

[return to updates](#)

# Stephen Hawking died and has been replaced



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published April 17, 2015*

I have written several papers critiquing Stephen Hawking, including [a long one](#) on his *Brave New World* series for the BBC. But this is my first paper really linking my science research with my faked events research. I will use simple photo analysis and facial analysis to quickly show you the current Stephen Hawking is not the same person as the original Stephen Hawking.

This should not surprise you too much, especially if you know something about ALS. ALS is Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis, also known as Lou Gehrig's Disease. We are told Hawking has had ALS for over 52 years, which is a record by many decades. Jason Becker is the only person I have heard of who has lived more than 20 years with the disease, so there is about a three-decade difference between the longest survivor and the second longest survivor. That is a more than 100% difference between first and second place. It would be like Justin Gatlin running the 100 meters in 9.8 seconds, and Usain Bolt beating him with a time of 4.5 seconds. In other words, statistically it doesn't happen.

The average survival time for ALS is four years. When Hawking was first diagnosed in 1963, doctors gave him two years to live. And yet here we are, 52 years later and counting. Should you believe it? Well, no. Like Becker, it appears the real Hawking did beat the odds and live for about 20 years. But at some point he was replaced. I have no proof he died, but I assume that is why they replaced him. He was a very useful public relations entity for physics, and they didn't want to lose him.

But rather than speculate on that, let us go right to the evidence. I won't call it *proof*, since of course you are free to disagree with me. This is an opinion piece, not a court transcript; and even if it were a stamped court finding, you would be free to disagree with it. You don't *have* to agree with anything anyone tells you, *ever*. Remember that. This paper is nothing more than presented evidence, evidence

I find compelling. If you also find it compelling, fine. If you don't, also fine.

The picture under title is the real Hawking. Notice the longish face and skinny neck. Also notice the dark brown hair. Here is another picture of the real Hawking:



Let that etch into your brain. This is also Hawking, a few years later:



You see that his hair is turning gray. But the thing to notice here is his teeth. Pretty awful, right?

Well, it gets worse.



He is now fully gray, and he has pretty much lost his lower teeth. I am not a dentist and don't know exactly what is going on there, but it looks like those teeth have been filed down or chipped down, with only stub fillings left. The next step would be dentures, right?



Well, no. The next step, apparently, was going from gray to blonde, even in the eyebrows, and a whole new set of old yellow teeth. He also bought some new fat cheeks. Amazing right?

Actually, that is the replacement. That isn't Hawking, as I hope you can see now that I point it out. Go back two photos and compare the teeth directly. Not even close. They found a guy with the same nose and big ears, but otherwise they don't look that much alike. This is the guy you have been looking at for the past thirty years. Which means Hawking might not have written *A Brief History of Time*, which came out in 1988. I haven't pinpointed the date, but that was about the time they made the switch. My current guess is early 80's, which—if true—would mean that book was a forgery.

You will say, “That is just a younger Hawking, before he lost those lower teeth.” No, it isn't. I just showed you the younger Hawking, and he didn't look like that. Compare them side by side.



Besides, the first picture is Hawking from the 1970's. The second is Hawking from the 1990's. Amazing that he aged 20 years with a debilitating disease and got younger looking at the same time, isn't it?

Hawking was still looking young in 2007, when he went aboard the ZeroG Plane:



See how it says “zero g” on his shirt? That is from when he went up in the plane, which was in 2007. He was supposed to be 65 in 2007. Looks great for 65, eh? Unfortunately, he already looked older than that in 1982, 25 years earlier:



1982



2007

His face also got shorter. Normally your face will get longer as you age, not shorter.

Here is a more recent photo of the impostor:



Again, the teeth are the clue. This may be the same guy as our blonde impostor, but it certainly isn't Stephen Hawking. Go back to the earlier photos. Those four lower teeth were supposed to be gone decades ago, filed down to filling nubs. Are we supposed to believe they regrew? Do those look like caps or dentures to you? Would you pay a dentist to *replace* your teeth with those? No, we are supposed to believe that is what he has left of his real teeth, obviously. But I have just shown you why that cannot be the case.

Here is a photo I found of the blonde impostor where it is really easy to see he isn't Hawking:



That picture is from a foreign magazine, I guess, since it seems to have been suppressed in the US and on the internet. I only found one copy of it, and the full-size image is gone. The website has been scrubbed. This makes me think photos of this guy have normally been retouched to make him look a bit more like Hawking.

And here is a really weird one, although I bet you won't see it until I point it out:



Well, did you find the problem? This time it is with the hands. Look at the coloration and texture. Those are waxwork hands. If you can't see it there, maybe you can see it here:



Another reason I noticed the hands is that they don't look like ALS hands. [In Hawking's biography](#), they admit that his fingers had already begun to curl in the 1960's. Those with this disease not only can't straighten their fingers, they can't straighten their wrists. In older pictures of Hawking, he has badly curled wrists, with his left hand normally bent sideways. So how did his hands suddenly get so smooth and relaxed in his 70's?

