

[return to updates](#)

THE PHOTON SPIN IS REAL!

by Miles Mathis

First published May 23, 2013

Although the princes of quantum mechanics have been telling us for many decades that the spins on quanta (both photons and electrons) are intrinsic, some research physicists have known since the 1990's that quantum spins are real. You don't and won't see this knowledge paraded in the mainstream magazines or even in the professional journals, but [you might trip across it on the internet with some luck](#). Prof. Miles Padgett at the University of Glasgow has left the information in plain sight at that link, along with this short text:

It has been known since the middle ages that light exerts a radiation pressure. Not so well known is that light also exerts a twist. The intricate nature of this twist was not recognised until the 1990s and we have been working on it ever since. Beyond the fascination of setting microscopic objects into rotation, this orbital angular momentum may hold the key to better communication sensing and imaging systems.

What that Miles doesn't say explicitly is that this orbital angular momentum OAM must be a real characteristic of light. Otherwise it could not possibly “set (real) objects into rotation,” could it? And if that is so, then this new knowledge that Prof. Miles Padgett is admitting must conflict strongly with the current gauge math, which gives photons no mass, no radius, and no real spin. Prof. Padgett says that the OAM may lead to new technology, but he does not tell you that it must overturn the foundations of quantum mechanics. What this real spin does, and must do, is redefine the entire nature of light, leading us to a totally new theory of photons and the photon field. In short, this experimental data is a strong indication of my new theory of photons and charge, which demands that photons must have real spin, real radius, and real mass equivalence.

To deflect me from this “rush to a conclusion,” mainstream physicists might claim that the imparting of spin is done by a collection of photons, not by each photon individually. But to make that deflection stick, they would have to point to some theory that could mechanically explain how collections of point particles with no mass, no radius, and no real spin could impart real spin to real objects. Of course we have never seen the beginnings of that mechanical theory, or anything like it. And since I have shown it is quite easy to explain this imparting of spin with spinning photons, there is no reason to deflect anyone into a different theory. That should have been the default theory from the beginning, and the only reason we are still shooed away from it is that it is dangerous to the current mathematical mess that stands in the place of a simple mechanical theory.

Is Prof. Padgett's page an implied olive branch to those who question mainstream theory (math)? That is entirely possible, since the page—though short—is written in an open and friendly style. He even welcomes PhD proposals! And I know that university physicists are looking for new ideas in photon theory, since many can see the old theory simply doesn't work. I have recently received emails from other university physicists who have confirmed that to me. So what I plan to do is extend my hand to Prof. Padgett and see what happens. You can follow along while I do it. I will start by simply giving

him a link to my [super.html](#) paper, which may or may not interest him. Since it simultaneously shows the generation of his diagrams from first principles and explains superposition, it seems it might be of interest to him, but you never know. I haven't had any luck getting through to most university physicists—or at least not the ones who referee the journals—so we will not expect too much. But maybe the fact that my name is Miles and the fact I am of Scots extraction will get me over that high first wall.