

## Re: 1 FERTZ

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2004-06/0039.html>

---

**From:** Bjoern Feuerbacher ([feuerbac\\_at\\_thphys.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:feuerbac_at_thphys.uni-heidelberg.de))

**Date:** 06/03/04

Date: Thu, 03 Jun 2004 16:40:17 +0200

Y.Porat wrote:

> *Bjoern Feuerbacher* <[feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)> wrote in message  
news:<c9mo0e\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de>...

>

>>Y.Porat wrote:

>>

>>>*Bjoern Feuerbacher* <[feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)> wrote in message  
news:<c9kvur\$4mk\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de>...

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>>*Oh, BTW, when Newton computed the orbit of the earth around the  
>>sun – had he also to consider all the details of the mass distribution  
>>in the earth, in your opinion?*

>

> -----

> *there is only a litle difference between netons calculations and yourse:*

>

> *nertons is \*macrocosm\**

> *wile your fertz should belong to microcosm*

Complete utter nonsense. An electromagnetic wave which comes from the orbit of the earth around the sun belongs *\*obviously\** to the macrocosm, since that orbit itself belongs to the macrocosm. That the wave is essentially created by the motion of microscopic particles is *\*IRRELEVANT\**, since the *\*MACROSCOPIC MOTION\** of these particles is what creates the wave.

Does the creation of a radio wave by an antenna *\*also\** belong to the "microcosm"? If yes, then why is the frequency of the created wave *\*equal\** to the frequency of the oscillating charges and currents in the antenna? Furthermore, why is this true *\*regardless of the shape of the antenna\**?

> *unless you understand the diffrence you will remain the real crackpot.*

Unless you understand that your ramblings about "microcosm" are nonsense, you will remain the real crackpot.

> -----  
>  
>  
>>  
>>>you ignored all of the reservations that  
>>>other readers ponted to you about the real situation  
>>>and stick oOnly to your paper.  
>>  
>>Err, no. I \*dealt\* with these reservations, and it turned out  
>>that they are simply irrelevant for the problem at hand.  
>  
> -----  
> you are cheating at this point

No, not at all. You see problems where none are, since you didn't understand a word of what the other posters really said.

> the sun radiation is \*the relevant factor here:

Err, no. The solar \*wind\* is relevant here (since it provides a plasma, and in a plasma, there is a cut-off frequency). The solar \*wind\* has \*nothing\* to do with the solar \*radiation\*.

Thanks for again demonstrating to everyone that you have no clue what you are talking about.

And, BTW, I \*did\* address the plasma frequency. It is \*irrelevant\* for the problem at hand. All the things you brought up so far were \*irrelevant\* to the problem at hand – i.e., they were simply obfuscations. (see, I can also use some of your beloved nonsensical accusations!)

> now since your new equations are so good

There is nothing new about these equations. As I said about 20 times now, they have been known for at least 100 years now.

> please tell us :  
> what will be the energy of your fertz (say in ergs)

The "fertz" is a frequency. Frequencies don't have energies.

Do you mean the energy of the wave with that frequency, or what?

If yes, what is so important about that?

> 2 what is the energy of sun radiation in comparison  
> to that energy of your fertz.?

As I said above, the radiation of the sun is *\*totally\**  
*\*irrelevant\** here.

If you mean the energy in the solar *\*wind\**: why on earth should  
*\*that\** be relevant

> *3 what is your prve that suin radiation does not change*  
> *during the year*

The radiation of the sun (as well as the solar wind) do indeed  
change during the year.

SO WHAT?????

> -----  
> *crackpot*  
> *Y.Porat*  
> -----

Thanks that you keep pointing that out?

Bye,  
Bjoern