Shredinger and others».

There you can see Landau's student, L.B. Okun, which didn't find place for mechanics and electrodynamics *between two pillars upon whom the modern physics is based*. They are not worthy to attract attention of *modern physics* at all in opinion of the modern Academician. They do not exist because they are not in Landau's textbooks – that's all there is to it! As if physics in normal sense didn't exist, only Landau's false-physics remained. Now when somebody says about crisis in modern physics, look at them attentively, who says by this way? Namely Academician of false-physics says so?

So, hypothesis of L.B. Okun about magic tensor is absurd in its basis. It conflicts with theoretic concept of science of physics in sense of Aristotle, Newton and Maxwell and, therefore, this hypothesis has not proved to be true and never will prove to be true. Naturally, in the future it can and should serve only as a funny example of the academic disgrace. And, summarizing, we should underline that all mentioned above so-called afflatuses of Landau, Lifshits, Okun and others are not connected with physics. Our searches of the confirmed hypotheses in the physicist have ended while with a discomfiture. Probably, that such also exist, but they did not manage to be seen behind a veil of a deceit, which was filled with falsifiers of a science. Probably. But all revelations of Landau, Lifshits, Okun and so forth do not concern natural sciences in general and conduct readers only into deadlock, scientific and moral.

Academician Higgs's hypothesis (Royal Society of London)

Let's starts with reference information: Peter W. Higgs (29 May 1929) is English physicist-theoretic, member of Royal Society of Edinburgh, member of Royal Society of London, at present he is emeritus professor of Edinburgh University. He studied in Royal College of London (information from Wikipedia).

He is author of hypothesis of existence of unknown particle, which was called after him as Higgs boson. The following was said in Wikipedia about it:

«Higgs boson ... – elementary particle, *quantum of Higgs field* appearing with necessity in *Standard Model* due to *Higgs mechanism* of spontaneous alteration of *electrically weak symmetry*. According to construction Higgs boson is a *scalar particle* i.e. it has zero spin. It is *postulated by Peter Higgs* in 1960 (according to other information, in 1964), within the frame of *Standard Model* it is responsible for elementary particle mass (italics type is ours everywhere).

Everything highlighted in the previous paragraph by italics means hypotheses on which Higgs hypothesis is based. Unfortunately, *Standard Model* is marked twice. So in reality only 6 hypotheses have been highlighted. But this fact cannot influence on results of our analysis significantly because in any case each of the highlighted hypotheses is based on immense heap of other hypotheses. In this structure the most original hypotheses (hypotheses for invention of other hypotheses, which in their turn are recommended for invention of the following layers of hypotheses) meet fully the

requirements (principle) of Landau-Okun, i.e. they do not contain mechanics and electrodynamics, but these hypotheses conflict certainly with these sciences expressly and infallibly (otherwise they would contain references for advertising). So all source hypotheses are covered very carefully as if from cold and even are isolated from any influences of classical normal physics. Therefore, we can be sure and can even share our certainty with others that none of these hypotheses is going to be confirmed in nature anywhere and at any time as far as they conflict reliably with experience and science about nature i.e. physics. We won't be account random coincidence. Naturally, it upsets modern theorists very little and at this moment we are upset little too. Because we only observe as Aristotle taught.

Certainly, we have no barriers to remember also famous Bayes formula (1) and to calculate posterior probability of Higgs hypothesis confirmation i.e. $P(A | B)$. It can be done easily for any sets of B , because far as at any experiment the probability of confirmation of any of 6 highlighted hypotheses wouldn't be higher expressly than probability of finding the basilisk that "hatches from eggs laid down by old cockerel" (see description of this problem and its decision in our paragraph "*Insidious denominator and method limits*"). And it is an exact null. But denial of each of these partial hypotheses denies evidently and certainly the Higgs main concept as a whole. Therefore, we always will have equality $P(A | B) = 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 = 0$ in any conditions and set of parameters B . And notorious conceptual "boson" will never be real.

