

Re: My New Website

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/2169.html>

From: Y.Porat (maporat_at_012.net.il)

Date: 07/07/04

Date: 6 Jul 2004 22:52:52 -0700

Lothar Brendel <l.no.spam.brendel@uni-duisburg.de> wrote in message news:<[ccd88\\$7s7\\$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de](mailto:ccd88$7s7$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de)>...

> Y.Porat wrote:

> > Lothar Brendel <l.no.spam.brendel@uni-duisburg.de> wrote in message news:<[ccbhq4\\$sal\\$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de](mailto:ccbhq4sal1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de)>...

> >

> >> Y.Porat wrote:

> >>>

> >>> Lothar Brendel <l.no.spam.brendel@uni-duisburg.de> wrote in message news:<[cc4t1s\\$10t\\$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de](mailto:cc4t1s$10t$1@a1-hrz.uni-duisburg.de)>...

> >

> [...]

>

> > dont you realise just now that you are unable to calculate

> > the atoms size based on 79 electrons per Au tom ??

> > just an example ???!!

>

> I am unable to procude here a full blown, necessarily numerically

> excessive QM calculation of Au, yes. Is that a flaw of QM?

dont do it for me do it for youself!

and take your time even years if necessary because it is vitally important

that is exactly the problem wiht some aspects of qm:

anyone is relying on other 'experts'

people take it so much as holy scrolls that is might be as the holy scrolls ie frozen

if yoy want my advise

be critically about anything you smell uncertain there

at least as you are critical twarsds me and we realise

you and Bjoern are very good in criticicm

but do it all along the way – for holy coves' as well

>

>

> > while the little child Porat is explaining it as easy

> > as a little child can do:

> > ie no many shells and no many 'shmells' in ther Au atom

- > > *just one 'shell' around the Au atom*
- >
- > *This "nice" and simple picture doesn't explain e.g. the X-ray lines of*
- > *the Au atom, while QM describe them quantitatively.*

does it explain it based on 79 electrons
or nmay be many of them are 'screened' there???
(screened is very much like mumbling)

- >
- > > *and just one at the Ag atom and just one at Al etc etc*
- > > *and thats why their size is so similar !!*
- > > *(just one set of 'legs' for the 'crab'!—that will be better*
- > > *for your long run memory)*
- > > *got it!!*
- >
- > *I understand your picture since a long time.*
- >
- >
- > > *remeber as well Ocam's razor! it might be sharp and hurting like*
- > > *a sharp knife*
- >
- > *You don't seem to know this razor. There is nothing left to cut from QM*
- > *anymore. QM has very few axioms and no fitting parameter, and yet it*
- > *reproduces experiments very well.*

where is the explanation of heavy atoms size
very similar to much smaller ones?
you quote books that you never checked nver was able to folow thir
devious manuvners of fitting resuls to known exoerimantally.
thisr trick is to make it so comlicated that no one can folow it
to defy it. and if complicated
anyone is ashamed to admit he cant folow then saying
'yes yes' or else he will be considered afool as uncompetent.

-
- >
 - > *Your model on the other hand has a free number of free parameters, which*
 - > *you can't even state properly and of which you didn't dare to fix even*
 - > *one; and it doesn't explain anything, it just postulates the similar*
 - > *size of a few selected atoms.*

that is only the beginning – one mans work
so waht do u expect??
i am just a very small crackpot genius not a big shot...

-
- >
 - >
 - > > *but at the long run people will get what*
 - > > *'the little' child sayed*
 - >
 - > *No, becaue the little child is unaware of the dozens of experiments,*

> *which it model should explain as well, but doesn't.*

>

> -----

experiments sometimes are infected by

' a prediction that justifies itself have you heard

about that social * phenomena

fo just a little example:

people are looking for the 'radius of the electron'

do you get it?? they asume apriory that the electron

is a sphere... just an example...

>

>

> > *i am just one single old man*

> > *so i expect a younger generation to take it over*

> > *and lead it further away....*

>

> *Good luck for finding a younger crackpot.*

>

>

> >> *I'm quite sure that you did more work in your tiny niche than anybody*

> >> *else. But either it was still not enough or your niche is a dead end.*

> >> -----

> >

> > *no sir you dont have an idea about it*

> > *you live only on Bjoern 'unfarginning' abuses.*

>

> *No, my judgement lives entirely on your own demonstration of your model*

> *and your ignorance, lazyness and smugness here in the newsgroup.*

no smugness at all

one who is considered to be a crackpot cannot be smug

and mind you it is not an easy job to be excentric

it is very difficult and ungrateful job.

