

## Re: My New Website

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/1541.html>

---

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

**Date:** 07/05/04

Date: Mon, 05 Jul 2004 11:47:11 +0200

Y.Porat wrote:

> *Bjoern Feuerbacher* <[feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)> wrote in message news:<[cc39ot\\$17n\\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:cc39ot$17n$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de)>...

>

>> *Y.Porat* wrote:

>>

>>> *Lothar Brendel* <[l.no.spam.brendel@uni-duisburg.de](mailto:l.no.spam.brendel@uni-duisburg.de)> wrote in message news:<[cc17cm\\$m61\\$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de](mailto:cc17cm$m61$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de)>...

>>>

>>

>> *mbers.*

>>

>> *No \*scientist\* ever said that.*

The context was:

"(the sun orbits the earth 'you can even see it with your own eyes'!!) "

Why did you remove this context?

> -----

> *these were the 'scintists' of those days*

The quotation marks here are important, since there *\*were\** no scientists, as we understand the word today, in these days. Modern science started essentially with Kepler, Galileo and Newton.

[snip]

>> *Now, do the same with your model.*

>

> -----

> *yes it is a pioneering one i declare it always*

You always act as if your model were the Absolute Truth (tm), it had already been firmly established, and we all will be ashamed in the future that we didn't recognize your ingenuity. So pretending to be humble now won't buy you anything.

> *have you ever done pioneering science (beside your Fertz?)*

Yes. I already told you that several times.

> *just to show you that even your science is only \*partial  
> and not a complete one and might lead to wrong conclusions)*

Yes, that's clear to me. You don't need to tell me that.

> *you don't be too confident and too smug with it !!!)*

\*YOU\* are the one who is too confident and too smug.

[snip]

>>>*imho*  
>>>*the trouble is with \*incomplete theories\* unfortunately most of them  
>>>are that kind!*  
>>  
>>*How can a theory be incomplete if it describes all the things it  
>>was built for with an amazing accuracy?*  
>  
> *your mistake is in your 'all things' here exactly is where  
> the devil lies!!.*

I said "all things \*it was built for\*", not only "all things". Could you please stop misrepresenting what I say?

> *people of 500 years ago could predict the sun rise and ;set'  
> with a wonderful precision but the complete bottom line  
> conclusion that the sun orbits the earth was wrong!!  
> did you go that ???*

Yes. That's a totally false analogy.

> *one can see the trees very clearly and accurately but not see the forest.*

Yes. You are \*willfully\* ignoring the forest.

>>>*ie much of it seems to work but there is some 'simple minor' data  
>>>and facts that are ignored*  
>>  
>> > *(in order of not spoiling the jubily)*  
>> > *and later it comes out that all those little minor ignored facts  
>> > are the straw that broke the Camel.*  
>>  
>>*Give examples of things which QM can not explain and ignores, please.*  
>>-----  
>  
> *qm cannot describe heavy atoms RIGHTLY*

It can. If you think otherwise, drop the rhetoric and begin providing evidence for your assertions.

> *AND COMPLETELY*

QM describes atom as completely as possible.

> *as it does for light atoms!!*

Describing heavy atoms requires more computational time than describing light atoms, but there is no principle difference, neither in the methods nor in the accuracy.

> *you are not well enough aware of it*

In contrast to you, I actually \*know\* how much QM can describe. I have \*seen\* the experimental results, and even partially base my own work on them!

As I have said several times now: you are simply unaware of at least 99.99% of the experimental results of the past century.

> *and there are a lot of silly excuses for it.*

There are no excuses, since QM \*can\* do that.

[snip]

>>>*but how come (quantitatively !!!!! – in numbers!!)*  
>>>*that an atom with 13 electrons and another one with 49 electrons*  
>>>*and another one with 79 electrons*  
>>>*has such a similar \*distance\* \*between their atoms in their lattice ???*  
>>  
>>*Quite simple. The heavier atoms have also a nucleus with a higher*  
>>*charge, and therefore the electrons are closer to the nucleus.*  
>>  
>>*If you want to see the calculation showing this quantitatively,*  
>>*you have to understand differential equations, and eigenvalue equations.*  
>>*Do you understand these things?*

Hello? Do you understand them?

