

Re: Bohr's Atom still number one

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-05/msg01575.html>

- *From:* bz <bz+spr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 10 May 2007 10:28:39 +0000 (UTC)
-

"guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx" <guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
news:1178773380.464933.87660@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

On May 9, 5:32 am, bz <bz+...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"g...@xxxxxxxxxxx" <g...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
innews:1178686901.552915.67220@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

On May 8, 3:40 pm, bz <bz+...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

The explanation given
at <http://bethe.cornell.edu/>
(if I understood it correctly) is that 'not even
the electrons know
where they are' to a high enough accuracy to
be able to 'accelerate'
while they are in their 'orbitals'.

Their location is so uncertain that the
probability plots ARE the
correct 'picture'.

They say you can know when you know their location, you
can't know
their velocityand vice-versa?

'they' are only approximately correct.

Re: Bohr's Atom still number one

(and/or the more you know their location, the less you know their velocity)

In order for electrons to 'orbit', the electrons must know their own location and their own velocity, otherwise they can not follow the path of an orbit, but they can not. Therefore they do not orbit.

Science fiction destroying the rule that ONLY when electrons change velocity (only when they accelerate or decelerate) do photons radiate.
Thus velocity = orbit.

They ain't static. If they aint static they got an orbit and quantum shells.

You are now redefining the word 'orbit' to 'make yourself right' rather than looking at the way the word is commonly used and realizing that there is a reason that QM uses the word 'orbital' rather than 'orbit'.

It is to help people see that thinking 'orbit' is wrong and gives the wrong ideas.

Did you come here to learn something or to try to convince others that you are right and the way physics is taught is wrong?

If you are trying to learn something, you are going at it wrong. You are clinging to wrong opinions.

If you are trying to change others opinions, you are going at it wrong because you clearly do not know what you are talking about. Go away and learn physics and come back when you know what you are talking about.

But from what you wrote above it's saying only possible to know the PROBABILITY of their location....this is conflicting from the definition I wrote above??

Follow the references given. STUDY.

Re: Bohr's Atom still number one

Re: Bohr's Atom still number one

--
bz

please pardon my infinite ignorance, the set-of-things-I-do-not-know is an infinite set.

bz+spr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx remove ch100-5 to avoid spam trap

.