>

>

>

> > -----

> > *you dont know the history between me and Bjoern:*

>

> *Maybe. But that's irrelevant for getting a copy of page 94.*

why not get the whole book?? and free

you cant understand me from one page.

>

> [...]

>

ue?

> >>

> >

> > -----
> > *wellcome lets have it !*
>
> *So, you don't know QM's predictions, because you didn't care to look
> them up. You criticize what you _think_ QM should predict, but that has
> very little to do with the actual predictions.*
>
> *And that's what makes your criticism only a crackpot's baseless whining.*
>
>
> >>>*that shold not be compatible witht the shell model
> >>>since they have much different numbers of electrons!!*
> >>
> >>*Why not? You seem to think that QM would state that the size of (say)
> >>the 3rd shell should be the same for every atom.*
> >>-----
> >
> > *if it has a bunch of other layers it shold be more diatnt
> > from the nuc.*
>
> *Wrong, since their radii decrease with $1/Z^*$. Without screening,*

why should i beleive you that they do not screen
while there are 79 or 92 of them and they move' in a dazling speed
how can a certral force controll such a mess
dont give me now the stupid paulis rule that is good as nice handwaving.

> *instead of Z^* , the predicted atom size would even _decrease_ for larger
> and larger Z.*

so why not decrease??

>
> *you will say screening but that is another hand waving
without numbers or such complicated calculations
that no one can folow and anyone can cheat a bit here
and a bit there. to fit the result.*

> > *nothing simpler than that that is even more*

> > *physics basics than the pauli rule*

>

> *No, it's not "physics basics", it's your imagination, since you don't
> take into account the increase of Z.*

>

>

> > *13 peoplw oculy less volume than 79 people nothing will do about it.*

> > *no trickes and shmicks.*

>

> *Squeezing people together is no trick.*

> -----

the electrons are not 'sardins in a tin'
they move like mad actually acordind to my uderstanding
they rather vibrate and not leaving thier connection to a *soecific

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

point* of thje nuc but still vibrating vigorously
79 of them will refuse to live to gether and vibrate
not enough 3d room fo rsuch a *dynamic*mess

```
---
>
> >>>so i suspect that your 2.49 is not right.
> >>
> >>It's not _my_ 2.49Å, it's an experimental finding.
> >>-----
> >
> > i wonder if it is not just interpretations
>
> Sure, everything you don't like must be a misinterpretation. That's your
> reality.
>
>
> > or may be there are not just one distance but a few of them!!
> > my model can explain a few distances at the iron latice.
>
> Your model doesn't explain anything. It's an inconsistent bunch of free
> parameters.
> -----
what do you know about my model ?? a drop in a bucket.
> [...]
>
> >>>>And you still failed to demonstrate how to build lattices from these
> >>>>arrangements.
> >>>
> >>>-----
> >>>in my book ....quite enough to make the point...
> >>
> >>I strongly doubt that. I would need to see those structures.
> >
> > ok oi offered you my whole book for free!!
> > all the expenses on me .....
>
> Better not. From what I learned about it here, I'm rather sure that
> Bjoern is right, and then you would have to insult two people about not
> sending back the copy.
> -----
ok live with Bjoern to the rest of your life.
and be happy.
> [...]
>
> >>>the H2 is aranged something like the V shape
> >>
> >>Like the following?
> >>
> >>o o
> >> \ /
> >>
> >>Sou you're H_2 does not have rotational symmetry?
> >
> > -----
> > why not
> > if there is a center of gravity of it
> > it shold rotale around it
> > do uou have some 'googles' to see around wich point it rotales??
>
> Ever heard of the adiabatic exponent?
```