>>>*please think about it*  
>>  
>>*I have. QM explains it quantitatively.*  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>>*but not only think*  
>>>*calculate according to anything you want (but do it with numbers*  
>>>*not hand waving) and get the results of the expected distance*

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

>>>*\*from that calculations of yourse ie qm or whatever smart theory you got.*  
>>  
>>*The calculation is quite involved. One can't do it in just a few minutes*  
>>*by hand. After all, we are talking about systemss here which consist*  
>>*of quite a lot of particles!!! You \*do\* know that even in \*Newtonian*  
>>*mechanics\*, even the \*three-body problem\* can't be solved exactly?*  
>  
> -----  
> *do it not in one minute*  
> *do it in one hour one week one month one year*  
> *but \*do it\* for devils sake*

Why should I? People *\*have\** already done it. Hint: go looking at the published literature. It's all there. Just open your eyes.

Why should I invest lots of my valuable time for results which are already known, which were obtained by people who know far better how to do such calculations than I?

> *'dont talk shoot'!!!!(as they sayed it in the famous western...)*  
> *and do it with numbers!! oir else it is ..... you already know*  
> *how it is called.*

Yes. Everything you don't bother actually looking up, you simply call hand waving.

> *you will never but such 'merchandise' from me*  
> *dont you ie without numbers.*

Everyone can present numbers which were obtained with lots of free parameters and nevertheless disagree from the actual observations up to 30%.

> *(show us the calculations of atom size with 79 electrons!!!)*

It's there, in the literature. Look it up yourself, you lazy man.

[snip]

>>>*(and i thank you for that – no cynicism)*  
>>>*anyway Bjoern suggested a number (quote from memory of about 10 minutes ago*  
>>>*too lazy to look back.... it was someting between 1.6 – 1.8...*  
>>  
>>*Could you please \*finally\* make up your mind which number you want*  
>>*to use, and stick to it?*

Hello?

>>>*A so lets trry it all of us i welcome that teem work!*  
>>>*Bjoern can testify btw that i in my book suggested the number of 1.9 A*  
>>>*as an alternative.*

Re: My New Website

>>

>>*That's still higher than 1.8 A, if you didn't notice.*

>

> -----

> *ok take your 1.8*

*\*IS\** this now your final number, or will you modify it again in the future?

> *just to remind you:*

> *in pioneering science at the beginning we are not 'nit pickers'*

> *or else you cant do pioneering science/ you can stay with your*

> *parroted digested stuff for the rest of your life.*

You are wrong. I told you several times that even in pioneering science (hey, there even more than in other places!), scientist *\*explain\** deviations between their ideas and the actual observations. You, on the other hand, simply present results which disagree with the actual observations up to 30%, and instead of explaining the deviations, you tout that as a marvelous confirmation of your ideas.

In short: you don't understand science.

>>*And you still ignore that you get the ratio of the double to the triple*

>>*bond length wrong. "This is pioneering science!" is a rather lame excuse*

>>*for that. No pioneering scientist would present results which deviate*

>>*by 8% from observation \*WITHOUT HAVING A GOOD EXPLANATION\* for the*  
>>*deviation.*

>

> -----

> *as a start 8 percent is more than a good start*

Considering that standard QM gets this far better, this is a rather bad start.

And you *\*still\** ignore that you should have an *\*\*\*EXPLANATION\*\*\** for *\*\*\*WHY\*\*\** this deviation occurs!!!!

> *my science is done by 'trial and error'*

Yes, and you keep ignoring the errors.

> *do you think 'your science was done otherwise????!!'*

No. But in my science, people *\*\*\*EXPLAINED\*\*\** the *\*\*\*SOURCE\*\*\** of the errors!!!!

>>>*so if it works better lets go on that number.*

>>

>>*Which one? 1.9 A? 1.8 A? 1.6 A?*

>

> *lets start with the 1.8 if you are so maticulous character.*

Err, one **\*\*\*HAS\*\*\*** to be meticulous in science, if you didn't notice!!!

