

13 THINGS THAT DON'T MAKE SENSE

'Entertaining ... engagingly written ... a worthwhile read for budding explorers of new worlds' Jon Turney, *Independent*

'Odd data clusters are crime scenes, over which Brooks combs with the reassuring casualness of an expert ... to provide riveting cliffhangers of scientific detection ... admirable' Steven Poole, *Guardian*

'This entertaining and often provocative book examines such mysteries as dark matter and dark energy, the prospect of life on Mars, sex and death, free will and the placebo effect, among other head-scratchers ... The book is at its best when Brooks throws himself into the action. He undergoes transcranial magnetic stimulation to test the assumption that he has free will, and subjects himself to electric shocks for a placebo-response test ... This elegantly written, meticulously researched and thought-provoking book provides a window into how science actually works, and is sure to spur intense debate.' Jennifer Ouellette, *New Scientist*

'Buy yourself a copy, and prepare yourself to be entertained and challenged in equal measure' Robert Matthews, *BBC Focus*

'Brooks expertly works his way through ... hotly debated quandaries in a smooth, engaging writing style reminiscent of Carl Sagan or Stephen Jay Gould ... every mystery is brought to life in vivid detail, and wit and humour are sprinkled throughout' Anahad O'Connor, *New York Times*

'Brooks is an exemplary science writer. His explanations have the sort of clarity you often yearn for when you read about science, but rarely find. I'm relatively ignorant when it comes to science. But now I feel I can discuss complex things ... This is the sort of science book one always hopes for. Learned, but easy to read. Packed with detail, but clear. Reading it will make you feel clever.' William Leith, *Daily Telegraph*

'Like Indiana Jones in a lab coat, Brooks throws himself energetically into the search and comes back with first-hand news from the wild frontiers of weird science.' Iain Finlayson, *Saga*

‘Sparklingly written ... Brooks’ enthusiasm is infectious’ *Times Higher Education Supplement*

‘A fascinating read ... This clear-eyed book is a refreshing insight’ *Big Issue*

‘Wow! is one of the things that Michael Brooks includes here – it is the signal from space that may have come from an alien civilization – but it’s also the way I feel about this book’s magical mystery tour. You will be amazed and astonished when you learn that science has been unable to come up with a working definition of life, why death should happen at all, why sex is necessary, or whether cold fusion is a hoax or one of the greatest breakthroughs of all time. Strap yourself in and prepare for a Wow! of an experience.’ Richard Ellis, author of *The Empty Ocean*

‘Excellent ... Brooks is breezy and fun – always readable and never dull ... each chapter is a little vessel of delights ... deserves to be up there as one of the best popular science books of 2008/9. Recommended.’

popularscience.co.uk

MICHAEL BROOKS, who holds a PhD in quantum physics, is a consultant to *New Scientist* magazine. His writing has appeared in the *Guardian*, *Independent*, *Observer* and *Times Higher Educational Supplement*. He has lectured at Cambridge University, the American Museum of Natural History and New York University, and is a regular speaker and debate chair at the Science Festival in Brighton. www.michaelbrooks.org

13 THINGS THAT DON'T MAKE SENSE

THE MOST INTRIGUING SCIENTIFIC MYSTERIES OF OUR TIME

Michael Brooks

P
PROFILE BOOKS

This paperback edition published in 2010

First published in Great Britain in 2009 by
PROFILE BOOKS LTD
3A Exmouth House
Pine Street
London EC1R 0JH
www.profilebooks.com

First published in the United States of America by
Doubleday, a division of Random House, Inc., New York

Copyright © Michael Brooks, 2009, 2010

This book is based on an article that originally appeared
in the 19 March, 2005 issue of the *New Scientist*

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Bookmarque, Croydon, Surrey

Book design by Elizabeth Rendfleisch

The moral right of the author has been asserted.

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise), without the prior written permission of both the copyright owner and the publisher of this book.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978 1 86197 647 5
eISBN 978 1 84765 130 3



*To Mr. Sumner, for lasting inspiration and fascination.
I hope this repays some of my debt.*

Also to Phillippa, Millie, and Zachary for inspiration every day.

The most exciting phrase to
hear in science, the one that
heralds the most discoveries,
is not “Eureka!” but “That’s
funny . . .”