However, mass-media can put crimp in public recognition of this fact. For example there are such statements: "In mass-media Higgs boson has been characterized as "a particle of Gods". Assumptions that this particle creates all mass of the galaxy caused fears that its artificial creating can induce chain reaction of uncontrolled growth of mass accompanied by appearance of black hole. On the other hand, impossibility to discover this boson *can compromise physics of elementary particle as a whole* (italics type is ours)", (again Wikipedia).

So, the end, maybe, would not come. The "bosons" finders also read newspapers. They understand that if you are warned then you are armed. In this situation the other game begins with other stakes and other statistical laws far away from Bayes Formula, which we have discussed using of three card players as example. It is not excluded that card-sharps had time to deal cards again.

Certainly, some doubts in impunity remain as stability can be impaired by not very tactful publications of the authors who are not very partisan in scientific communities and more persistent such as Vladimir Pokrovskiy from "Independent Newspaper" (Nezavisimay gazeta) (2007-04-25):

«According to this theory the "tsar" of all elementary particles must exist and that is Higgs boson which is about 190 times as heavy as proton. Indirect confirmation of this boson existence have been obtained, however it itself has not been met in acceleration experiments so far because energy was too low to wake up this monster. LHC provides such energies and if suddenly Higgs boson was not found

by this collider this fact would mean that the standard theory is wrong and *nature, according to one of physicists, can be accused for its bad taste...*

So, the European Nuclear Research Organization has remained as the only participant of chase Higgs boson. If Higgs boson is not found, it will be tragedy but very unlikely. If Higgs boson is found but anything else is not found it will be even not tragedy but the end of acceleration physics as a whole i.e. the dead-end. Countries participating in Project of the European Nuclear Research Organization won't be able to realize simply why they shall spend money and built the following more advanced accelerator on which the physics of the European Nuclear Research Organization rely much».

These emotional and stubborn journalists have a little chance to bring to quasi-physics the real light directly as our unforgettable doggy made it. But now there are only hopes and hopes

3. Conclusions

How many knockouts physics has received

We know from Aristotle, that the scientific subject of the physicist is engaged in studying of a matter and its movement. Physics is a part of a large system of knowledge of the natural phenomena occurring in global material world that is called as natural science. According to the type of scientific problems, their solution methods as well as chronological order, physics as a whole can be divided into parts, which it is accepted to consider as theories. By this time among them the followings have been defined more or less: Mechanics, Electrodynamics, Thermodynamics together with Statistical physics, Theory of field, Theory of substance. Some problems are solved by conditional theories drawing attention to separate forms of substance (for example, Theory of plasma, Hydrodynamics and etc) or on a scale of processes (Astronomy etc.), which are connected with conditions and conditionality of their origination and application. But such separation is usually additional and temporary as far as we know the world is unified, i.e. sooner or later people recognize a primacy of a principle of unity of the nature. About this unity of the nature it was known to Aristotle, with it is necessary to be considered and now.

The dialectic of physics development always put two natural questions, namely: how physics develop and how people can promote this development. Answers these questions are concluded in centuries-old set of great number of investigations having. However, all people are very subjective and so the question, that is the reflected second one, is of current interest now, namely: how people can hinder physics development. It is this third question has become especially sharp at current step in human progress. And we must try to answer this question.

Even modern comprachicos cannot deform the physics as a whole as far as the first three theories have been grown-up and matured completely. So we are discussing only the last two theories such as theories of field and substance. And that's the place where sadists have been on the loose! And in these young theories we should account damages of physics. Removal of mechanics and electrodynamics together with their factual material, mathematical and methodical tools from the investigation cycle of each of these growing theories has brought physics to two evident knockouts. In the physicist already there is nothing more to destroy. Now it is permissible to knock physics lying sick on the carpet by the most unprincipled hypotheses. Basilisks with dragons are not acting because of naivety and weakness. Logical explanations and justifications are not required now from hypothetical statements at all. No reason is necessary. These stupidities are pouring as swift as rain. They can be considered as knockdowns on the basis of three knockdowns per one knockout. But how can we connect this with physics recumbent on the carpet?

