THE X-PARTICLE

by Miles Mathis

First published January 26, 2022

MIT is claiming now to have pinpointed the signature of the famous X-particle. Is this particle a tetraquark and indication of exotic Big Bang theory? No, of course not. Like the W, the Z, the Higgs and other over-proton mass particles, it is just a fleeting result of collisions in energetic environments. As such, it is proof of no current theories but mine: mine being that these masses are caused by spins, not quarks.

The only reason you are hearing about these "exciting discoveries" now is that mainstream physics is in a freefall and needs daily stories to feed to the media to keep funding up and hide the collapse. This X-particle is being used to prop up at least three major parts of current theory, including quark theory, Big Bang and dark matter, as we will see below. I have singlehandedly destroyed Modern physics as a whole and in most parts, but no one on the inside of the castle can admit defeat. They can't concede that one unfunded artist on a mac mini has brought down the entire edifice since Newton, and that they are now sitting on a radioactive pile of dust and ash. They think that by pushing these stories through all media outlets down to Infowars, they can somehow stave off ultimate and utter destruction. But they can't. **It is already done**. I know it and they know it and the Gods and Muses know it, so what the media reports is of no consequence. It has happened and cannot be unhappened. They can bring in the Air Force to fake numbers and try to bury me, they can flood the media with lies, they can attack half the population with vaccines, they can collapse entire economies: it will not matter. In trying to destroy me and the truth, they will only ensure the future will hate them more. The only legacy they are tainting is their own.

The specific theory they are trying to save with this X-particle today is quark theory, which I have been bombing very successfully for many years, since 2008. It is nothing but rubble now. Also see my more recent paper on the EMC effect from last year, which must have stung them, leading to this X-particle nonsense. You can also consult my paper of 2015 on the pentaquark, since it mirrors and precedes the analysis below on the tetraquark. In the same line is my 2016 paper on the bottom quark.

We can tell this so-called X-particle is a result of my spin mechanics and the charge field right from its mass: 3872. Because the particle is so rare, we will assume it is created by colliding three particles together, rather than just two. Most fleeting masses in accelerator are caused by the collision of two particles, for obvious reasons. But in some cases a third particle will get caught in between the other two, creating an even rarer "particle". To discover its composition, just go to my paper on mesons linked above and scan down to the section on D mesons. The main one weighs 1860.5. Doubling that one gives us 3721. Doubling that twice gives us 7442. If we collide those two particles, outer spins are stripped taking us down to 3721. But our X-particle is 151 above that, indicating a pion got trapped in the collision. A pion is normally only 145, leaving us with 3866, not 3872, indicating either that they miscalculated the mass of the X by 6, or that some small part of the ambient charge field is also being weighed in the collision. We have seen before that these measured "masses" are masses of collision residue, not real particles, and that they therefore do vary somewhat depending on the energy of the ambient field. A more energetic experiment implies a more dense charge field in accelerator, and this charge field ends up getting weighed in calculating energies. Remember, all particles are

recycling the charge field at all times, and that field is weighed with the particle. It is part of its energy.

We have also found that these numbers can often be arrived at in more than one way, being derived by rather simple math and physics, whereby spins are doubled or multiplied by other common terms, so it is possible the X can be composed in multiple ways.

Also worth commenting on is the statement from MIT:

They based their analysis on the LHC's 2018 dataset, which included more than 13 billion lead-ion collisions, each of which released quarks and gluons that scattered and merged to form more than a quadrillion short-lived particles before cooling and decaying.

13 billion collisions releasing trillions of quarks, and not one quark was actually seen or isolated or proved. Every single quark in this experiment was an assumption. Same for gluons. Neither quarks nor gluons have ever been seen in an experiment. They can't be, because they don't exist, except on paper. Quarks and gluons are completely theoretical, and the theory isn't even a good one. There is no quark-gluon soup, there is only the charge field and photon structures within it. All particles are photon structures, determined by spin mechanics.