—ISAAC ASIMOV

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE 1

- 1 THE MISSING UNIVERSE 7**
We can only account for 4 percent of the cosmos
- 2 THE PIONEER ANOMALY 36**
Two spacecraft are flouting the laws of physics
- 3 VARYING CONSTANTS 46**
Destabilizing our view of the universe
- 4 GOLD FUSION 57**
Nuclear energy without the drama
- 5 LIFE 69**
Are you more than just a bag of chemicals?
- 6 VIKING 83**
NASA scientists found evidence for life on Mars. Then they changed their minds.
- 7 THE WOW! SIGNAL 97**
Has ET already been in touch?
- 8 A GIANT VIRUS 110**
It's a freak that could rewrite the story of life

9 DEATH 122

Evolution's problem with self-destruction

10 SEX 136

There are better ways to reproduce

11 FREE WILL 151

Your decisions are not your own

12 THE PLACEBO EFFECT 164

Who's being deceived?

13 HOMEOPATHY 181

It's patently absurd, so why won't it go away?

EPILOGUE 203

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 211

NOTES AND SOURCES 213

INDEX 225

13 THINGS THAT DON'T MAKE SENSE

PROLOGUE

I am standing in the magnificent lobby of the Hotel Metropole in Brussels, watching three Nobel laureates struggle with the elevator.

It's certainly not an easy elevator to deal with; it's an open mesh cage, with a winch system that looks like something Isambard Kingdom Brunel might have built. When I first got into it three days ago, I felt like I was traveling back in time. But at least I got it to work.

Embarrassed for the scientists, I look away for a moment and distract myself with the grandeur of my surroundings. The Metropole was built at the end of the nineteenth century and is almost ridiculously ornate. The walls are paneled with vast slabs of marble, the ceilings decorated in subtle but beautiful gold and sage green geometric patterns. The glittering crystal chandeliers radiate a warmth that makes me want to curl up and go to sleep beneath their light. In fact, there are glowing, comforting lights everywhere. Outside, in the Place de Brouckère, the wind is blowing a bitter cold across the city; faced with the bleak December beyond those revolving doors, I feel like I could stand here forever.

The Nobel laureates are still struggling. No one else seems to have noticed their plight, and I'm wondering whether to walk across the lobby and

offer help. When I had my long fight with the door, I discovered there's something about the shutter mechanism that defies logic—when you think it must be locked, it isn't; it needs a final pull. But it occurs to me that people who have attached Nobel Academy pins to their lapels ought to be able to work that out for themselves.

I like to think of scientists as being on top of things, able to explain the world we live in, masters of their universe. But maybe that's just a comforting delusion. When I can tear myself away from the farce playing out in the elevator, I will be getting into a cab and leaving behind perhaps the most fascinating conference I have ever attended. Not because there was new scientific insight—quite the contrary. It was the fact that there was no insight, seemingly no way forward for these scientists, that made the discussions so interesting. In science, being completely and utterly stuck can be a good thing; it often means a revolution is coming.

The discussion at the conference was focused on string theory, the attempt to tie quantum theory together with Einstein's theory of relativity. The two are incompatible; we need to rework them to describe the universe properly, and string theory may be our best bet. Or maybe not. I have spent the last three days listening to some of today's greatest minds discuss how we might combine relativity and quantum theory. And their conclusion was that, more than three decades after the birth of string theory, we still don't really know where to start.

This was a Solvay physics conference, a meeting with the richest of histories. At the first Solvay conference in 1911—the world's first physics conference—the delegates debated what was to be made of the newly discovered phenomenon of radioactivity. Here in this hotel Marie Curie, Hendrik Lorentz, and the young Albert Einstein debated how it was that radioactive materials could apparently defy the laws of conservation of energy and momentum. Radioactivity was an anomaly; it didn't make sense. The problem was eventually solved by the birth of quantum theory. At the 1927 Solvay conference, though, the strange nature of quantum theory caused its own problems, provoking Einstein and Niels Bohr, Lorentz and Erwin Schrödinger, Ernest Rutherford and John von Neumann to sit discussing these new laws of physics with the same degree of confusion as they had shown toward radioactivity.

It was an extraordinary moment in the history of science. Quantum theory encapsulated the novel idea that some things in nature are entirely random, happen entirely without cause. This made no sense to Einstein or Bohr, and the pair spent their time outside the formal discussions sparring over what it all meant. They had entirely different philosophical approaches to dealing with that mystery, however. To Bohr, it meant some things might be beyond the scope of science. To Einstein, it meant something was wrong with the theory; it was here in this hotel that Einstein made his famous remark that “God does not play dice.” Bohr’s reaction faces up to scientists’ biggest frustration: that they don’t get to set the rules. “Einstein,” he said, “stop telling God what to do.”

