

For Y.Porat from Sergey Karavashkin on Quantum Paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/3326.html>

From: Sergey Karavashkin (*selftrans_at_yandex.ru*)

Date: 01/08/05

Date: 8 Jan 2005 14:28:18 -0800

From: Y.Porat (*maporat@012.net.il*)

Subject: Re: For Y.Porat from Sergey Karavashkin on Quantum Paradox

Newsgroup: sci.physics

Date: 2004-12-28 05:51:30 PST

Sergey Karavashkin wrote:

> *Dear Y.Porat, by some unknown reason, quite long time I cannot post my
> reply to you on the thread where we began our talk. So I'm posting it
> here where Google allows. You wrote me on the thread "Quantum Paradox
> of a Self-Interference of a Photon in VLBI"*

i suppose you couldn't answer because of the new Beta system

Or rather because of special 'inquisition' view on discussion by supporters of Relativity and quantum conception. ;-)

now

Hi Sergei

it is a great honor to me

that you devoted a special thread to me

it seems that though your rejecting my suggestion

you feel intuitively that it is not something

completely 'dead by arrival'

and I still have that feeling so let's 'cook it a bit more

see the following.....

>

> *From: Y.Porat (maporat@012.net.il)*

> *Subject: Re: Quantum Paradox of a Self-Interference of a Photon in VLBI*

excuse my laziness and ignorance;

what is VLBI

Sergey Karavashkin:

Dear Y. Porat,

I am really glad that you responded to my post so substantially. Here I will answer your question, and under your next post we will discuss your conception of photons.

VLBI is an astronomical interferometer with a tremendous basis of interference in whose development Aleksandr Timofeev is involved. The distinct is, in this interferometer signals are added through a computer; both past year and before Aleksandr had here stormy discussions about validity of this method. Discussions were mainly just about the photon representation of interference pattern, because, first, so much spaced basis does not correlate with the quantum theory supporters' idea of probability of photon hitting to some point of screen in relation with their wave function. Second, there is no screen as such in VLBI. The pattern on the display is formed not according to the theory of stochastic processes of quantum physics but by digital codes summation, which fully corroborates the wave theory of EM waves. ;-)

Just so Aleksandr has risen the problem, how can photon divide when interfering, knowing that indivisible photon is one of basic postulates of QM. So I came to his thread, as the interference of light at the edge of screen is basically similar to his question, only much more visually shows the absurdity of photon conception, and the main, it lifts stupid questions of digital code; someone who calls himself "Quantum Mirror" wearied Aleksandr with these questions. You can ask Aleksandr to tell more. He will gladly explain, even with diagrams. ;-)