Many of the photos of Hawking have been faked, as you might expect given what we just discovered. Take a look at these two, for instance:



Those are both sold to us as wedding pictures of Hawking and Elaine Mason. So how many times did they get married, and how many wedding dresses did Mason have? I knew these were faked even before noticing the two wedding dresses, because this is the real Hawking, not the blonde impostor. But Mason married the blonde impostor, so I knew these photos must be faked. How did I know this was Hawking so fast? Look at the photo of him from the side. See how skinny his neck is and how it slopes up quickly to meet his skull? Then he has a protruding rear skull. The blonde impostor doesn't have that. The shape of his skull is entirely different, and it is very obvious from the side. The real Hawking was always much more bony and angular.

I also beg you to notice again how *old* Hawking looks there. That was supposed to be 1995 (but was really 1984-ish). Then how did he look like this in 2007?





dated 1995 but actually ~1984



2007

Twelve (actually 23) years later with a debilitating disease, and he looks ten years younger? How does that work? Where did he get those cheeks?

If this analysis is true, it would mean that Hawking's recent books are forgeries, unless he wrote them from beyond the grave (or is still alive as a brain in a tank somewhere). And it would mean his recommendation in 2012 that Peter Higgs get the Nobel Prize was a forgery. The only person recommending anything in that case would be this impostor.

You may say something like, “Yes, I see what you are saying, but I am going to withhold judgment until this breaks in the press. If you are right, it can't stay hidden. Someone will sue or something and a judge will decide.” To this I say, *don't hold your breath*. These things *do* stay out of the mainstream press indefinitely, since the press is controlled. For example, the truth about the Lincoln assassination still hasn't come out in the mainstream, 150 years later. Odds are, no one will *ever* decide this for you, so you have to do your own research. If you doubt my analysis, do your own. This is how things now work, and if you want to know something, you have to research it and make your own decision. Which is why I don't mind putting this on my science site. That is what science is, after all. Not accepting someone else's decision—which would be belief by hearsay or reputation. Science is studying the facts yourself and coming to your own conclusions. You cannot do science second hand. You can learn from a teacher, but ultimately you have to be your own scientist.

But let's not quit there. I would really like to know if Hawking's famous book is a forgery. I have proposed before that the sales numbers for that book were faked, since they aren't believable. But if we can show that Hawking was already gone before the book came out, that would go a long way to proving the sales figures were also faked. If they can fake the author they are hardly going to stick at faking the sales numbers, are they?

Since most of the photos of Hawking on the internet are conveniently not dated, this line of research is difficult. So let's go to his biography to see if we can find other clues to the date of the switch. We find the important paragraph at Wikipedia without much effort:

During a visit to the [European Organisation for Nuclear Research](#) on the border of France and Switzerland

in mid-1985, Hawking contracted [pneumonia](#), which in his condition was life-threatening; he was so ill that Jane was asked if life support should be terminated. She refused but the consequence was a [tracheotomy](#), which would require round-the-clock nursing care, and remove what remained of his speech.[\[55\]\[56\]](#) The [National Health Service](#) would pay for a [nursing home](#), but Jane was determined that he would live at home. The cost of the care was funded by an American foundation.[\[57\]\[58\]](#) Nurses were hired for the three shifts required to provide the round-the-clock support he required. One of those employed was Elaine Mason, who was to become Hawking's second wife.

Wow. It's all there, we only have to unwind it. First of all, if you have had ALS for 23 years and have pneumonia to the point that doctors are recommending life support be terminated, a tracheotomy isn't going to cure you immediately. A tracheotomy is just the procedure of drilling a hole in your windpipe so you can breath through it instead of your nose or mouth. But the problems obviously went far beyond that, or they wouldn't have been recommending life support termination. He was probably losing control of his diaphragm, and couldn't fill his lungs on his own. That is what happens with ALS, you know: you lose control of parts of your body one by one, until you finally lose control of them all. We aren't told why a tracheotomy suddenly allowed him to go off the ventilator, for instance. So none of this makes any sense. If you have any doctor friends, ask them what they think of this paragraph at Wikipedia. They may tell you the truth.

This makes the likely date of the switch 1985, which is three years before *A Brief History of Time* came out. And it looks like Elaine Mason married the blonde impostor, not Hawking. Which brings us to the next clue:

By December 1977, [Hawking's first wife] Jane had met organist Jonathan Hellyer Jones when singing in a church choir. Hellyer Jones became close to the Hawking family, and by the mid-1980s, he and Jane had developed romantic feelings for each other.