Neither man lived to see a satisfactory solution to the enigma—it remains unsolved, in fact. But if some delegates at the twenty-third Solvay conference are to be believed, it seems Bohr might have been right about there being limits to science. Half of the string theorists present, some of the greatest minds in the world, are now convinced that we can never fully comprehend the universe. The other seekers after a “theory of everything” think there must be some explanation available to us. But they have no idea where to find it. What has led to this extraordinary situation? Yet another anomaly.

This one was discovered in 1997. Analysis of the light from a distant supernova led astronomers to a startling conclusion: that the universe is expanding, and that this expansion is getting faster and faster all the time. The revelation has stunned cosmologists; no one knows why this should be so. All they can say is that some mysterious “dark energy” is blowing up the universe.

This anomaly, an apparently simple observation, has brought string theory to its knees. It cuts away at everything its proponents thought they had achieved. Put simply, they can’t explain it—and many of them feel they should stop trying. There is a straightforward answer staring us in the face, they say: our universe must be one of many universes, each with different characteristics. To try to find reasons why those characteristics are as they are in our universe, they argue, is a waste of time.

But it is not. There is something inspiring about this—and any— anomaly. When Thomas Kuhn wrote *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* in the early 1960s, he wanted to examine the history of science for clues to

the nature of discovery. The clues led him to invent the term—now a cliché—*paradigm shift*. Scientists work with one set of ideas about how the world is. Everything they do, be it experimental or theoretical work, is informed by, and framed within, that set of ideas. There will be some evidence that doesn't fit, however. At first, that evidence will be ignored or sabotaged. Eventually, though, the anomalies will pile up so high they simply cannot be ignored or sabotaged any longer. Then comes crisis.

Crisis, Kuhn said, is soon followed by the paradigm shift in which everyone gains a radically new way of looking at the world. Thus were conceived ideas like relativity, quantum theory, and the theory of plate tectonics.

The dark energy situation is another such crisis. You can see it as depressing, a hint that science has hit a brick wall. But, equally, you can see it as exciting and inspiring. Something has now got to give, and the breakthrough could come from anywhere at any time. What is even more exciting is that it is not the only anomaly of our time—not by a long way.

It is not even the only one in cosmology. Another cosmic problem, dark matter, was first spotted in the 1930s. Following Kuhn's template almost exactly, it was ignored for nearly forty years. Vera Rubin, an astronomer at Washington, D.C.'s Carnegie Institution, was the one to nail it down and make people deal with it. In the early 1970s, she showed that the shape, size, and spin of galaxies means either there is something wrong with gravity or there's much more matter out there in space than we can see. No one wants to mess with Newton's laws governing gravity, but neither do we know what this dark matter might be.

It's sometimes comforting to imagine that science is mastering the universe, but the facts tell a different story. Put together, dark matter and dark energy make up 96 percent of the universe. Just two anomalous scientific results have told us that we can see only a tiny fraction of what we call the cosmos. The good news is that cosmologists are now, perhaps, emerging from Kuhn's crisis stage and are in the process of reinventing our universe—or they will be once they manage to work out where the paradigm shift should lead.

Other, equally stirring anomalies—revolutions-in-waiting, perhaps—await our attention closer to home too. There is the placebo effect: carefully planned, rigorously controlled experiments repeatedly show that the mind

can affect the body's biochemistry in ways that banish pain and produce startling medical effects. Except that, like dark matter, no one is quite sure that the placebo effect really exists. Cold fusion experiments, where nuclear reactions inside metal atoms safely release more energy than they consume, have also survived nearly two decades of skepticism, and the U.S. Department of Energy recently declared that the laboratory evidence is strong enough to merit funding of a new round of experimental research. The thing is, cold fusion goes against all the received wisdom in physics; there is no good explanation for why it should work—or even strong evidence that it does. But it is still worth investigating: the hints that we do have suggest that it could expose a new, deeper theory of physics that could have an enormous impact on many aspects of science. Then there is the “intelligent” signal from outer space that has defied explanation for thirty years; the enigma of our sense of free will despite all scientific evidence to the contrary; the spacecraft that are being pushed off course by an unknown force; the trouble we have explaining the origin of both sex and death using our best biological theories . . . the list goes on.

The philosopher Karl Popper once said, rather cruelly perhaps, that “science may be described as the art of systematic oversimplification.” Though that is an oversimplification in itself, it is clear that science still has plenty to be humble about. But here is the point that is often missed by scientists eager to look as if nothing is beyond their abilities. Dark energy has been described as the most embarrassing problem in physics. But it is not; it is surely the greatest opportunity in physics—it gives us reason to examine our oversimplifications and correct them, bringing us to a new state of knowledge. The future of science depends on identifying the things that don't make sense; our attempts to explain anomalies are exactly what drives science forward.