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

```
>
> It depends on what your arms should consist of, of course.
>
> [...]
>
> >>>so my guess is that this .74 A is just an avrage distance!!
> >>
> >>In fact, it can be an average distance in the sense that small
> >>oscillations around this value are possible. These oscillations contain
> >>certain quanta of energy which can be measured and are in agreement with
> >>QM's prediction.
> >
> > -----
> > so you see i predicted those osciations based just
> > on my poor model and poor concepts.
>
> You didn't predict a shit about them, you just babbled something of an
> average value without specifying which kind of average. QM on the other
> hand predicts them quantitatively correct, without additional
> parameters, do you get that?
>
> -----
i predict the the dulance variations of H2 will be much bigger
than those of astome ain a metal latice.
-----
> >>>>>It doesn't work for Carbon (i.e. C_2), about which the discussion
> >>>>>started, either, since its bond length is 1.24Å < 1.44Å.
> >>>>
> >>>>No comment?
> >>>>
> >>>>-----
> >>>>see above
> >>>>a gas with that V shape
> >>>>
> >>>>With the V's angle as yet another free parameter? So you have an
> >>>>individual angle for each X_2 molecule?
> >>>>
> >>>> -----
> >>>> not an endless number there shold be some
> >>>> limitations of degrees of freedom.
> >>>>
> >>>>"Some limitation", sure. The angle is between 0 and \pi, eh?
> >>>>
> >>>> [...]
> >>>>
> >>>>the nuc is 'negligible size' compaired to the atom size!!
> >>>>and here is were you actually stepped on an important issue
> >>>>of my model:
> >>>>there are no many shells of electrons
> >>>>that swhy light and heavy have actually the same *atomic* size.
> >>>>
> >>>>IC. So what about stuff like strontium?
> >>>>
> >>>> -----
> >>>> ???????????????
> >>>>
> >>>> It has a bond length of 4.3Å
> >>>> -----
can you be more specific and tell me about a real picture of it??
it sound like two electrons from each side one
-----
>
```

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

```
> [...]
>
> >>>just trying to concentrat on the main points the bottom lines.
> >>
> >>But your main point is that QM is wrong, and yet you don't show any
> >>understanding of it.
> >
> > i never dared to say that it is all wrong!! that would be stupid.
>
> You just said that its solution of the atom is wrong; without evidence,
> of course.
> -----
not 'the solusion of atom' but in many cases
and not a complete solusion
di dyou got it once and for all??
>
> >>>>anyway i dont think torque is taken in acount in any of the theories
> >>>>about it.
> >>>>
> >>>>Exactly, it isn't (atom forces are central forces), in agreement with
> >>>>experiments.
> >>>
> >>>-----
> >>>central ????
> >>
> >>Yes. You don't know what's a central force?
> >
> > -----no shame on me
>
> Yes. Shame on your ignorance and smugness.
-----
so insteaad of insults may be you tell me about it
may be i know it but not with that name?
>
>
> [...]
>
> > -----
> > so be it
> > so is there a 4 fold bond on trhe sortest line between atoms??
>
> No, only you claimed so.
>
> [...]
>
> >>>nothing like that
> >>>you misunderstood me
>
> >
> > single bonds in 4 directions.
>
> And which length does a YP-single bond have?
-----
mostly something around 2 A
-----
>
>
> >>>or crystalography and i wondered why?
> >>>just material for thinking.
> >>
> >>People already know the answer.
```

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

```
> >
> > -----
> > which is ???
>
> Too unfavourable wrt energy. Why do you think that e.g. CH4 likes to be
> a tetrahedron so much?
-----
and you say you know my model hey ???!
had you known my Carbon nuc you would not ask that question...
you have no clue about my model.
my explantion ids obvious immediate ans self understandable
much simpler than the smarthguys explanations.
-----
-----
>
> >>>?????
> >>>see for instance my V expalanaton for X 2 gases X is an unknown.
> >>>and dont tell me i dont have a creative immagination ...(:-)
> >>
> >>You have. But that doesn't make your images real.
> >
> > -
> > no real so no deal .....
>
> Exactly.
>
> [...]
>
> >>>i wold like to get a compuer model in which we can rotate it
> >>>to any desired angle.
> >>
> >>That isn't necessary at all for the calculation. But if you need it, why
> >>don't you use your Autocad?
> >>
> >>-----
> >
> > a malicious virus too k it from me
> > btw even just yesterday a malicious virus destroyed
> > all my hard disc and you see ... even though i am still here!!
> > good for my survival abilitly isnt that ???...)
> >
> > anyway even if i had you cant deal with a figure you take from the
> > net and was not built in that Autocad program
> > so i woder if there is another way to do it/
>
> VRML is free.
-----
what is it i could not get it
-----
>
>
> >>>if you start patronising
> >>>i can doa similar job:
> >>>how about your disgrace in not being able
> >>>to explain the similar sises of
> >>>Al Ag Au
> >>
> >>Bjoern already gave the answer.
> >
> > -----
> > that is a fucken miserable answer arnt you ashamed??
>
```