>>>*and try to advance it*

>>>*there migh tbe needed some new improvements even somer corrective*

>>>*ideas*

>>

>>*In other words: you might need to make up even more rules out of thin*

>>*air.*

>

> -----

> *i already saided that i have my 'medium orbitals ' in my 'rerserves'*

> *those medium orbitals are as the electron ones*

> *with the quantum characteristic of eithr being complelly*

> *or not being completley ie nothing in between.*

Did I ever mention "lots of free parameters"?

Did I ever mention "unsupported assertions"?

>>>*but i am sure we are on the right principle way!!*

>>

>>*You are the only one who is sure of that.*

>

> *so you have to appreciate my persistance and my being*

> *'a brave fighter' for his beives....*

I don't appreciate that you are too stubborn and too lazy to actually learn what the experimental evidence is, how the experiments work, etc.

> *though the heavy cost*

> *he has to pay and never be rewarded for it*

> *just 'rewarded' with abuse all along his life*

> *isnt that courages ?? (:-*

No, that is foolishness. GET AN EDUCATION!

>>>*ie some basic bond length and not endless numbers*

>>>*that is used in different geometric angles and ways*

>>

>>*Err, \*you\* keep inventing different angles all the time.*

>>

>>*QM only explains the ones which are actually observed.*

>

> -----

> *what about predicting \*anything\* as you pretend?*

Huh? What do you want???

>>>by ways i mean fo rinstance that in some cases there is only  
>>>\*one arm between two atone\* in other cases \*two arms\*  
>>>in other 3 arms  
>>  
>>Present evidence for that assertion, please. You could start  
>>by explaining the \*measured\* electron densities.  
>  
> -----  
> have you ever seen the calculation \*and observation\* of a heavy atom  
> say with 79 electrons

No.

But what I have seen are e.g. observations of the electron density  
in anthracene. IIRC, they are shown e.g. in the book by Haken and Wolf  
on atomic and molecular physics.

<<http://tinyurl.com/2yhp2>>

> showing the 78 electron densities???

What on earth is that supposed to mean???

> if yes please shoot

Huh???

>>>btw another interesting questiuon that occeres to me  
>>>why is it a max of 3 arms bond and not more/(on one plan)  
>>>in my nuc astuctures thwer are even 4 bonds in one plan!  
>>  
>>So, why don't you draw the obvious conclusion that there is something  
>>wrong with your model?  
>  
> -----  
> i never said that the rules of nucs and atoms aere  
> all along the same

As I said above: everytime there is something wrong with your  
model, you simply invent a new rule out of thin air.

Hint: QM, on the other hand, describes \*all\* atoms with the  
\*same\* set of rules. And without needing any additional free parameters.

> why do \*you\* jump into conclusions that i didnt  
> yet you scceded to obfuscate my important question  
> is ther electron connections with more than 3 in one plan??

I think there is (e.g. in H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, I would guess). I would have to  
look that up. Why don't you do that yourself? Too lazy again?

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

>>>>That obviously doesn't work for H<sub>2</sub>, since its bond length is  $0.74\text{\AA} < 1.44\text{\AA}$ .  
>>>>  
>>>>It doesn't work for Carbon (i.e. C<sub>2</sub>), about which the discussion  
>>>>started, either, since its bond length is  $1.24\text{\AA} < 1.44\text{\AA}$ .  
>  
> -----  
> very nice  
> if you take your 1.8 A  
> amking sory of a V shape  
> with the two hydrogens at the 'upper edges' of that V  
> and the side length of that V is your 1.8 A  
> what will be the angle of that V while the distance  
> between the trwo upper edges id 0.74 ???

That angle is yet another free parameter. You can "explain"  
\*any\* bond length by simply inventing a new angle out of  
thin air, and adjusting it to the experimental outcome!

For the tenth time: QM can describe all those bond length \*without\*  
needing additional free parameters!

> just to give you the way i see it .....  
> ie how you can solve and explain many distance datas  
> with one electron bond length.in that case  
> the lenght iof that V 'leg'

BY MAKING UP NEW FREE PARAMETERS OUT OF THIN AIR!!!  
THAT IS NOT "EXPLAINING" ANYTHING!!!