“By the mid-1980's.” That confirms the date of 1985 as the date of the switch. If Hawking died in 1985, Jane would of course be free to move on to Jones. This would also absolve her of any taint of adultery, so my reading is actually less sordid (and more believable) than the mainstream reading. It explains all the partner switches in the 1980's.

To continue to pursue this line of reasoning, let us look at a clue hidden (probably on purpose) here. *The cost of his care was funded by an American foundation.* That probably didn't jump out at you, since it is written in a language to make it disappear for most people. But that very language acted as a red flag for me. So what American foundation funded this? [It took some digging](#), but it is the MacArthur Foundation. This is a huge red flag, since John D. MacArthur was the owner of Bankers Life and Casualty, one of the largest insurance firms. At the time of his death [he was said to have been](#) one of the three richest men in the US. So we should look at his foundation like we look at the Rockefeller Foundation or the Ford Foundation: that is to say, with high suspicion.

MacArthur owned Bankers Life from 1935 to 1978. In that year, most of his wealth went into his Foundation, we are told. Curiously, in the next year, 1979, a large financial services holding company called Conseco (now CNO) was born. It immediately began buying up insurance companies, including Bankers Life and Casualty. Get ready for this: it bought Bankers Life in 1986, the very same year the MacArthur Foundation began funding Hawking. Coincidence? We'll see.

We are told CNO purchased Bankers Life for 118 million, which seems absurdly low for the company of the 3<sup>rd</sup> richest man in the US. How did MacArthur become a multi-billionaire from such a measly company? These are the questions you should be asking.

*Forbes* listed CNO with a revenue of 4.5 billion in 2007. This despite the fact that CNO had gone through the third largest bankruptcy (after Enron and Worldcom) in US history in 2002. Also despite the fact that CNO is listed with only four subsidiaries, including Bankers Life, Colonial Penn, Washington National, and 40/86. Something doesn't add up here.

Neither does MacArthur's Wikipedia page, which is ridiculously short for someone who was recently the 3<sup>rd</sup> richest man in the US. In fact, if you Google John MacArthur without the middle initial, it takes you to first to John F. MacArthur, a radio pastor. Yes, I am sure he is more important to US history than the 3<sup>rd</sup> richest man in the US, with a Foundation endowed in the amount of 6 billion.

But back to MacArthur's Wikipedia page. It says he was born a poor black child in rural Mississippi. Just kidding, that is a line from Steve Martin's *The Jerk*. But seriously, his official bio says he and his siblings grew up in poverty, the children of an itinerant Baptist preacher. That is a bit hard to believe, considering that all his surviving brothers also became rich and/or famous. They admit that of his older brother Charles MacArthur, the famous playwright who was part of the Algonquin Round Table, dated Dorothy Parker, and married Helen Hayes. But they forget to tell you of Alfred, who also made a mint in insurance; and Lawrence Telfer MacArthur, who was a publisher. So all four brothers just happened to scratch their way out of crushing poverty into wealth and fame? Sure they did. Because America is just that kind of place.

A clue may be found by looking at Catherine T. MacArthur's family. Her family name was Hyland, and we are told her father was part of the Irish Catholic political machine in South Chicago, holding several local and state positions. That should be another red flag, and may be a clue as to how the MacArthurs advanced. Chicago politics has long been famous for its corruption, and even Wikipedia says,

The political environment in Chicago in the 1910s and 1920s let [organized crime](#) flourish to the point that many Chicago policemen earned more money from pay-offs than from the city.

This is when Catherine MacArthur's father would have been rising in Chicago politics.

We see similar red flags when we return to John D. MacArthur's page. In addition to his insurance companies, he was also known as a Palm Beach, FL, real estate mogul, buying up large parts of Palm Beach and Sarasota in the 1960's. Even the [PalmBeachPost admits](#) their city has long been a bed for organized crime, although they forget to tell you that organized crime was taken over by the Feds decades ago. Private mobsters no longer exist, having been absorbed by the more powerful families that run the US government. As with all other business, the past 50 years has seen a monopolization of all lucrative operations by “investment firms”, “holding companies” and of course banks. Since these banks and other huge companies are fronts for the same few families, there is no longer any room for mobsters or any of the rest of those people. They went extinct some time in the 1960's. All the *Godfather* movies and *Soprano* shows are just misdirection to make you think organized crime still exists in the old way. It doesn't. They have found ways to steal much larger sums of money without getting their hands dirty or their names in the paper—with absolutely no risk of getting caught. They do it by stealing from you under the aegis of the Federal government.

