

**To:**  
Stockholm, Sweden – **Barbara Cannon**, President,  
The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences  
**Carl-Henrik Heldin**, Chairman,  
The Nobel Foundation  
**Lars Brink**, Chairman,  
Nobel Committee for Physics  
Moscow, Kremlin – **Vladimir Putin**, President of Russia  
Moscow, Tverskaya 11 – **Dmitry Livanov**, Minister of  
Education and Science of Russia

## AN OPEN PROTEST OF THE RUSSIAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY

With regard to the award of the Nobel Prize in Physics  
for 2013

The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences has decided to award the Nobel Prize in Physics for 2013 to François Englert of Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium, and Peter W. Higgs of the University of Edinburgh, UK,

*"for the theoretical discovery of a mechanism that contributes to our understanding of the origin of mass of subatomic particles, and which recently was confirmed through the discovery of the predicted fundamental particle, by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at CERN's Large Hadron Collider."*

Thus the prize is awarded,

**1. "for the theoretical discovery of a mechanism...»**

Any **hypothesis** about a mechanism of occurrence of a phenomenon or a process **should not be recognized subjectively as a discovery** without a complete objective verification of the hypothesis. Moreover, it is unacceptable to do such a way, especially, only because the fact that it (hypothesis) belongs to the persons of a selected group of the physics community, which completely disregard for other existing hypotheses independently of the fact that the given hypotheses are more adequate to reality than theirs.

In the case of the present nomination, there was such an out-of-tolerance approach; the prize was hastily awarded for the hypothesis supporting the accepted theories of the Standard model and to people developing it, i.e., who upholding the well-established conservative views in physics, without any expert analysis of the value of their hypothesis *as compared with other* ones existed. This testifies about the lack of professionalism and is unacceptable.

Actually, there are other relevant hypotheses devoted to the "*mechanism that contributes to our understanding*," but for some reasons about the existence of these alternative hypotheses do not say anything, as if they do not exist at all; they are simply ignored.

It is not a scientific approach, but the method of those who privatized science, arrogated to himself the sole right to consider what is science and what is pseudoscience, where truth and where falsehood, where black is black, and where black is white [1].

Till all the existing hypotheses will not be taken into account, verified and analyzed, it is unacceptably to recognize, hastily and arbitrarily, one of them as uniquely more appropriate, as was done in this case; prematurely, frankly roughly, by boorish way, ignoring the true scientific method. The more that, in the first instance, a hypothesis must establish itself and become the basis of the theory, confirming its importance and efficiency in practice.

## 2. Discovery “... *that contributes to our understanding* ...”

Many, many phenomena, processes, hypothesis in physics “... *contributes to our understanding...*” of different things, including “*the origin of mass*”.

Thus, according to the formula of the announced Nobel Prize, the “*discovered mechanism*”, in substance, **does not responsible for the creation of mass** of a particle; it only “*contributes to our understanding*”.

To put it mildly, it is a very streamlined strange formulation of the “*discovery*”. It seems that it was created by morons, which is hard to believe; so the creators are, rather, rogues, adventurers.

Indeed, in this formulation is written “*OUR*”, that is their (a small group of people) “*understanding*.” After all, the members of the Committee did not ask us, apparently, assuming by the default that they do it on behalf of the most physicists expressing their opinion. Please note that this formulation allows for the interpretation of “*understanding*” both meanings, as valid one as well as improper, because “*OUR*” (their) understanding may be different and most likely wrong. It was well understood by the creators of the formula, which were not sure about the reality of the “*discovery*”, however, loudly announcing it over the world.

It is well known that *any experience*, including perhaps especially negative, i.e., right or wrong, that is “*OUR*” (in this case, their, as they stand alone, by a narrow circle, but not on behalf of most of the physics community), really *leads ultimately to a correct understanding*, by trial and error. And in this they are right, insuring themselves, thus, against the future justification for what they did now. They left the door open for a retreat in advance knowing that it is not a discovery, but a clean water bluff, taking so all of us for fools, being confident that we do not soon realize it.