[snip]

>>>not yet so soon i simply didnt invest the proper time for it.  
>>  
>>Well, what about your picture on page 94?  
>  
> what about it??  
> it is an Auticad based struuctyre 3d with 3 projections  
> of the same thing  
> based of the exagone that you see in page 96

It \*is\* the diamond structure, isn't it?

>>>the sider or crab is just a memory aid (and you realise the fact  
>>>you remember it that it is an efficient memory aid!  
>>>a sider has its legs at his side  
>>>my atom has its \*working arms\* at his front and back only !!!  
>>>no more than 4 at each direction  
>>>my atom is from fluorine upwards – a sort of a rectaggular pipe  
>>  
>>Octogonal pipe, may I remind you...  
>

> -----  
> *thank you anyway i guess i am the last man in this universe*  
> *that you have to remind it to him !!(;-*

Why do you keep repeating this "rectangular pipe" stuff,  
although it is octagonal?

> *i just try to be more simple not to entangle it*

Talking about a rectangle when in fact it is an octagon is  
not "more simple", it is simply wrong.

[snip]

>>>*that becomes bigger and bigger with atom wight actually*  
>>>*built of quartets of alpha rectangular sections connected in*  
>>>*linear succesion (if you wantr methaphorically the way surage pipe*  
>>>*sections are connected linearily (quite a smelly methaphore isnt it?(-*  
>>  
>>*Please explain the measured charge distribution in nuclei based on*  
>>*your model.*  
>  
> -----  
> *words words words*

Evasion noted.

So you can't do it. Big surprise.

>>>*but the result of it is that onlt the atoms at the edges of those*  
>>>*structres are working all th einner ones are eithr lost during*  
>>>*connection or inactive fro some reasons*  
>>>*so we get similar properties fo rheavy and light atoms*  
>>>*becuase of similar geometric structre.*  
>>>*and Al is similar to Ag and that to Au*  
>>  
>>*Nevertheless, Ag and Au are much \*bigger\* structures than Al*  
>>*in your model – so why should they have the same number of atoms*  
>>*per volume???*  
>  
> -----  
> *common dont sjame youself in front of me (bad ENGLISH sorry)*  
> *just to remind you that i know well that the nuc*  
> *altogether is very small vwery very small compaired*  
> *to the electon orbitals right ???.....*

I don't remember that you said anytime before what size you  
actually assume for the nucleus.

> *the figures that you see might misslead*  
> *but i always stress that it is 'not in scale– not proportional*

> *remember??*

No, I don't remember stressing you that. That's neither on page 22 nor 23, directly before your graphics. So, where did you say that?

[snip]

>>>*it is not a single bond it is 4 fold bond of 4 hinge arms that became 'out of hinge ' because of the altogether geometric situation.*

>>

>>*Err, in your book, on page 94, you show only single bonds (only one electron arm) between the "brick stones". Not 4 bonds.*

>

> -----

> *so probably we are not talking about the same thing*

We were talking about the diamond structure. Isn't it shown on page 94?

> *the structure in that page id\ s based on a tetraheder*

> *with 2 legs in one pole and 2 at the opposite pole*

Yes, that's clear.

> *btw to you question how i know what is the front [pole*

> *and what the back of my nuc.*

> *it is very simple*

> *if you folowd my model;*

> *it has never the same front face as the back face*

> *it is always differnet*

Yes, the two "faces" are different. But that does not answer my question how you determine which one is the front pole and which is the back pole!!!

BTW, where is the experimental evidence for hydrogen having two "poles"?

And why was it never observed that electrons can bind to neutrons?

> *that is one of my interesting findings!!*

You still confuse "findings" with "assertions".

> -----

> *now about you 'explanatins'; about minimising energies*

> *give me a break*

> *as long as it is just words words words and no numbers*

> *your words reman words and not scince.*

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

The calculations can be found in the literature. Try e.g. looking in books on solid state physics.

I see no reason to spoon-feed you things which are freely available for anyone. You simply use your lazyness as a lame excuse for not educating yourself.

> -----  
> *crackpot*  
> *Y*  
> -----

Thanks that you keep pointing that out.

Bye,  
Bjoern