> *Newsgroups:sci.physics, sci.physics.relativity, sci.astro*

> *Date:2004-12-03 02:39:54 PST*

>

>> *Sergey Karavashkin to Aleksandr Timofeev: the*

>>> *interference of light at the edge of screen. There is no signal*

>>> *transformation which takes place in VLBI. There things are ultimately*

>>> *simple. We have a source of light, a screen and its edge. A laser can*

>>> *serve as a source of light. What can be simpler? Two photons cannot*

>>> *interfere at the edge of screen, but we have an interference; if*

>>> *someone doubts, I can refer to not one but several photos from*

>>> *different sources. Well, when Quantum Mirror explains you the*

>>> *phenomenology of this phenomenon, he will be allowed to oppose you in*

>>> *the rest issues. ;-)*

>>>>

>>>> *Best,*

>>>>

>>>> *Sergey*

>>> -----

>

> *Y.Porat to Sergey Karavashkin:*

>
>>> *the photon is known as a Boson right?*
>>> *now bosons are able of acumulating right ?*
>>> *so how about the notion thatt the photon in self interference*
>>> *is actually:*
>>> **composed as a conglomeration of photons**
>>> *ie it is not a single entity but a conglomeration of entites*
>>> *so*
>>> *while passing throgh the slits it -- splits*
>>> *into two subcomponents*
>>> *now interference of the two is possible*
>>> *since it is not 'one photon ' anymore it is two of them?*
>>> *how about that*
>>> *TIA*
>>> *Y.Porat*
>>> -----
>>
>
> *Sergey Karavashkin to Y.Porat:*
>
>> *Dear Y.Porat,*
>>
>> *I understand, being a supporter of photon theory, you used to run*
>> *along a rolled smooth path; but my question was of interference at the*
>> *SCREEN EDGE where you have neither one nor two slits. ;-) Have you a*
>> *difficulty? ;-)*
> -----
>
> *Y.Porat to Sergey Karavashkin:*
>
> *no more than others (:-)*
>
> *att he end of your article you say*
> *'it is basically unable'.....*
> *may be here is 'where the dog is burried'*
> *some basic wrong assumptions!*
>
> *so may be if photon that is aconglomeration of smaller parts– splits*
> **without a change of their fequencies?????**
> *ie at least at the double slit case, they do not change their*
> *frequency?*
> *or may be that while they combine again on or close to the screen*
> *the original frequency is restored ????*
> -----
>
> *Sergey Karavashkin to Y.Porat:*
>
> *No, dear Y.Porat, no. If we admit that photons can be divided or*
> *joined, quantification loses all its sense.*

lets find out about your general declaration:

maybe I didn't explain exactly what's on my mind:
my suggestion is that a photon (in most common cases)
is not just a single 'creature'
it is something like a procession of particles running one after the other.
more specifically
the picture that is in my mind is very accurate
(unlike the very abstract common picture)
it is some basic particle, let's call it the 'Circlon'
that strange particle has a strange feature:
it is moving 'naturally' in a closed circle (if not disturbed on its way)
now in the photon we have a double kind of movement
one of the 'ordinary circlon' is in a closed circle but ...
if it gets a push perpendicular to the plane of its circular movement
it starts to move as a 'helix' - hope you got it until now.
now my suggestion is that not only a single one can move along that
helix path but many of them, i.e.
they are running one after the other exactly on the same
helix path with the same radius and same forward 'step'
which makes the 'frequency'
(actually maybe the radius alone is determining the forward 'step'
as well)
so we have a long procession of particles running one after the other
now you mentioned rightly the 'quantitative element'
because we know that
 $E = h f$
i.e. it is frequency dependent
now a question:

how is it quantitative and what is that quantitative mean??
suppose the sun is emitting a beam - a 'photon'
with frequency f_1 (only)
now imagine two cases
1. it is emitting those f_1 beam for one second

case 2
it is emitting the same f_1 but now not only one second but
one hour

what is the energy of the 'photon' in case one
and what is the energy in case 2??

both of them have the same 'energy' $E_1 = h f_1$
so that is the quantitative difference in energy between them??

--
it seems to me that the energy of $E = h f$ is of just one
quanta of that beam
and not at all to (as we are used to) the 'accumulation of energy'
during a long time!?!? but just referring to some unit that is emitted
momentarily

sci.physics: For Y.Porat from Sergey Karavashkin on Quantum Paradox

if you examine the dimensions of that equation you realise
iirc that it is divided by the time unit !!!
so if we have a 'procession of Circlons' running one after the other
we are not measuring *all of them* but only some of them
in a short time
so
the quantity of Circlon that are running one after the other
cannot be detected by the equation $E=h f$
because it is not meant to make that difference
between one of them in a short time
or many of them in a longer time!
so i think that your 'quantitative argument'
is not contradicting my suggestion.
am i right ??
lets examine it at this stage just until this point
and we will see later.

TIA
Y.Porat

am i right?