In the 1500s, a set of celestial anomalies led the astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus to the realization that the Earth goes around the Sun—not the other way around. In the 1770s, the chemists Antoine Lavoisier and Joseph Priestley inferred the existence of oxygen through experimental results that defied all the theories of the time. Through several decades, plenty of people noticed the strange jigsaw-piece similarity between the east coast of South America and the west coast of Africa, but it wasn't until 1915 that someone

pointed out it could be more than a coincidence. Alfred Wegener's insightful observation led to our theory of plate tectonics and continental drift; it is an observation that, at a stroke, did away with the "stamp-collecting" nature of geologic science and gave it a unifying theory that opened up billions of years of Earth's history for inspection. Charles Darwin performed a similar feat for biology with his theory of evolution by natural selection; the days of remarking on the wide variety of life on Earth without being able to tie them all together were suddenly over. It is not just an issue of experiments and observations either; there are intellectual anomalies. The incompatibility of two theories, for example, led Albert Einstein to devise relativity, a revolutionary theory that has forever changed our view of space, time, and the vast reaches of the universe.

Einstein didn't win his Nobel Prize for relativity. It was another anomaly—the strange nature of heat radiation—that brought him science's ultimate accolade. Observations of heat had led Max Planck to suggest that radiation could be considered as existing in lumps, or quanta. For Planck, this quantum theory was little more than a neat mathematical trick, but Einstein used it to show it was much more. Inspired by Planck's work, Einstein proved that light was quantized—and that experiments could reveal each quantum packet of energy. It was this discovery, that the stuff of the universe was built from blocks, that won him the 1922 Nobel Prize for Physics.

Not that a Nobel Prize for Physics is the answer to everything—my view across the Metropole's lobby makes that abundantly clear. Why can't these three men, three of the brightest minds of their generation, see the obvious solution? I can't help wondering if Einstein struggled with that elevator; if he did, by now even he, shaking his fist at the Almighty, would have called out for help.

Admitting that you're stuck doesn't come easy to scientists; they have lost the habit of recognizing it as the first step on a new and exciting path. But once you've done it, and enrolled your colleagues in helping resolve the sticky issue rather than proudly having them ignore it, you can continue with your journey. In science, being stuck can be a sign that you are about to make a great leap forward. The things that don't make sense are, in some ways, the only things that matter.

1

THE MISSING UNIVERSE

We can only account for 4 percent
of the cosmos

The Indian tribes around the sleepy Arizona city of Flagstaff have an interesting take on the human struggle for peace and harmony. According to their traditions, the difficulties and confusions of life have their roots in the arrangement of the stars in the heavens—or rather the lack of it. Those jewels in the sky were meant to help us find a tranquil, contented existence, but when First Woman was using the stars to write the moral laws into the blackness, Coyote ran out of patience and flung them out of her bowl, spattering them across the skies. From Coyote's primal impatience came the mess of constellations in the heavens and the chaos of human existence.

The astronomers who spend their nights gazing at the skies over Flagstaff may find some comfort in this tale. On top of the hill above the city sits a telescope whose observations of the heavens, of the mess of stars and the way they move, have led us into a deep confusion. At the beginning of the twentieth century, starlight passing through the Clark telescope at Flagstaff's Lowell Observatory began a chain of observations that led us to

one of the strangest discoveries in science: that most of the universe is missing.

If the future of science depends on identifying the things that don't make sense, the cosmos has a lot to offer. We long to know what the universe is made of, how it really works: in other words, its constituent particles and the forces that guide their interactions. This is the essence of the "final theory" that physicists dream of: a pithy summation of the cosmos and its rules of engagement. Sometimes newspaper, magazine, and TV reports give the impression that we're almost there. But we're not. It is going to be hard to find that final theory until we have dealt with the fact that the majority of the particles and forces it is supposed to describe are entirely unknown to science. We are privileged enough to be living in the golden age of cosmology; we know an enormous amount about how the cosmos came to be, how it evolved into its current state, and yet we don't actually know what most of it *is*. Almost all of the universe is missing: 96 percent, to put a number on it.

The stars we see at the edges of distant galaxies seem to be moving under the guidance of invisible hands that hold the stars in place and stop them from flying off into empty space. According to our best calculations, the substance of those invisible guiding hands—known to scientists as *dark matter*—is nearly a quarter of the total amount of mass in the cosmos. Dark matter is just a name, though. We don't have a clue what it is.