## 3. This “*discovery of a mechanism ... recently was confirmed through the discovery of the predicted fundamental particle...*”

This statement is not correct, it is far-fetched truth. Please analyze carefully the results presented by the ATLAS and CMS research groups. In addition, the need to be confirmations from other laboratories obtained at independent researches on similar systems as LHC or other. There are not such data.

4. It is assumed that in the Standard model Higgs boson is responsible for the mass of elementary particles. Its mass is estimated at about 125—126 GeV/c<sup>2</sup>. Can anyone from theorists explain to a normal person in simple language how the boson is responsible for mass, at least of the electron, whose mass is several orders of magnitude less and equal to 0.510 998 928 MeV/c<sup>2</sup>?

5. Let's agree that Higgs boson is an elementary particle responsible for the mass of all other elementary particles. The question arises. What (or what particle) is responsible for the mass of the boson itself?

Thus, many questions are in this regard. However, there are no answers.

6. From the additional data posted on the website of Nobel Foundation ([www.nobelprize.org](http://www.nobelprize.org)), we find the following expression:

«Both François Englert and Peter Higgs were young scientists when they, in 1964, independently of each other put forward a theory **that rescued the Standard Model from collapse**». [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/physics/laureates/2013/popular.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/2013/popular.html).

How their theory “*rescued the Standard Model from collapse*» can be seen with the naked eye.

Since then, it took 50 years. And here's the “*salvation from collapse*”. As they say, a drowning man clutching at straws. But the collapse of the Standard Model is obvious; all undertaken efforts for these 50 years have failed and could not to prevent the inevitability of the collapse.

And all attempts with the Higgs theory, “*that contributes to our (i.e., their, which maybe right or maybe wrong) understanding of the origin of mass*” also doomed to failure. After all, apart from the origin of masse, there is still much, much more waiting in line for their “*understanding*” in the Standard Model, for the salvation of the latter.

Here's a list of some of the fundamental problems unresolved and cannot be solved, in principle, within the framework of the Standard Model.

Modern physics, based on the Standard model, does not comprehend till now such fundamental things as: what is

- the nature of charges,
- the origin of mass (the Higgs hypothesis does not explain this, because it only “*contributes to our understanding*”, as announced to the whole world),
- the nature of gravitation?

A great mystery for physicists is still:

- the physical meaning of the *speed* of light  $c$  in the famous formula of the *rest energy* of particles,  $E_0 = m_0 c^2$ ,
- the origin of the fine structure constant  $\alpha$  of the observed magnitude,
- the physical meaning of the polar-azimuthal functions in Schrödinger's equation.

Modern physics erroneously interprets the polar-azimuthal functions in Schrodinger's equation ascribing to these functions, quite arbitrarily and unfoundedly, the physical meaning of atomic “*electron orbitals*” with which these functions, actually, have nothing to do [2-4]. As a result, the development of atomic physics has gone astray.

Modern physics theorists are unable, in principle, to derive theoretically:

- the relative atomic masses of all isotopes of the elements of the Mendeleev Periodic Table,
- the magnetic moment of a neutron,
- the magnetic moment of a proton;
- to build a unified theory of all fundamental interactions, including gravitational, *etc.*

In addition to the listed above, please, pay a special attention at the derivation of the anomalous magnetic moment of the electron carried out in quantum electrodynamics (QED), wherewith so proud modern theorists [1]. The matter is that the aforesaid derivation has reached in QED such an extent of absurdity (about what the general public is not informed) that it goes far beyond the bounds of common sense.

About what else is there to speak. Modern physics does not know also, from which matter and how are made the particles referred to as elementary (electrons, protons, neutrons, quarks, strings, and *etc.*)? *Etc.*

7. If the Nobel Committee considered the "*understanding*" recognized as the "*discovery*", along with some of the alternative "*understandings*" known from publications, well, for example – [5-7], it is clear that the result would have been different. Namely, they would have had to score the final nail in the coffin of the Standard Model.

It is at this is, apparently, the reason of the whole affair with the play of making such a "*discovery*". The ground goes away from under their feet, and that's clinging to straws from the last efforts. Moreover, they should to justify somehow, with great fanfare, billions spent on the LHC ...