Dear Y.Porat,

Let us consider. First of all I would like to mark, Cyrclon conception
is much like vortex paths conception which V.A. Atsukovsky developed
in his "General Etherodynamics", and the age of your and his
conceptions is about equal. Should you be able to read in Russian, I
would suggest you to read his book where he describes his conception
in short. In English, we briefly analysed it in pages 9 and 10 of our
paper

"Comparison of characteristics of propagation velocities of
transversal acoustic waves and transversal EM waves in the near field"
http://angelfire.lycos.com/la3/selftrans/v3_1/taew/taew09/taew09.html

To understand the heart of problem, we should return a century back
and analyse attentively the amount of problems which was under
consideration then, before Fermi created his quantum mechanics, and
the more, before QFT and Klein - Gordon.

In this connection I would mark, all problems still raised in this NG
are not new, they reflect the century-old claims. The only difference
is, I am more consistent in analysis of these contradictions. But the
amount of these problems is still the same, I intentionally do not
broaden it. This amount allowed to formulate a set of postulates; if
any of them was violated, it renews with new power the basic
discrepancies of photon conception. But the set of postulates also was
no more than gloss on broken shoes of photon conception. Just so the
supporters of this conception never agree to consider the whole
conception but jump from one effect to another and from one postulate
to another. In the limit case they call the opponent ignorant, as he
does not know some new, still unpublished development which as if
lifts these discrepancies. And QM supporters are not new in it. It was
Einstein who developed this methodology of discussion in order to
'prove' both his Relativity and quantum deadlock. And, both then and
now, they apply most dirty tricks and accuse opponents. They feel free
writing any nonsense, deny their words, juggle formulas. No limits, no
morality.

To understand the essence, we need to consider their postulates in
amount. Your Cyrclon conception just falls among two postulates. On
one hand there is the postulate that photons are emitted/absorbed
momentarily, and on the other we have the postulate of quantum size of
photons. True, photon supporters partially denied this first and
substituted momentary radiation by short time of radiation, lest to be
discrepant to the second postulate. And your conception is just
consistent with the second postulate. You are just suggesting a

sci.physics: For Y.Porat from Sergey Karavashkin on Quantum Paradox

two-cases problem of Sun radiating photons different time:

Y. Porat:

now you mentioned rightly the 'quantitative element'
because we know that

$$E = h f$$

ie it is f dependant

now a question:

how it is quantitative and what is that quantitative mean??

suppose the sun is emitting a beam - a 'photon'

with frequency f_1 (only)

now imagine two cases

1 it is emitting those f_1 beam for one second

case 2

it is emitting the same f_1 but now not only one second but
one hour

what is the energy of the 'photon in case one

and what is the energy in case 2 ??

both of them have the same 'energy' $E_1 = h f_1$

so that is the quantitative difference in energy between them??

Sergey:

The difference is, the light passes 300 000 km per second; if such long duration of radiation, the photon will not be able to inscribe into quantum size. Even the distance between you and me will be less than this 'quantum size'. This means, classical physics will be disabled in such photon sizes, with all consequences for photon conception. Namely this is why Franz Heymann so much adheres the quantum size of photon and is ready to give up that photon is uncharged to retain the quantum size. Because otherwise this automatically is the death of photon conception without any buts and ifs. ;-)

One more postulate concerning your Cyrclon is, photon is radiated during one act of orbital electron excitation. Just with this supposition Niels Bohr had yielded his terrific results, and just this principle, only transformed, has been moved onto QM. And photon is indivisible! If it were divisible, it would contradict the experiment, as in this case there would arise additional strips in the spectrum. But your wave absorption occurs in time. Consequently, photon is absorbed not at once but by portions, so to say, sequentially. But if we switch the receiver off, we can interrupt the absorption. This means, your photon is divisible? And if you are thinking, it can interfere with itself at the edge of screen, it can also spontaneously divide - this means, we will see additional lines in spectrum with larger distance from the source. ;-)

In conclusion I would mark, in classical wave conception all these discrepancies are absent. Well, what a need we have to salvage broken shoes if we can afford a pleasure to have new, without all these difficulties? This is what I would like you to think about before going on salvaging.

ps at the end of your thread you reveal yourself as a Ukrainian
if positive

good for you and your new leader!!

i dont know what was your vote

mine was to the elected one!!

one among the other reasons is that he is 'more'

eastern minded

though just now even the Russians became more 'western minded'...