And then there is the *dark energy*. When Albert Einstein showed that mass and energy were like two sides of the same coin, that one could be converted into the other using the recipe $E = mc^2$, he unwittingly laid the foundations for what is now widely regarded as the most embarrassing problem in physics. Dark energy is scientists' name for the ghostly essence that is making the fabric of the universe expand ever faster, creating ever more empty space between galaxies. Use Einstein's equation for converting energy to mass, and you'll discover that dark energy is actually 70 percent of the mass (after Einstein, we should really call it mass-energy) in the cosmos. No one knows where this energy comes from, what it is, whether it will keep on accelerating the universe's expansion forever, or whether it will run out of steam eventually. When it comes to the major constituents of the universe, it seems no one knows anything much. The familiar world of atoms—the

stuff that makes us up—accounts for only a tiny fraction of the mass and energy in the universe. The rest is a puzzle that has yet to be solved.

HOW did we get here? Via one man's obsession with life on Mars. In 1894 Percival Lowell, a wealthy Massachusetts industrialist, had become fixated on the idea that there was an alien civilization on the red planet. Despite merciless mocking from many astronomers of the time, Lowell decided to search for irrefutable astronomical evidence in support of his conviction. He sent a scout to various locations around the United States; in the end, it was decided that the clear Arizona skies above Flagstaff were perfect for the task. After a couple of years of observing with small telescopes, Lowell bought a huge (for the time) 24-inch refractor from a Boston manufacturer and had it shipped to Flagstaff along the Santa Fe railroad.

Thus began the era of big astronomy. The Clark telescope cost Lowell twenty thousand dollars and is housed in a magnificent pine-clad dome on top of Mars Hill, a steep, switchbacked track named in honor of Lowell's great obsession. The telescope has an assured place in history: in the 1960s the Apollo astronauts used it to get their first proper look at their lunar landing sites. And decades earlier an earnest and reserved young man called Vesto Melvin Slipher used it to kick-start modern cosmology.

Slipher was born an Indiana farm boy in 1875. He came to Flagstaff as Percival Lowell's assistant in 1901, just after receiving his degree in mechanics and astronomy. Lowell took Slipher on for a short, fixed term; he employed Slipher reluctantly, as a grudging favor to one of his old professors. It didn't work out quite as Lowell planned, however. Slipher left fifty-three years later when he retired from the position of observatory director.

Though sympathetic to his boss's obsession, Slipher was not terribly interested in the hunt for Martian civilization. He was more captivated by the way that inanimate balls of gas and dust—the stars and planets—moved through the universe. One of the biggest puzzles facing astronomers of the time was the enigma of the spiral nebulae. These faint glows in the night sky were thought by some to be vast aggregations of stars—"Island Universes," as the philosopher Immanuel Kant had described them. Others believed

them to be simply distant planetary systems. It is almost ironic that, in resolving this question, Slipher's research led us to worry about what we can't see, rather than what we can.

IN 1917, when Albert Einstein was putting the finishing touches to his description of how the universe behaves, he needed to know one experimental fact to pull it all together. The question he asked of the world's astronomers was this: Is the universe expanding, contracting, or holding steady?

Einstein's equations described how the shape of space-time (the dimensions of space and time that together make the fabric of the universe) would develop depending on the mass and energy held within it. Originally, the equations made the universe either expand or contract under the influence of gravity. If the universe was holding steady, he would have to put something else in there: an *antigravity* term that could push where gravity exerted a pull. He wasn't keen to do so; while it made sense for mass and energy to exert a gravitational pull, there was no obvious reason why any antigravity should exist.

Unfortunately for Einstein, there was consensus among astronomers of the time that the universe was holding steady. So, with a heavy heart, he added in the antigravity term to stop his universe expanding or contracting. It was known as the *cosmological constant* (because it affected things over cosmological distances, but not on the everyday scale of phenomena within our solar system), and it was introduced with profuse apologies. This constant, Einstein said, was "not justified by our actual knowledge of gravitation." It was only there to make the equations fit with the data. What a shame, then, that nobody had been paying attention to Vesto Slipher's results.

Slipher had been using the Clark telescope to measure whether the nebulae were moving relative to Earth. For this he used a spectrograph, an instrument that splits the light from telescopes into its constituent colors. Looking at the light from the spiral nebulae, Slipher realized that the various colors in the light would change depending on whether a nebula was moving toward or away from Earth. Color is our way of interpreting the frequency of—that is, the number of waves per second in—radiation. When