And finally, I draw your attention to how unnatural the search for these particles was.

The researchers, led by MIT postdoc Jing Wang, identified key variables that describe the shape of the X particle decay pattern. They trained a machine-learning algorithm to recognize these variables, then fed the algorithm actual data from the LHC's collision experiments. The algorithm was able to sift through the extremely dense and noisy dataset to pick out the key variables that were likely a result of decaying X particles.

Pushing computer programs, as usual. With that amount of manipulation, you can find anything. So we have to ask why they wanted to find this data, to the point of manufacturing it. Because these particles have been used not only to sell and prop up a dying quark theory, they have been used to sell and prop up an already dead Big Bang theory. All mention of X-particles is accompanied by the claim that they are "primordial particles from the dawn of time". And a third dying theory is being sold as well: dark matter. Most people who are not cosmologists have already forgotten that X-particles were originally pulled out of their shorts by Hooman Davoudiasi, David Morrissey, et al, in 2010 to explain baryon and dark matter densities:

We present a novel mechanism for generating both the baryon and dark matter densities of the Universe. A new Dirac fermion —carrying a conserved baryon number charge couples to the standard model quarks as well as a GeV-scale hidden sector. $\pm f$-violating decays of —, produced nonthermally in low-temperature reheating, sequester antibaryon number in the hidden sector, thereby leaving a baryon excess in the visible sector. The antibaryonic hidden states are stable dark matter. A spectacular signature of this mechanism is the baryon-destroying inelastic scattering of dark matter that can annihilate baryons at appreciable rates relevant for nucleon decay searches.

Pathetic, since there is not one word of real physics in that abstract. It is all "angels on the head of a pin" blather, since they are trying to explain problems that don't exist with particles and mechanisms that don't exist. Why? Again, it is to promote the various failed standard models and to manufacture headlines from nothing.

This clarifies that muddle somewhat:

Physicists from Canada's TRIUMF particle-physics facility, the University of British Columbia, and Brookhaven National Laboratory have theorized a particle that can explain both dark matter and the origins of matter and antimatter: the "X" particle. In their paper published last month in Physical Review Letters , the team explains that the yet-to-be-discovered X particle is expected to decay mostly to normal matter, whereas its antiparticle is expected decay mostly to "hidden" antimatter. The team claims that its existence in the early universe could explain why there is more matter than antimatter in the universeand that dark matter is in fact hidden antimatter, as explained by Kate McAlpine writing for Physics World .

Oh, so that's what that abstract was about! Would you ever have guessed? As you see, they think they need to explain why there is more matter in the universe than antimatter. *Though there is no indication there is.* We only find more matter than antimatter in our Solar System and galaxy, and I have shown that is due to spin. The galaxy is spinning one way and not the other, so the entire galaxy and everything in it is "left-handed". The Sun is also spinning one way and not the other.

And the idea that dark matter is hidden antimatter is so ludicrous it is beyond belief. I have long since done the simple calculations proving dark matter is just charge. So there is no need for coupling to the hidden sector or sequestering antibaryons there. That these guys weren't immediately laughed out of the lab is just more proof mainstream physicists don't even know what antimatter is, much less dark matter. They don't comprehend what their own old equations have been telling them all along, and when I came along and pointed it out in simple language, they didn't have the decency to thank me for it.

I first unveiled those calculations in 2009 in my paper on the Fine Structure Constant. There you will see that using only the value of the fundamental charge and the definition of the Ampere, I was able to calculate the amount of charge being recycled by the proton in kilograms/s. It turned out to be about 19 times the mass of the proton itself, indicating the charge field outweighed the matter field by that much. If you don't see what that has to do with anything, remind yourself that dark matter is 95% of the total field in the universe. 95% = 19 to 1.

$e = 1.602 \times 10^{-19}$ C
1C = 2×10^{-7} kg/s (see definition of Ampere to find this number in the mainstream)
$e = 3.204 \times 10^{-26}$ kg/s