Please note that in the cited studies *revealed the nature of the origin of mass*, and not only [1]. Simultaneously all the problems mentioned above, which cannot be solved in principle by the Standard model, also were solved (see, in particular, a Comparative Table of the two models in [8]). Let the honourable members of the Nobel Committee for Physics will try to prove that this is not the case. Up to now, over 20 years, there was not a single argument against these findings from physicists. Is not this is the main factor of their reality?

[1] G. P. Shpenkov, *Some Words About Fundamental Problems of Physics: Constructive Analysis*, LAMBERT Academic Publishing, p.116 (2012);  
[http://shpenkov.janmax.com/978-3-659-23750-8\\_eng.JPG](http://shpenkov.janmax.com/978-3-659-23750-8_eng.JPG)  
<http://shpenkov.janmax.com/Book-2011-Eng.pdf>

[2] G. P. Shpenkov, *Conceptual Unfoundedness of Hybridization and the Nature of the Spherical Harmonics*, HADRONIC JOURNAL, Vol. 29. No. 4, p. 455, (2006);  
<http://shpenkov.janmax.com/HybridizationShpenkov.pdf>

[3] L. G. Kreidik and G. P. Shpenkov, *Important Results of Analyzing Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, GALILEAN ELECTRODYNAMICS & QED-EAST, Vol. 13, SI No. 2, 23-30, (2002); <http://shpenkov.janmax.com/QM-Analysis.pdf>

[4] G. P. Shpenkov and L. G. Kreidik, *Schrodinger's Errors of Principle*, GALILEAN ELECTRODYNAMICS, Vol. 16, No. 3, 51 - 56, (2005);  
<http://shpenkov.janmax.com/Blunders.pdf>

[5] L. G. Kreidik and G. P. Shpenkov, *Dynamic Model of Elementary Particles and the Nature of Mass and "Electric" Charge*, REVISTA CIENCIAS EXATAS E NATURAIS, Vol. 3, No 2, 157-170, (2001); <http://shpenkov.janmax.com/masscharge.pdf>

[6] G. P. Shpenkov, *An Elucidation of the Nature of the Periodic Law*, Chapter 7 in "*The Mathematics of the Periodic Table*", edited by Rouvray D. H. and King R. B., NOVA SCIENCE PUBLISHERS, NY, 119-160, 2006.

[7] G. P. Shpenkov, *Physics and Chemistry of Carbon in the Light of Shell-Nodal Atomic Model*, Chapter 12 in "*Quantum Frontiers of Atoms and Molecules*", edited by Putz M. V., NOVA SCIENCE PUBLISHERS, New York, 277-323, 2011;

[https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product\\_info.php?cPath=23\\_29&products\\_id=12687](https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product_info.php?cPath=23_29&products_id=12687)

[8] G.P. Shpenkov, *A Comparison of Two Models in Physics: DM (new) and SM (used currently)* (2006); <http://shpenkov.janmax.com/AdvantagesDM.pdf>

[9] V.A. Lebedev, *Gravitation*. G.P. Shpenkov, *Fundamental period-quantum of the Decimal Code of the Universe*. I.V. Dmitriev, *About the mysteries of the structure of matter from subatomic physics to astrophysics*. // Encyclopaedia of Russian Thought, Vol. 19. – Reports to the Russian Physical Society, 2013 (Collection of scientific papers, in Russian).

**Vladimir Rodionov** (Moscow, Russia) – The Russian Physical Society, President

**Yuri Voronov** (St. Petersburg, Russia) –The Russian Physical Society, Scientific Secretary

**George Shpenkov** (Bielsko-Biala, Poland) – Leading scientific expert, member of the Russian Physical Society, author of the *Dynamic Model of the Universe*

**Vladimir Lebedev** (Novosibirsk, Russia) - Winner of the Award of the Russian Physical Society, member of the Russian Physical Society, author of the *Stock Gravity Model*

**Igor Dmitriev** (Samara, Russia) - Scientific expert of the Russian Physical Society, member of the Academy of Medical and Technical Problems, author of the *Auto-torsion Theory of the structure of matter*

**Moscow, October 14, 2013**

<http://rusphysics.ru/articles/812/> (Russian)

<http://www.rusphysics.ru/files/ProtestRusPhysSoc.pdf> (English)