

Michael Schmiechen

Von: "Michael Schmiechen" <m.schm@t-online.de>
An: <review@marinepropulsors.com>
Gesendet: Montag, 9. Mai 2011 13:38
Betreff: SMP '11: Paper 131 corrected

Dear reviewer, dear colleague,

many thanks for your kind advice, which I have tried to follow without blurring my message and taking the opportunity further to clarify some arguments and to add more recent results, though leaving lots of new problems coming to mind unresolved, and, last but not least, to improve the layout of the figures.

The factor 2π in equation 5 on page 2 is not missing. It is included in the definition of the power ratio KPP. Earlier I have indeed used the torque ratio KQP and the factor 2π and hence the brackets, which I have now deleted as being obsolete.

Further I have added the missing reference and others, in particular one on high power density waterjet propulsion investigated in the Future Naval Capabilities program overseen by the Office of Naval Research.

Explicitly I have stated the observation that both, Jürgen's and Steden's designs, although following different, but hidden, at least for me, design goals, are shifting Horn's criterion towards considerably lower energy loading.

And I have replaced the figure of the flow cross sections of Steden's design by the comparison of a duct contour obtained by simply applying the equation of continuity with Steden's duct contour, in order to stress my point.

Further I have expanded on my remark concerning the potential of CFD not yet being fully utilised, referring to Schlichting's 'Boundary Layer Theory' and Goethe's remark concerning Francis Bacon's approach (Goethe-Jahrbuch 124 (2007) 171):

'er komme ihm vor wie ein Herkules, der "einen Stall vom dialektischen Mist reinigt, um ihn mit Erfahrungsmist füllen zu lassen".'

It needs little powers of imagination to guess, why Goethe wrote (!) this quite immodest verdict, though only in a letter, and why I am quoting it.

Concerning the change of paradigm from 'propulsor' to 'pump', I am promoting for reasons explicitly and clearly stated, I am reminding of Sedow's opening address at the IUTAM Symposium at Leningrad 1971, which Georg Weinblum purposely translated for his German colleagues and students, though to my knowledge without any 'response'.

As there will be hardly any chance to discuss my paper at the 'symposium', originally the only purpose of such meetings, I use this opportunity to clarify some points, which came to my mind already while preparing for my presentation and now reading your review.

First of all, I do not quite understand what is 'provocative' in reading a

student's exercise reminding professionals of some basic facts and the state of the art in propulsion. And what is a 'fresh' look after all, after fifty years or at least twenty years of research and continuous publication of its results worldwide?

Now concerning your main point. I am afraid you grossly underestimate my modesty and the depth and potential of my insights, based on embedding ship theory into classical mechanics. The mechanics of propulsion figures only as an example in volume three of my rational reconstruction of classical dynamics; a reference added.

When I refer to 'naval architects' I am 'of course' referring only to those 'whom I know'. You will not and cannot possibly expect me to list the names of those holding wrong principles, 'false instinctive beliefs', 'adhering to professional superstition'? For those interested it is easy to guess the names of at least two of them.

Further, nobody needs to read my papers and/or agree with my insights. Everybody is free to ignore the work of his colleagues and to avoid taking advantage of their results, in my case nothing new, but just understanding the implications of basic hydromechanics.

I do not know, what I find more surprising: the lack of curiosity, the lack of craftsmanship or the lack of phantasy. If you do not like my modest 'surprising', call it 'hardly and hard to believe' or even 'absolutely incredible'. That's what it is, according to my modest standards!

But how then can it happen that the purpose of ducts is described in exactly my words without due reference? According to ordinary standards and the law this is plain plagiarism, recently an offense of considerable public interest in Germany. Nobody believes an expert (any more), 'claiming' not to know the literature in his field.

In another case of exactly the same type, concerning the purpose of trials, the equally surprising argument has been, that an adequate reference would have shied away clients! Again those interested will know whom I am referring to. Maybe, instead of 'surprising' you prefer the more appropriate 'incredibly stupid'.

I am a fan of equivalent models, provided they meet professional standards and can thus be standardised. They save us a lot of work and give us the freedom to select the ones, which are most suitable for our various purposes at hand. In that spirit I have delivered my lecture 'On Platon's prisoners and their models' at many institutes interested in my insights and meta-insights.

In other places any discussions have been refused for decades, the 'standing' reason has already been stated by Jacob Hildebrand (1693-1739) in his little poem 'The writer' ('Verse and Worse', 1958/230):
 "Titus reads neither prose nor rhyme,
 He writes himself; he has no time."

But back to my modesty, you find missing. If I find in a doctoral thesis and in a report - 'overseen' by at least eight experts, their names listed in the references - under the title 'Theoretical background' an abstruse

account of the fundamentals of hydrodynamics and propulsion I cannot but modestly, but unmistakably state, that the blatant nonsense concerning Bernoulli's equation and its implications is not mine.

Of course I understand that a paper, not having been read, cannot possibly be understood. But as you will have noted, I modestly refer to a number of much more severe problems, for those who still know how to read and to relish modest formulations.

Again and again I felt that all the simple things I am talking about are not worth mentioning to young colleagues, who can do wonderful things. But having seen some of their instinctive beliefs, some of their theoretical background in writing (!) has finally convinced me, that Dr. Wagner was right in encouraging me to write my simple minded contribution.

Let me close with a remark on the disadvantage of too much modesty. In case of ISO 15016: 2002-06 'Ship speed trials' modesty has led to ignore the evident deficiencies of the draft, made public well in time, and thus resulted in a standard not meeting the requirements of industry.

Similarly DIN 1313:1998-12, corresponding to ISO 31 'Quantities and units', does not reflect the state of the art and 'modesty' is going to prevent the necessary revision I am currently promoting; details to be found on my website.

In my paper I just follow John Allen Paulos. In his 'Once upon a number' he stated, I just quote from the German edition at hand (2004/73):

"Ich wiederhole die meisten dieser Punkte – trotz der Tatsache, dass die Wiederholung von Unsinn viel eher toleriert wird als die seiner Entlarvung, die meistens als Schimpfen und Ereifern aufgefasst wird."

And as long as colleagues are talking about 'how' I am talking, I am pretty confident, that they are not yet wondering 'why' I am talking about 'what'.

After all you can certainly envisage the problems I am facing in preparing a modest presentation, catching the interest of the audience in about no time allotted, after the end of a busy day and before a reception at another location.

With kind regards and many thanks again for your truly 'provocative' review, resulting in this, maybe surprising, 'hopelessly' immodest, impudent mail and an additional page of my paper, I am looking forward to 'hopefully' fruitful discussions, if any.

Yours, Michael Schmiechen.

PS. I consider your comments and my reply as contributions to the discussions to be documented on my website as stated in the paper. In this connection I suggest that the collections of papers distributed at symposia should no longer be called 'proceedings'.