

Re: Isotope decay chains

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/7408.html>

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

Date: 02/15/05

Date: 15 Feb 2005 04:56:56 -0800

Angelo wrote:

> > > -----
> > *lets make it clear*
> > *th e single private enemy is not you!*
>
> *I was pretty sure about this, and can reassure*
> *you, on my side, that I am not.*

i waas writing an answer of about 20 minutes
and it got lost by an server error'
tough life.
so may be this time shorter

>
> > -----
> >
> *Again? I said: " well known 'problem' " :*
> *do you see the difference?*
>
> > *may be the question but surely not the answer!!*
>
> *And I said "question", not "answer": why don't you*
> *read me?*
>
> > *because the existing real detaled knowledge of the inner Nuc.*
> > *is cose to zero (if not completely wrong and ... flat zero!!*
>
> *If you say so ... that's your responsibility.*
>
> > *and as i sayed :*
> > *if you dont know the inner momentum of a single nucleid*
> > **as a member of the conglomeration* and the value of 'X'*
> > *it is stupidity (may be stuipid arrorance)to use the HUP in that*
> > *situation !!*
> > *hope you got it .*
>
> *So apparently, you didn't get the faintest clue*

> *about the HUP.*

easy easy with sweeping declarations

btw

are you sure that no one else is blowing behind your back???!?

> *For if we knew the exact position, at the same time*

> *we couldn't know nothing about momentum,*

who said the exact location???

i said the mutual location

ie a is next to b and b is next to c etc

that was what i meant by location.

and that is much more than ever known before

so please just have a look at the cite:

http://www.geocities.com/porat_y/mypage.html

then click the link there .

it is just the abstract of my model far from all of it.

and only then start evaluating my model

actually it should take you months to start understanding

and appreciating it !!!

months in the good case

if you of the Feurbacher stuff you will never get it

because of— among the others —'emotional

and psychological problems'

> *and "vice versa".*

> *And the HUP has not yet been falsified.*

> *I asked you about your idea of the HUP, and you*

> *didn't bother to answer: now I understand why.*

i never said it was falsified

it depends to what hands it falls!!!

now please note

the fact that you can't know it from the hup

(and there is a whole world that you can't know from that principle— so

that is the unpractical handicap

of that principle:

and abstract formula cannot replace all physics

and even not be the supreme judge of all issues

b

the fact that you cannot know the inner structure of

the nuc (and may be even molecules?? am i right about the molecules as well ??)

so the above fact that you can't know it from HUP

*does not mean that you can't know it ** from other sources**

got it ??

if not just see my model

it is from pure experimental data based!!

so ???

shell i tell you again the ;
'there is no such animal' joke ???

>

> > *I don't know what 'parrots' you are referring to.*

fo rinstanc those who hold the shell model

fo rhavy elements

if you are one of them pleasebring experimental data

for 32 electrons in the shell No 4 !!

so sorry to tell you :

if you cant do it and you suport it

you are a parrot as the others.

>

> > *diring about 10 years on the net i have more than an idea*

> > *about people know and about what they do not oknow*

> > *(an i didnt forgot about *waht i dont know and otheers*

> > *know better than me*

>

> *I acknowledge and respect your work,*

> *even though can't share your conclusions.*

it will take you some time !!

>

> > but that better than me is not in the nuc realm!!

> > at least not about its geometric structure

> > in whicch it seems with all the modesty i am expert No 1)

>

> No need for you to bother asking me

> to remember this: I will, automatically.

ok thats fine for me

>

> > > > I'm not sure what kind of answer you expect.

> > > > I'll try one: the information I could find, follows.

> > > > On the right side of the 'family':

> > > > 42Sc (EC) 42Ca (681 milliseconds)

> > > > 43Sc (EC) 43Ca (3.9 hours)

> > > > 44Sc (EC) 44Ca (3.7 hours)

> > > > On the left side of the 'family':

> > > > 38Cl (beta-) 38Ar (37.2 minutes)

> > > > 40Cl (beta-) 40Ar (1.35 minutes)

> > > > Obviously, all listed isotopes of Scandium

> > > > and Chlorine are artificial ones; meanwhile,

> > > > all decay products (Ca or Ar) are stable isotopes.

> > > > as you sayed

> > > > all of them are artifficial made so?

> > > > does that mean nothing to you ???!!!

> > > > it is no way the real Ar K and Ca

> > > > it is *imposters*

> > > > i think that the fact that you noted that all of them are

> > > > artifficial

> > > > is actually a good point rather to my first claim !!

>

sci.physics: Re: Isotope decay chains

> Glad for you.
you yourself say that all those isotopes around
Ar K and Ca are artificial and short life
and you don't know what is their *origin*
ie you don't know the complete scenario in which they were
born
Cl for instance is known to have just 2 stable isotopes
35 and 37
so
may be those ones that you quoted are just
imposters of Cl while actually their origin
is from Ar ??
and similarly about the Sc artificial ones
that might be originated from Ca and not from Sc??
how
if you are not sure about the origin of them
you can't say they are the original ones
and the same about the Pt Gold issue
you suggested the Pt 179 or 197 don't remember
anyway
you don't know for sure where from they are so
speculations
and it could be not the real Au that came out of it
just a name of Gold
in a similar way
Mike brought the news that some lead is beta decaying!
that as well is not a well supported data
because it might be just impositions of the lead
from its past history
that experiment has to be *reproduced* many times
btw just have a look on my lead and Bi model
at the end of my above file
there is no alpha particles there that are located
on the edges of the nucleus
those edges are the only locations from which it can
decay
I have many examples of it in the rest of my model
that you don't have there
compatible all along with experimental data !!

>
> > > You use words and phrasings which I find
> > > rather difficult to interpret, most probably
> > > my fault. Could you be so kind to explain
> > > what is your claim in the present case?
> > -----
> > it is you yourself who presented those isotopes as *artificial
> > and short life** so ???
> > can you relate that to the real Ar K Ca family???
> > it is just *artificial isotopes* that some human being decided
> > to call them 'Ar K and Ca'
> > it is not the real ones!!
> > and don't you see that this is another confirmation
> > of my prediction???
>
> If you think this is a confirmation of *your* model,
> then why asking me?
ok I will not ask you anymore
if you are locked against me a priori.
As I said, that model, as far as
> I can tell, seems to me fairly incredible.
> Notwithstanding, I passed over this, and even tried

sci.physics: Re: Isotope decay chains

> to help you somehow.
how do you know about tmy model
did you saw all of it ??????
and can release
such an irresponsible sweeping declaration!!
it seems very hostile and prejudiced and biased.!

> So, bottom line, you can't ask me to trust your
> model, inasmuch as I'm not not seeing any
> *soundly* *testable* *evidence*.

i don rneed your favours
i can live nicely without it
the same that i dont need your confirmation of the
Superfertz (as i undesstood you suport the Superfertz as well
ie an em wave with one cycle per 100 billion years!!
that you suport -- and my model not right ??

> > and keep well
ps again
are you sure that no one else is blowing behind your back??

Thanks again, I feel better now.
all the bst
Y.Porat