Now we see the result: in front of us the science of nature - physics is lying beaten and possible beaten to death. It is normal reaction of people as well as a dog to such sight to help, to save the injured. Of course, it is always necessary to save what we can save. But how we can save the man drowning if there is no water anywhere? So any rescue actions are always preceded by at least minimal information on a reason of such disaster. It is necessary to understand: What the matter was. Logical tumbles we have already analyzed. Now it is time to go into personals. It is this that we'll discuss below in more details.

Stupidity or intent

Problem of separation of stupidity from intent is equal to the problem of separation of the sheep from the goats, i.e. this problem is eternal. We have not seen anywhere real hypotheses or errors among ordinary ostensibly hypotheses, "models" and conjectures; always only a frank lie was there.

“Know them by their deals” – we have read this and known them. Now we have the problem how to organize the opposition.

For robbers, violators, maniacs the police make special profiles of criminals. Interpol makes collections of such profiles to provide easier capture of criminals. I think for serial shameless liars and physics killers such orientation must be made up. Then Bayes formula along with the dog sequence will prove to be in business and will work excellently. Only the dog itself cannot be shown openly while. Now, unlike the previous stages, absolutely new and very large stirring circumstance has appeared: the studied problem involves the vital interest of family, as in a mafia, of groups of the population specific on immorality. From here there is a danger that the dog will be hurt, will poison a dog, or killing PR-campaign will be organized for money. So the dog cannot cope with. We have to rake this evil by ourselves.

And we also well know, that the player has lost already when he sat to play with a cardsharp. Because now this is not a game at all but the cardsharp's game. We know this after physical forums. And when sitting down to write a brochure about physics we have already risked dealing with organization that is criminal according to its origination, criminal practice and criminal intentions. We sit down to play not to outplay the criminals playing their criminal game but to look broadly in their criminal faces for scientific purposes.

Now the point is in personalities. Whence the people are capable to declare: «a gravitational field Source is the four-dimensional tensor ...»? I think that they are not from heaven. In any case in Russia the discussions have lowered to the level of particular personalities, to the level of their moral and essence. Let's understand in morals of these bards of a deceit, bag and baggage. We are physicists and investigators as well.

We start from origination.

There we cannot be restricted only by statement of fact that theorists have lost their conscience. Works of Aristotle, Thomas Akvinsky, Newton, Maxwell are accessible to them. But they ignore differences of revelations from the physical experience, described in these works. They deliberately connect together physics to metaphysics. No, it is necessary to study out in the reasons of metamorphoses of children, students and graduate students into deep-rooted and low liars. And why? What such spice-cakes and stimuli's have appeared? However constant training is executed with promises of prospects, as a carrot for hare, and dung for fly. It gives result. Also there are idols, a pack of idols from usual illiterate liars. Look, ... here this genius ... the example what is for us ... ah the academician ... ah the prizewinner...! But what about "tensor" if he can stink over the whole hall, and from the graduate students will be cry in chorus: violets, ... violets! Idol is above thousand-year culture, dignity and mind for them.

The circle has been locked and all has incorporated. So perverts in the third and more generation have appeared here. Especially in Russia where in 20th century moral criteria have been especially underestimated by an interdiction of religion and planting of idolatry and mortification. The navel of it furuncle inside with landaus, lifshits and okuns is housed here so in Russia.

The recipe of the solution of our problem how to organize resistance to this system of a deceit, follows from here itself. It is simple: it is necessary to expose openly false idols, i.e. it is necessary to show of swindlers from a science. They are primitive and ridiculous. Decent people are not involved in such shameful game. Also it is necessary to not pay attention to how they praise each other, jumping on the bird's language. And what they can do? Results of work are not present and never will be at such backlog by nous in the field of check of hypotheses. In general it is better not to speak about visual recognition - very vile depictions - without the secretary will not find a key. And what now physics without the computer mathematics? But the head is necessary to techniques. And where they will find it?

If we refer to Christian traditions we can see not only dogmatic censure of lie but and detailed explanation of St. Thomas where God is, where idols are and what place occupies revelation in any of sciences.

