

Re: My New Website

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-06/2235.html>

From: Bjoern Feuerbacher (feuerbac_at_thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)

Date: 06/07/04

Date: Mon, 07 Jun 2004 12:53:49 +0200

Y.Porat wrote:

> *Lothar Brendel* <l.no.spam.brendel@uni-duisburg.de> wrote in message
news:<c9pn5c\$riv\$I@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de>...

>

>>Y.Porat wrote:

>>

>>>Bjoern Feuerbacher <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message
news:<c9ndqe\$ode\$I@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de>...

>>>

>>>

>>>>Y.Porat wrote:

>>

>>[...]

>>

>>

>>>>>more clear – i did to myself such 3d models

>>>>>and it helped me a lot though i am trained by my proffession

>>>>>to read 3d structures while i had to compute volumes

>>>>>*that belong to a single sphere* it was nearly indempensible

>>>>>or else you are fet lost in the littel 3d detailes

>>>>

>>>>>Well, the 3D model shown in that document is far clearer than any

>>>>>of the 3D pictures in your book. Apparently you have to practice

>>>>>drawing them a bit more...

>>>

>>>-----

>>>what i show in my model is what Mr Brendel calles

>>>'the primitive unit'

>>

>>I don't know the picture of your model you're referring to, but somehow

>>I have doubts about that. Do you really show a rhombohedron there?

>

>-----

> i showed the hexagonal structure

There is no "hexagonal structure" in diamond. Try again.

- > *that is the only 3d possibility to construct with the*
- > *what you call primitive unit)*

Huh?

- > *which is a tetrahedre ie*

Err, a rhombohedron is not a tetrahedron.

- > *it has two arms*

Huh? It has four.

- > *with the saparation of 109 deg*
- > *between ****all its arms**** ie between any two arms you take you will get*
- > *109 deg in the 3d directions.*
- > *you can build out of it (listen carefully)*
- > *only one 3d structure*

Yes. The one shown in the pdf file I provided. The picture in your book doesn't look like that.

- > *provided you use only one tetraheder in each junction*

"junction"?

- > *is it clear now ??*
- > *no matter if i send you a scetch or not*
- > *it is unequivocally defined.*
- >
- > *(i wonded if you would like to get my whole book*

Well, he already said that it's not worth the effort to even look only at your picture.

- > *which could make my arguments much clearer to you*
- > *but i guess that once you hear Mr f desperate endless efforts*
- > *to defame me i guess you will decline my offer)*

Correcting your errors has nothing to do with defaming you.

- > *antway*
- > *btw i suggest to lower the volume of personal antagonism*
- > *that starts to build here whith the influence of*
- > *Feuerbacher*

Huh? *You* start to spill the insults, as usual.

- > *that insist of defaiming me*

Correcting your errors has nothing to do with defaming you.

> *because of his being defeated by me in some threads.*

ROTFL!!!!!!!!!!!!

- > *but that leads to no constructive discussion*
- > *if we want to do a real discussion we have to forget*
- > *any *personal accounts* and start to do it*
- > *open minded and open hearted as if no personal clashes*
- > *had been before.*
- > *so even if we take your claim that there is 2 atoms in*
- > *a primitive unit*
- > *now my questionis:*
- > *how do you see in the x ray pictures that primitive unit*
- > *IOW: what are you actually *see* there??*

In other words: you have never bothered to actually look up the X-ray results, but nevertheless you make proud, broad pronouncements about them? Typical.

Hint: X-ray scattering is discussed in all books on solid state physics. Try reading one.

You could also search the web for "Debye-Scherrer". That's one of the common methods used.

> *that should be a preemptive question to have a common language*

Well, yes. So why didn't you look that up before?

- > *the question is to Mr Randel no need *at this stage**
- > *for Bjoern to jump and 'help' Mr Randel*

1) His last name is Brendel, not Randel. Your "laziness" in writing names correctly is the height of impoliteness and arrogance!

2) He has not answered for three days now, and suggested that it is "not worth the effort" to pursue this further.

So I think I am allowed to answer now for him, don't you think?

- > -----
- > *TIA*
- > *Y.Porat*
- > *(for Mr Randel i am still not a crackpot- it is only*
- > *for Feuerbacher...)*
- > -----

You are a crackpot for everyone who knows some physics. And Lothar Brendel apparently does.

[snip]

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

Bye,
Bjoern