

# HOW LIGHT PULLS ELECTRONS BACKWARD

*by Miles Mathis*

*First written September 4, 2019*

In [an article](#) from August 2 by Mark Buchanan at *Physics*, it was reported that light was pulling electrons back at a boundary. This is a report of a paper at *Physical Review Letters* by Jared Strait and Henri Lezec of NIST. This conflicts with similar previous experiments which showed light pushing electrons forward. It is shown that with metal exposed to air, light pushes electrons at the boundary forward; but in vacuum it pushes them backward. Neither the authors nor any other physicists have shown a good reason for this dichotomy, with most admitting mystification. For instance, Stephen Barnett at University of Glasgow is quoted as saying he is “not sure what to make of it”. Not once in the article is spin mentioned.

But my readers already know the answer. We have hit it many times, most recently in my paper called [Cool Moonlight](#), where we saw that light can cause either heating or cooling, depending on its spin. Before that we saw it in my paper on [Raman Scattering](#), where I showed the real spin of light causes the various effects. Earlier, we saw it in my paper on [Raleigh Scattering](#), where I showed all anti-Stokes effects are due to spin. Most explicitly we saw it in my 2015 paper called [The Pushing Force of Light](#), in which I refuted both Minkowski and Abraham by showing it was light's real spin causing the effects. Also see my 2018 paper on the electron called [What Rutherford Really Proved about the Electron](#), where I show it is released from the north pole of the nucleus, explaining its opposing spin to the main field. In other words, the electron is spinning opposite the ambient charge field. As such, it is actually the quantum of anticharge.

The reason this explains light pulling electrons backward is that common light can either be photonic or antiphotonic as a whole. For more on this, see my 2018 paper called [Additive Color Theory and Antiphotons](#), where I show that light is almost always a mixture of photons and antiphotons. But in some situations the photons will outnumber, and in others the antiphotons will. In one case they will push electrons, in the other they will pull. This is because both electrons and photons have real spins. Not just polarization, which is often explained as intrinsic or virtual in current theory; but **real spins**.

To see another manifestation of the same thing, visit my 2013 paper called [Blackbody Radiation as an Attraction](#). There you will see the ground-level cause of the attraction—what they are calling here a pulling backward. In both cases, it isn't an actual attraction or pull, it is a loss of repulsion. Opposite spins cause spin cancellations, which cause an energy loss. That energy loss at the boundary causes a low in the field at that spot, which electrons then move into. So the electrons aren't really pulled backward, they are simply pushed forward less than they were before the light hit the area, causing them to move out toward the boundary. This creates an *apparent* pull.

Conversely, when light pushes electrons at a boundary, it is because the spin of the light matches the spin of the charge field in the metal, augmenting the spin and therefore the energy of the field. It is like a gain in charge density, though it is a spin gain, not a particle gain. This gain creates more repulsion in the field, driving any ions inward, where the charge field is less energetic.

In this way, you see the full explanation is a field explanation. It isn't that the photons in the light are

spinning the electron itself up or down (although that also happens). Rather, it is that the photons are colliding among themselves, augmenting or diminishing the total spin energy in the field. I will be reminded that I have previously stated that photon fields are interpenetrable, which is true. But I have also said that nuclei and electrons recycle photons through them, and that photons collide edge to edge during this recycling. Charge is compressed during recycling, and it is there that the collisions take place. So photon fields are only interpenetrable when not in the presence of matter or plasma. The more matter or ions that are present, the more photon interaction we will get.

The reason light pushes forward when air is involved is again due to spin matching. Since the metal has a stronger and denser charge field than the air around it, the air will align to the metal. It is the densest body in the environs that sets the charge field. If the field in the metal is spinning mainly left, the field in the air will spin match itself to that in a short time. Light travelling through the air will also be spin matched, so when the light hits the metal, we have a spin augmentation. This pushes the electrons in. But when the air is not there, there is no spin matching. The light can then be spinning either way, depending on the set-up. In a vacuum surrounding a body of any sort, you will still find a charge field, since there is no such thing as a charge vacuum. That vacuum will tend to have the opposite charge (spin) of the body, for a very simple reason: parity. See the conservation of positive and negative electricity from the old textbooks, for an example of the same thing. In short, every right spin demands a left spin, since all spins are caused by edge hits among photons. No right spin can be created on its own, by the laws of collision. Therefore, a field of left spinners demands a field of right spinners, and that field is usually nearby. The easiest place for it to set up is in an adjacent vacuum, also for obvious reasons: no matter or ions are preventing it from doing so. Inside the metal, there is a spin coherence caused by nuclear alignments and currents, so the odds are good any right spinners will be turned into left spinners. But outside the metal, the odds of that go to zero, so right spinners will naturally congregate there. Light then travelling through that field will also tend to be spinning right.

I will be told there is no mechanism to force light to spin right in a right-spinning vacuum, which would be true if the vacuum were total. But of course you can't create such a thing, especially near a metal. In this experiment, the space beyond the metal can't possibly be a total vacuum, since there is nothing to stop the metal from releasing some ions into its surroundings. It can only be a partial vacuum, with an ion density much less than the metal. But any ion density is enough to affect light, since light recycles through any ions in its path.

It will then be pointed out that I have appeared to contradict myself. Air aligns to the metal, but the vacuum or a weak ion field will not. How can that be? It is because air is molecular, containing nuclei, which are much stronger channelers of the charge field than ions. Ions are normally electrons, which do channel but channel very weakly compared to the nucleus. So we have a straightforward mechanism for the metal linking to the air, and aligning or cohering it. But the metal cannot align the weak ion field in the same way, since the linkage is far too weak. So although the ion field can align the light, which is smaller still, the metal cannot align the ion field. So the metal cannot align the light, you see.

---

---

At that page at *Physics*, I noticed an announcement in the sidebar. We are informed that a lady named Raissa **D'Souza** has just been appointed lead editor of *Physical Review Research*. That jumped out at me as a red flag for many reasons, the first being a guy named Dinesh D'Souza. Google him and you will quickly find he is a high-ranking literary/political spook, blackwashing various positions with his

antics. He is obviously an Intel operative of some sort, though of course I can't peg him as CIA or NSA or DHS—though I would suspect the last one. He is part East Indian, of wealthy families that are probably of Jewish or Phoenician lines. My guess is Raissa is related to him, though no information is easily discovered online on that. She may be his daughter, since he does have a daughter that age, name not given. Neither person is given an early bio. But the red flags don't stop there. Raissa is also connected to the Santa Fe Institute, a known spook front. She is quite young for the position of lead editor, having gotten her PhD in 1999. Afterwards she worked on a postdoc, then went to work for Bell Labs and then for Microsoft. Two more towering red flags, indicating links to Intelligence. Her previous work has centered on theoretical computer science—most of which is smoke, of course—with a focus on cascading failures. Ironic that, since all of physics is now a cascading failure. In my mind, this is just more proof that the sciences have been taken over by Intelligence, and that most of what you read is misdirection and propaganda, not just in the popular journals like *(Un)Scientific American*, but in the “professional” journals like *(Non)Physical Review*.