

THE TWO-SLIT EXPERIMENT REVISITED

by Miles Mathis

First published July 14, 2021

I am still waiting on my delayed move and so I needed something to write about today. Fortunately a reader was nice enough to send me a [new youtube video](#) on this subject. It is not just the usual gassy theories and crumby mainstream illustrations, it is an actual experiment with a clear and straightforward set-up, a logical and concise introduction, and a somewhat new result. Unfortunately the author still relies on mainstream assumptions, coming to the usual faulty conclusions, but that is nearly beside the point. We don't need him to tell us what to think, since we can already think for ourselves. But we are grateful to him for his work nonetheless.

We don't require his or the mainstream misdirection, since [I already solved this one 13 years ago](#). There I proposed what should have already been obvious: the introduced light is not the only light present in this experiment, or any like it. So it does not have to interfere with itself to explain any patterns. To be specific, in this experiment, the author is using a slit or two slits that he has etched in Chromium. Well, the Chromium is already emitting light before the laser is turned on, so why hasn't anyone ever remembered that?

What do I mean? I mean all matter is recycling charge all the time, and charge is light. Everyone after Maxwell knew that, or should have. So the slit is already full of interfering charge before any light is sent through. I guess the reason no one thought of that is that charge is in the infrared, and so is normally invisible. They never think to do this experiment in the infrared, do they? If they did, they would see interference patterns already present before the laser is turned on. If we saw the world like snakes or frogs, we could never have misread this experiment like we have.

Therefore, this experiment is once again direct proof of my theory and direct disproof of mainstream theories of light.

What should have clued in our author here is that he admits you don't need two slits to create these interference patterns. They are already present with one slit. Why? Because one slit already has *two* walls.

Huygens long ago described this as diffraction, and no one since him has had a new thought on the subject. But diffraction was a canard and dead-end from the get-go, since it ignored the ambient field. Huygens and others of the time, including Newton, focused their attention only on the introduced light and the material edges, ignoring the ambient field. They can be forgiven for not understanding there was a pre-existing charge field present, being emitted by the slit walls, but we cannot. The princes of quantum mechanics have been aware of charge for almost a century, but they still have not thought to give it a real presence in the field. They mysteriously continue to ignore it in this experiment and all others up to the present moment. For them it remains only little plusses and minuses on charged particles, or naked and unassigned field potentials, or placeholders in the matrices. No one ever thinks to give it a physical presence here.

Therefore, when our author says at minute 11:30,

And the result is actually amazingly clear: whether the photons are alone in the beam or whether there are many at the same time, the results of all these interference measurements are exactly the same. This proves that a photon does not need the presence of another photon to display interference,

he is—wittingly or unwittingly—misdirecting. It proves nothing of the sort. We now know that the ambient field is already stiff with charge photons, so even if only one photon is introduced by the laser, it is interacting with billions of charge photons already there.

Our author admits that here, but misses it. At minute 10:57 he shows us that when he increases the sensor gain, he gets a lot of thermal noise. That means he is detecting the charge field, since “thermal” means he is in the infrared. That is where charge is as well. These people always mistake charge for heat and subtract it out of their experiments, ignoring it after that. We have seen it a million times, in experiments in all subfields. He does this as well, since he cools his apparatus to -5C to get rid of it. That doesn't get rid of the charge field, of course, it just tamps it down so that he can continue to ignore it. But you can't vacuum out the charge field. Even at absolute zero on Earth it will still be there. So it is still there in this experiment, creating pre-existing patterns. He has just hidden it below the threshold of his sensor.

Personally, I think our unnamed author here is misdirecting on purpose, since after the quote above, he goes completely off the beam, selling you mainstream theory right out of the bag. He tells us that each photon is going through both slits at the same time, “which is pretty weird”. It isn't weird, it is just stupid, considering what we now know. How could mainstream science ever think this thought, much less promote it decade after decade as a possibility?

Our author claims he has given it careful thought, but that is not believable. No one who had given this question careful thought would EVER try to salvage the idea that one photon is going through both slits. They would immediately move to plan B. Instead, the author ignores that and shunts you off into the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, which, by the way, has now been overthrown. Mainstream articles [have admitted that](#), and I have quoted them and commented on them already. So it is difficult to understand why our author has diverted into this, unless he is fudging all this for the usual reasons. Basically, he uses the HUP to smear the photon out into a particle much larger than its given wavelength, allowing part of it to go through both slits. However, that is a cheat even by the rules of quantum mechanics, since it is not allowed to use the wave function on a photon to smear it out beyond its wavelength. The wave function of a photon is or should be defined by its wavelength: hence the name. So the probability of finding a photon outside its own wavelength should be zero. Instead, our dishonest author makes up some rule by which the photon can be ANYWHERE it is allowed to go. And yes, I mean anywhere. An emitted photon's “spatial probability function” is a sphere expanding at the speed of light from the point of emission, so after a few seconds the photon is as big as Solar System. That's convenient for mainstream theory, right? But do we have any evidence of that, or did someone just make it up? What do you think? Our author quotes Heisenberg as the authority here, but that is meaningless, since Heisenberg never showed any reason this should be so. It is contrary to all logic and experiment, so why is our author pushing the idea here? Because he isn't as honest as he tries to come off in the first half of this video. Basically, he is just another pettifogger.

If you watch the video closely at this point in the argument, you should realize how this probability math is being fudged. Our author implies that the spatial probability function is being calculated from some rules or equations of quantum mechanics, but it isn't. It is being calculated from nothing. Basically, the same calculation could be done on any particle we had zero knowledge of. “If we have

no knowledge of the particle, its probability of being anywhere is the same". In other words, it could be anywhere. Is that quantum math? No, it is just probability math applied to nescience. So neither Heisenberg nor our author are actually doing quantum mechanics here. They are just claiming that because they know nothing about the photon, it could be anywhere. That's true in a sense, but it doesn't imply the photon really is EVERYWHERE. Because I don't know where you live, doesn't mean you don't live anywhere, much less that you live everywhere. This is just math and logic for the unwashed.

But our author continues to misdirect, assuring us that if we don't understand that before we detected it, the photon *really was everywhere*, we are just exhibiting limited intelligence. He says that concept is one of the most difficult for humans to grasp. No, I fully grasp it. But what I grasp is that these guys like Heisenberg and our author are liars trying to sell illogic as logic. They are trying to force this shit down our throats by using shame and other sub-collegiate debating tricks. And it makes me furious. It is a good thing I don't have to meet any of these people face to face, since I might punch one of them in face. They are so slimy and dishonest it truly passes belief.

Remember that if you ever meet a professional physicist, mathematician, or scientist. These are people that have agreed to be part of a field led by people like this. For whatever personal reasons they have, they have agreed to continue selling this crap to their students and to the public. We know these people like our author here are not stupid. We can tell that from the first half of the video, where he comes off as very educated, disciplined, and clear-headed. So why would he switch gears in the second half and stoop to try to browbeat us into accepting this pretend math as real math? He has to know what he is doing. It can't have escaped his notice that he is doing extravagantly bad math here, of a very low order. Which must mean he is lying on purpose. Why? I propose it is to keep you confused, so that you can't find the ground to tell him to shut up and make sense. Because if you and other citizens had the gumption to do that, you would also have the gumption to cut off funding to all the fake multi-million dollar science projects being funded by your taxdollars. And if that happened, the midlevel physicists and engineers would have the gumption to drum all the top posers out of the field, allowing us to start over from scratch. Instead of *talking* about a revolution in science, we would actually have one.