Anyway, so that is who funded the Hawking impostor after 1985. But why? Well, we have seen all sorts of weirdness afoot in physics and other science since then. I haven't made up this weirdness, you know, I just circle it and comment on it. See [my paper](#) on Hawking's *Brave New World*, if you haven't already. See [my paper on Yuri Milner](#) and the Fundamental Physics Prize. See [my paper on the Higgs](#)

[Boson announcement](#), which I show was faked from the ground up. See [my paper on Alan Guth](#) and the faked gravity wave research and promotion which preceded his 2014 Kavli Prize. Well, the reason for all this weirdness is the reason for all the other weirdnesses in the Modern world: money. Physics has become a giant cash cow, milked straight from the various national treasuries by the usual suspects. Hundreds of billions of dollars are siphoned from the people of Europe, China, Russia, and the Americas via these fake programs. And Hawking was an important PR personality in the early 1980's, one they didn't want to lose. He was a top salesman of their various boondoggles, and he became an even better salesman once he was replaced by an impostor. Once he was replaced, his puppeteers had complete control over the product they were creating, with no fear that the real Hawking might develop scruples.

Remember, this is exactly what they did in art in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They got rid of all the real artists and replaced them with impostors. The scheme was slightly different, in that they didn't replace Rodin and Monet and Whistler with look-alikes in 1900. Instead, they just replaced the entire field with their own manufactured mannequins over a generation or two. But the Modern artists have been impostors one way or the other. They certainly aren't artists by the old definitions, since they can't create anything beautiful or interesting. They are just PR personalities, the faces that front the fakery.

In the very same way, physics has been taken over. Just as the Modern artists are incapable of real art, the Modern physicists are incapable of real physics. So instead they manufacture some huge pile of equations that seems (to some gullible people) to resemble physics or math, and then sell it to Congress or Parliament as cutting-edge. The important thing is not that any physics or art gets done, but that money flows from the treasury. It is all a colossal scam, of earth-shattering proportions. And I mean that literally. All the societies of this Earth are being shattered by this rampant fakery. They are coming apart at the seams. Not only are they being milked dry of all revenues—revenues that could and should be going to real programs—but they are being milked dry of all inspiration, all creativity, all good will, and all belief in humanity. Human potential is shriveling up like a spider on a hot sidewalk under a magnifying glass, and these rich families are the magnifying glass.

It has to stop. It has gotten so bad, the rich are actually undercutting themselves. For money to be worth anything there has to be something worth buying. The rich can no longer collect art, since they have destroyed it. They can no longer have the joy of underwriting real science, since they have destroyed it. They can't collect books or poetry, since they have destroyed both literature and poetry. They can't enjoy the company of innocent youths, since they have destroyed the innocence of youth. They can't enjoy love, because they have destroyed it for profit. They can't enjoy beautiful architecture, because they have destroyed it. And they can't enjoy the feeling of a day well spent, because their days *aren't* well spent. That is the thing about dirty money and a dirty conscience: no matter how much you spend, you can't hire someone to clean it.

[I am rushing this into print with only a few days research, since I predict they will announce his death very very soon.]

**Addendum, April 22, 2015:** Two days after this paper went up, there was [an internet death hoax](#) for Hawking. Someone got over a million hits at Facebook with this hoax. I read that two ways: 1) the widely publicized hoax acts to cover this paper a bit, because some will dismiss my title without reading the paper, thinking it is linked to the hoax. For this reason, I assume the death hoax was started by the same people that are behind the longterm Hawking hoax. 2) We have seen that these internet death hoaxes often now precede a real death announcement. See the strange goings-on before the announcement of Robin Williams' death (which I assume was faked like the rest). This confusion is

created on purpose, because it prevents most people from making any sense of the news. Confusing news prevents questions—perhaps surprisingly—because it causes most people's brains to shut down. You would think confusing news would create questions, and in a few people it still does. But in the majority of people, very confusing news acts as its own shield. If enough confusion is created, the reader or viewer will just see a tangled web he has no hope of unwinding, causing him to accept whatever he is told and “move on.” For this reason, I will double down on my prediction that the real death announcement of Hawking is coming soon. However, we know they are reading my papers, so they may stall just for the purpose of nixing my prediction. At any rate, my intuition tells me the blonde impostor died recently and they are already stalling. Maybe they are looking for another replacement, who knows. I think it will be hard to find someone who looked like the blonde impostor did at the end.

**Addendum, April 25 2015:** We already have new evidence for my claim that the Hawking impostor is also dead, in that his current appearances are via hologram. [Last night he appeared](#) in Sydney via hologram, but these 3D images *cannot be confirmed to be live*. Like any other images, holograms can be taped and played back later. I will be told he responds to live questions, but that can be explained in any number of ways, included planted questions. But even if we assume or prove the questions are live and not planted, the responses of Hawking all have to be *interpreted*, which allows for any amount of trickery. From visual and aural clues alone, there is no way to tell what Hawking is responding to, which you will have to admit is convenient.

[There is now a follow-up to this paper](#) from 2018. At that time, the *Daily Mail* in London published a piece based on my research here *and admitted I was right*. Two months later MI5/6 retired the project, with the announcement of Hawking's death. 33 years late.