Thank you for your good wish. Well, no secret: I am Russian, was born in Russia, all my life I live in Ukraine, see my CV

<http://angelfire.lycos.com/1a3/SELFlab/cv/CV.html>

sci.physics: For Y.Porat from Sergey Karavashkin on Quantum Paradox

I trice voted for Victor Yushchenko (western-minded), his site is <http://razom.org.ua/>

I make no secret of this all. This is Yanukovich, lost criminal candidate who needs to hide. I was one of leaders of people movement in my town Kharkov in the late 80th - early 90th, then my group was the only who in full voice claimed, we are with Helsinki movement for human rights and with Ukrainian National groups, then both underground and strongly suppressed by Communist party and post-communists. Due to this, all these years I also was (and am) suppressed by Securities of just 'independent' Ukraine. Such a paradox. So I voted for Yushchenko whose main trend is to revive just Ukraine.

I would mark, as opposite to many who voted for Yushchenko, I see not only positive but also negative sides of his programme. I do not expect milk and honey from him. Ukrainian economics has been fully destroyed. Now here act such management teams formed by past power that are 'cleaning' the documents of mills and factories to show them not dead as they really are but profitable and attractive for Western investors. These investors may want to know this lest to swallow the bait prepared for them.

Another great problem is incredible disproportion between the management, distributors and just the working people (one worker runs among five machine-tools in an empty work-section). There is tremendous unemployment and mainly concealed, but those who have a job are also paid not fully and not always. Many my colleagues appeared 'in the street', as their institutes were turned into casino, restaurants, banks; those who retained their positions all say, they would like to follow my way and to leave official institutions for free business. I can tell more, if the powers see someone trying to manage his own business here avoiding their mafious paws, powers do their utmost to make this business impossible. There in the country exist many dozens of armed special detachments subordinated personally to district leaders and up to President.

Then, with outwardly favourable tax system, there exist illegal right: armed to the teeth policemen and tax policemen drive from company to company and wring out the tribute. Once policemen stopped me in the bright day in the centre of town, near the cathedral, and robbed. Yushchenko hardly can stop this all during one year, neither during all his term of power.

Finally, there exists one more economic cause inherent in all the Western world, and in Yushchenko the same. Since English bourgeois revolution (Cromwell, 17th century) the economic thought was targeted to the permanently growing productivity of industry. Henry Ford in his book "My life, my achievements" expressed it most short: "If the factory did not develop, it falls". This formula contains the grounds of all economic crises of overproduction and all wars (except liberation) that shake the mankind all this time. To make the economic development stable, they need another formula. We in co-authorship formulated it in our economic study in the middle 90th. But to implement it, the powers have to understand the advantage of balanced development over their formula "snatch out today!" Hard task for Yushchenko's is zero level of stable development, of adjusted structure of power, and of stable working economics, as for example EU has. So his and his team's formula "market will regulate everything" will bring only price disbalance and worsening of situation. We wrote him of this gently, and this is his right, to understand or not. It had no effect on our decision to vote for him, since this what he intends to do is essentially better than we could ever expect from old post-communistic power. (You hardly know that Kuchma, the past President, was the communist leader by his position, mind, and style of work. Before him we had our first President Kravchuk - ideologist of Ukrainian communist party, now the ideologist of post-communistic oligarchs.)

sci.physics: For Y.Porat from Sergey Karavashkin on Quantum Paradox

Yuschenko will see the difficulties of disproportional development in 2-3 year, and then, at that edge, we all will see, who is he really. By his inner potential, he is able to surmount. Time will show the rest.
All the best to you,
Sergey