

Re: The electron shell model – is far from being 'The story'

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-11/1631.html>

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

Date: 11/06/04

Date: 5 Nov 2004 23:56:19 -0800

Bjoern Feuerbacher <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message news:<[cmdqnv\\$dol\\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:cmdqnvdol1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de)>...

> *FrankH wrote:*

> > *maporat@012.net.il (Y.Porat) wrote in message > Hi Frank thank you for your very interesting information*

> >

> >> *yet while you mentioned the MIT people*

> >> *I lpease get to their attanetion the starnge fact that*

> >> *the shelll model is not confirmed experimentally*

> >> *for heavy elements*

>

> *Please note that this is wrong. Porat simply does not understand*

> *science. He thinks that as long as we don't have every tiny little*

> *detail experimentally checked, we are not allowed to say that a theory*

> *is experimentally confirmed!*

Hi Franklin

actually i like that situation in which the young parrot cannot answer me directly (acording to his commitment to kill file me)

that lets me the option to shake him out of my back

while he is just nagging

yet i can answer him once he is talking thinks that

'even look like 'reasonable and right ' (just look like that)

because Feuerbacher is a young 'thru believer'

i would say * a blind beleiver* in the existing situation

one of his serious disadvantages is

that he lacks * a sense of proportion*!

ie to say that a theory does not need to respond for all *tiny*

discrepancies' (that is my free transtacion to his claim)

so the *tiny discrepancies*

are indeed 'very tiny' (:-)

if you take Franks assumption that even Krypton does not

fit properly to the experimantal data than

a reasonable scintist should understand that

beyond krypton ther is a vast ocean of missind data

sci.physics: Re: The electron shell model – is far from being 'The story'

of those elements heavier than Krypton.
one of the basic physics that Bjoern didn't understand
though his 29 years old is :
*that physical equations rules assert etc etc etc....
has their LIMITS!!!
that is one of the most important differences between mathematics
and PHYSICS!!!
it seems that too many physicist do not realise it because.....
they came to physics from *the mathematics school*!!
in mathematics you can stretch your formulas rules etc
as far as you like
in physics it is not like that
if the Lorentz factor is right for ordinary masses
no one on earth can assure you that it is right for the photon as well!!!
because

in the physical world any phenomena *has its limits*
and one of the great tasks of a real physicist is ...
to find those limits
once the shell model works for elements say until krypton
that does not mean it works beyond it!!
unless you are a hasty irresponsible scientist that is ready to
JUMP TO CONCLUSIONS and jumping to conclusions is
a heavy crime in science.
if it works until krypton (and that is as well in doubt as Frankly
noted)
then listen carefully:!!
*the burden of proof is not on the skeptic
but on the true believer*!!!
because the standard theory is a *dominant theory*
it is an obliging situation to confront any raised question
and doubt!!
or else *it is a questionable theory*
now
why was it just me who is so decisive against the shell
model for heavy elements??!!
it is not just because there is no verifications for the heavier elements
what gave me the self confidence that it is wrong is

that I found other evidence and a model that shows that
the shell model is a fairy tale for heavy elements
ie in my model we can manage nicely without all those
dozens of electrons and shells and subshells
that has nothing to do with reality
ie
the assumption that all protons are positively charged
is a false assumption
it is right only for light elements
strangely enough it didn't occur to any scientist
that the protons once in the inner structure
lose their charge in the binding process that creates the nuc

sci.physics: Re: The electron shell model – is far from being 'The story'

(may be that once you attack it and collide it with external forces and particles some of them might get back their charge so the stripping process of electrons is not the ordinary stable situation that exists in the 'ground position' of the atom) so in my model that i got by an *independent scientific way (that is completely original) i found that all this story of one electron for one proton is a wrong jump to conclusion– for the heavy ones

(franklin if you like i can send you a pdf file that summarise my model– if you like)

now one thing that i dont like is that this article becomes too long it has to be more concise (or else no one is going to read it ...

>
>
> > **and yet no one was blinking an eye about it !!*
> >>
> >
> > *Exactly what do you mean by "heavy" elements?*
lets take your word and say – beyond Krypton

>
> *He talks about elements above iron. Some years ago, he asked in this newsgroup up to which element QM works, and someone (I think Franz Heymann)*

it was not only FRANTZ it was others as well with the stupid pretext that 'there is not enough computer power' i say the problem is not with computer power the problem is with human brain power and wrong assumption that will never let it be solved because my moto in this case is : *you cant find coconuts in the north pole... because

answered him that up to iron, the electronic structure of the
> *elements was analyzed in detail. What Porat does not understand here (or, better, refuses to accept and understand) is:*
> *1) Even for these cases, the analysis was done *theoretically* – by computer calculation. The results were *not* all, down to the tiniest little detail, checked experimentally.*

tinyest !! eh ??? who is to decide what is tiny and what not you have no right to call it tiny because it is not tiny

you cant adopt a logic system in which any question you cant answer

sci.physics: Re: The electron shell model – is far from being 'The story'

becomes 'tiny' once you do it *you are a tiny scientist!1*

> 2) *It is no big problem today to use heavier elements than iron in
> calculations, and this is done quite often. There is a vast literature
> dealing with the chemical properties of molecules containing heavy
> elements. The most prominent examples are that one can explain the
> colour of gold and the liquidity of quicksilver, but there are hundreds,
> probably even thousands of other applications. Hey, my own brother did
> some work with platin halogenides!*

thousands of applications sounds like an irresponsible hand waving
not to say demagogism.
and even if there were thousands – probably it should not be
thousands but millions
and if you can't answer even some of them – your model is a questionable one

> 3) *This does not show in any way that QM does not work for elements
> heavier than iron, and it also does not mean that QM was not checked
> experimentally for these cases.*

if it works it works *partially* and probably in those cases
it works *it is not due to the assumption of an electron for
any proton*!!!!!!

>
>
> > *I would say that the
> > electron energy levels are experimentally well confirmed for at least
> > up to krypton and this includes atoms which are fairly heavy (stuff
> > like iron, copper, etc.). Do you have evidence that it hasn't been
> > experimentally verified beyond a certain size atom?*
>
> *He does not bother to provide evidence. He simply repeats ad nauseum
> what he was told years ago in this newsgroup (see above).*

as I said above
the burden of proof is on the dominant theory – not on the skeptics.

>
> *since it becomes too long I start to snip*
because things start to repeat themselves

> *Oh, BTW, Porat seems to think that the "shells" are spatial structures.
> He does not understand that the "shell model" is essentially only about
> energy levels. Although I told him that several times.*
if it's just energy levels it means that the state of knowledge
is poorer than I thought!!!

btw
Feuerbacher introduced the stupid idea
that the atom and nuc 'have no definite structure'

Re: The electron shell model – is far from being 'The story'

sci.physics: Re: The electron shell model – is far from being 'The story'

'based on the HUP'

that is indeed a parrot ignorant assertion and stupid as well

>

and Franklin

i agree with all the skeptic questions you raised above

its time that decent people will wake up

Y.Porat