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

> No, not at all, because the answer is correct.
>
>
> > i asked for *numbers* remember?? so please dont obfuscate!!
>
> Pointing out that you neglect the increasing nucleus' attraction is by
> no means "obfuscating".
> -----
we want numbers
>
> >>untill now it was much more hand waiving
> >>>you didnt suply even a 'tail of a number' to explain it
> >>>io at least started to suply a tail of a number....
> >>
> >>We can do the following estimation: Along the lines of the simple,
> >>>non-relativistic H-model, the atomic radius is proportional to n^2/Z^*
> >>>where n is the "number of the outer shell" and Z^* is the effective
> >>>nuclear charge (it's not the full charge Z due to the screening by the
> >>>inner electrons).
> >
> > so here we have the 'fitting in'
>
> Nope, it's not fitted. It's based on QM calculations.
>
>
> > and it goes *in my direction* ie
> > not so many electrons at all
>
> I beg your pardon? Exactly that many electrons, screening the nuclear
> charge.
> -----
numbers please and calculations that we can follow them!!
>
> > yet screening and not screening has a big potential of
> > 'fitting in the results' no one has a control against
> > arbitrary fittings
>
> No, it's calculated. No fitting.
please supply a concrete example of say Gold.
>
> > Its calculation is not at all elementary, but people
>
> QM calculations are almost never elementary.
> -----
never elementary is very impressive
but a wide scope for crooks.
> >>like e.g. Charlotte Froese Fischer did the work for us and found
> >> $Z^*(Cu)=8.07$, $Z^*(Ag)=11.35$, and $Z^*(Au)=15.94$
> > -----
what are those numbers
and could you follow it and check it ???

> > and i expect you to fill in the calculations for Aluminum
> > and a lot of others.
>
> Why do you think you can expect me to do your work, lazybone?
> -----
it is not my work it is yours as well
look guy and notice you 'science'
it is based on personal crediting;
ie if it is one of the establishment he does not have to be checked
he is taken for granted because he establishes

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

'my science' and it makes me feel good ie means that
i invest my efforts in the good market and i will be able
to deal and get my salary or rewards by dealing with that
'merchandise' .
if it is an outsider he must be checked and neglected
because *i am not going to deal with that merchandise
and no gain for myself
ie the name of the game is personal gain and that's it.
is that your science system??
> [...]
>
> >>Hence, $r(\text{Cu})/r(\text{Ag})=4^2/5^2*11.35/8.07=0.9$ and
> >> $r(\text{Au})/r(\text{Ag})=5^2/6^2*15.94/11.35=0.975$
> >
> > .97 what ??
> > is it the radius ???
>
> Can't you read? It's the ratio of the radii.
so it is just ratios ? not absolute numbers of distance?!
why not absolute distances that you demand from me???
and *could you follow *all the 'fiddling' that they do there?

>
>
> > so what is .97 times 2 ??
>
> Well, let me think... It's 1.94, but that number doesn't mean anything.
>
>
> >>We can see that QM (even in this approximation) does not predict much
> >>bigger atoms for bigger Z.
>
> Obviously you can't see it.
>
>
> >>>bottom line sir !!!
> >>>atom sizes!! of Ag Al Au how many of them in a cm^3 right???
> >>>i don't need philosophy just numbers.
> >>
> >>Then look them up!
> >
> > -----
> > not convincing enough
>
> Sure, you are not convinced to do any work at all, lazy bone.

you are lazy bones
get up and study that work that you quoted
and check it to its 'bones'
i assure you you will find 'fittings ' there 'fiddling' with
assumptions and god knows what else but sure
nothing like predicting without prior experimental knowledge

>
>
> > and the little you brought is compatible with my claims
> > no 79 electrons in shells around the Au
>
> The point was to show that QM does not predict a much bigger radius

is that my prediction??
it is a direct result from 79 electrons as compared to 13

sci.physics: Re: My New Website

now another point:
once the nuclear electric charge is becoming 79 times bigger-
to what direction is it directed/ to all directions?
to all directions 79 times bigger?
so each electron should be attracted with a force that is
79 times stronger?
you say screening
an electron is exerting repulsion force on other ones
how does 79 electrons that move like mad exert force on each other
is it a constant force ?
is it a variable force depending on the instant point time of screening??
do you really believe those people could handle it seriously!?!???

> for (say) Au than for Ag, in contrast what you keep claiming. This
> demonstrates that you have no ideas about what QM really says.

i am a crackpot and you are a scholar didn't we agree about it??
and yet you still didn't tell me what is your job at your University
Ciao
crackpot Porat

>
> ciao
> Lothar