Koran also does not mask its attitude to the global catastrophe: «Don't confuse the truth with a lie, don't conceal the truth if you know it». Also we will not forget, that Aristotle's ideas have reached then illiterate Europe through followers of Prophet Mohammed.

It is even strange a bit that Christianity, ...Islam, all Her Majesty Civilization are against but lie have already been ruling for 100 years over physics and physicists. As if it is the time to reveal the Truth as it is said in Great Writings.

But where can we take warmth of the words and good feelings of our Teachers?

What is the next?

Above we found out that the root of a evil was only in professionalism and the organized nature of falsificators. Under the pretense of their revelations instead of knowledge torch, some people and big corporations bring to people systematically balls of complicated and more and more absurd legends which destroy the fundamentals of physics and possible intellect. Authors of the most ridiculous illusions are appointed by indisputable idols.

So the theoretical physics has evolved into a sect, which adherents have come off from a reality and cannot compete now even with beagle dogs on ability to predict processes in the nature and to check hypotheses. Naturally, such constructed on imaginations and frank lie the sect has no future.

Unfortunately, the monopoly of this dishonest public in means of the scientific information prevents to show their real face. Now unqualified liars make references in them only against each other and then they do ratings for itself from these references.

We will sustain a pause, however time hurries. Because 100 years has passed at all errors and a continuous deceit in sphere of one of leading sciences.

As all simple people we certainly hope that somebody will persuade the falsificators, restrict their all-might in academies and mass media reveling by this way freedom of words, discussions and idea propagations in science. Even it is possible that such our dream will come true some times. Then as in the times of Aristotle and Newton everything will come back at the proper place. Science will be science and politics will be politics.

It will occur, if the mankind does not have time to use that new curve mirror, that weapon of deliberate distortion of the reality, which it has developed and has ground in the course of destruction of theoretical physics in 20th and the beginning of 21st century till that time. This weapon of leg-pulling is not less monstrous in any way on force, and the crowd of the made a fool people are not less dangerous, than all our arsenal of H-bombs.

Through the fog we can see the chain: *physics – hypothesis – catastrophe*.

References

1. Bayes, T. "An Essay Toward Solving a Problem in the Doctrine of Chances", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* **53**, 370-418, 1764 [Facsimile available online: the original essay with an introduction by his friend Richard Price].
2. Glymour, Clark. *Theory and Evidence* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1980.
3. N. Gorelov. Story of birth and victories of Alexander the Great, «Azbuka-classika», St.Pb., 2006.
4. Translation of V.P. Karpov from book "Greek Philosophers - Fundamentals: LOGIC, PHYSICS, ETHICS", ECSMO-Press, Kharkov, 1056 pp., 1999.
5. James Clerk Maxwell. Royal Society Transactions, v. CLV, 1864.
6. L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits. Quantum mechanics, State Publishing House of physical and mathematical literature, M., 1963.
7. Б.Ф. Полторацкий. Электромагнитный вихрь в структуре элементарных частиц. Москва, «Sputnik+», 2006.
8. В.Ф. Poltoratsky. Fundamental particles in pictures without hypothesis. Moscow, «Sputnik+», 2007.
9. В.Ф. Poltoratsky. Electrodynamics in the theory of field and substance. Moscow, «Sputnik+», 2008.
10. G. Mie, Ann. d. Physik, **25**, 429, 1908.
11. M. Born, E. Wolf. Principles of optics. N-Y, Pergamon press, 1964.
12. Anna Birell. Chinese myths. «Fiar-Press», M., 2005.
13. V.A. Atsyukovsky. General electrodynamics. Energoizdat, M., 1990.
14. L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits. Mechanics, «Nauka», M., 1973.
15. L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits.. Theory of field, « Nauka », M., 1967.
16. V. Boayritsev. AntiEinstein. Main myth of XX century. «Yauza», 2005
17. S.N. Pukhov. New electrodynamics of moving bodies. Vladimir. 1994.
18. L.B. Okun. Physics of elementary particles. Moscow. «Editorial», 2005.