The Shape and the Switch: The Bond Angle of Water Is the Angle of the Nucleus, and Why Sharing Is Not Conducting

Martin Scholl — Independent Researcher

It Is All One — Chemistry Notes. July 2026 (working draft)

Abstract. Two structural facts of chemistry are re-read here through the geometry of the It Is All One series, and each carries a teaser a chemist can test from an armchair. First, shape: the tetrahedral bond angle arccos(−1/3) = 109.47° that sets the geometry of carbon and the bent 104.5° of water is the same closure angle that governs nuclear stability in this series' Neutron Decay paper — the proton sits at 108.35° (one degree under tetrahedral, stable), the neutron at 115.9° (six over, unstable). One geometric constant, the tetrahedral angle, appears at the chemistry rung and the colour rung, fourteen orders of magnitude apart. Second, the switch: the intuition that shared electrons make a material conductive is false, and its failure is diagnostic. Diamond shares every valence electron perfectly and is a 5.5 eV insulator. Conductivity is not a sharing property but a topology-and-filling property of the shared space — the rooms must percolate across the material and their winding shells must be open. This single reframing sorts the entire periodic landscape (covalent insulators, ionic melts, metals, aromatic rings, graphene, conducting polymers, semiconductors) by one question asked room by room: is the winding shell closed? The switch is Pauli's — the wedge $Q \wedge Q = 0$ that built the periodic table — read at the scale of the material. Both teasers are offered as curiosities, flagged at the series' standard, for the chemist to reproduce and judge.

1. The Angle of the Water Molecule

Water bends at 104.5°. Methane, and the carbon skeleton of all organic chemistry, sits at 109.5° — the tetrahedral angle, whose exact value is arccos(−1/3) = **109.47°**. This angle is the reason ice floats, the reason DNA is a double helix, the reason carbon builds life: it is the shape of a shared space with four windings arranged to stay as far apart as Pauli exclusion demands.

Now the teaser. In this series' *Neutron Decay as Octonion Algebra*, the stability of the nucleon is governed by a **closure angle** — the angle between the two ways of associating a triple product of octonions, which measures how close three quarks come to forming a perfect tetrahedron. The numbers:

Object	Angle	From tetrahedral (109.47°)	Fate
Methane (C)	109.5°	on it	the skeleton of life
Water (O)	104.5°	−5° (lone-pair compressed)	the solvent of life
Proton	108.35°	**−1.1°**	**stable**

Neutron	115.9°	**+6.5°**	**decays**

The same geometric constant — the tetrahedral angle, $\arccos(-1/3)$ — sets the shape of the water molecule and the life-or-death of the neutron. At the chemistry rung it is the angle four electron windings adopt in a shared cell; at the colour rung it is the angle three quark windings adopt in the cage. Fourteen orders of magnitude of scale, one angle. A chemist who has drawn 109.5° ten thousand times has been drawing the framework's fingerprint.

Flag, series-standard: the *appearance* of the tetrahedral angle at both rungs is exact (both are $\arccos(-1/3)$, for the same reason — four or three mutually-repelling directions on a sphere seek maximal separation). The *claim* that this is one geometry rather than two instances of a common optimization is the interpretive step, and it is offered as a curiosity, not a proof. But the coincidence is worth a chemist's pause: the angle they trust most is the nucleus's angle too.

2. The Switch: Why Sharing Is Not Conducting

Every chemist carries an intuition worth interrogating: shared electrons should conduct. It is false, and its failure is the most instructive thing in this note.

Diamond shares every valence electron, perfectly — four covalent bonds per carbon, the entire crystal one covalently-bonded molecule, sharing as total as sharing can be. Diamond is one of the best electrical insulators known, with a 5.5 eV band gap. Maximal sharing, zero conduction. The intuition is simply wrong, and the reason it is wrong is a theorem of this series.

A covalent bond is a two-centre shared cell occupied by exactly one electron pair — spin-up and spin-down, the two Pauli slots filled, the winding shell **closed**. In the *Pauli Exclusion* paper's language, a closed shell is a purely real quaternion: $Q \wedge Q = 0$, the wedge shut, inert. A covalent bond is therefore a **two-atom helium** — a locally completed shell, sealed against passing charge. The electrons are absolutely shared; but the shared winding is closed, and a closed winding cannot accept a traveller without paying the gap to the next winding up. Diamond's 5.5 eV gap is that price.

The corrected rule:

Conductivity is not sharing. It is percolation of open windings: the shared rooms must connect across the material, and the winding shells inside them must be unfilled.

Run the periodic landscape through that rule and it sorts itself:

Material	Shared space	Winding shell	Conducts?
Diamond, quartz (covalent)	millions of tiny 2-atom rooms	closed (full pair)	**no** — insulator
Rock salt (ionic)	winding transferred, not shared	both ions closed	**no** — but *melt* it and the rooms (ions) move → ionic

			conduction
Copper (metallic)	one room spanning the crystal	open at the Fermi surface	**yes**
Benzene (aromatic)	one 6-atom ring-room	open around the ring	**yes, around the ring** — the measurable ring current
Graphene	ring-rooms tiled into a plane	open across the plane	**yes**
Conducting polymer	ring-rooms chained	open along the chain	**yes** — plastic that conducts
Silicon (semiconductor)	sealed rooms, low door (~1 eV)	closed but leaking thermally	**partly** — $e^{(-E_g/2k_BT)}$, the seal at the bath's temperature

The whole electronics industry lives in the last two rows: engineering exactly how closed a shared space is, and installing dopant rooms whose tenants sit a whisker below the ceiling.

The teaser for a materials chemist, testable against known series: conduction switches on at the exact structural moment the *open* shared room percolates, and not one bond before — benzene (localized ring current) → fused rings → graphene (planar conductor), or isolated double bonds → conjugated chain → conducting polymer. The switch is not "more sharing"; it is "the shell stayed open *and* the open rooms connected." Both conditions, or neither works.

3. One Sentence

Chemistry is the art of building closed rooms; metallurgy is the art of leaving one room open; electronics is the art of a door you can afford — three trades in one shared-space geometry, distinguished by nothing except whether the winding shell clicks shut, and the click is Pauli's: the same $Q \wedge Q = 0$ that built the periodic table decides, room by room, whether your material insulates your desk or carries your current.

4. What This Note Claims, and Does Not

Claims. The tetrahedral angle is common to the electron-winding geometry of bonds and the quark-winding geometry of the nucleon, for the same repulsion-on-a-sphere reason. And conductivity is correctly diagnosed not by whether electrons are shared but by whether the shared winding shells are open and percolating — a reframing that sorts covalent, ionic, metallic, aromatic, and semiconducting matter by one criterion.

Does not claim. That the two-rung appearance of arccos(−1/3) is proven to be one geometry rather than two optimizations (Section 1's flag). That the shared-space language computes bond energies or band gaps — it organizes them; the numbers come from the full Schrödinger and band treatments this series derives elsewhere. The teasers are curiosities in the house sense: reproducible, falsifiable, and either meaningful or destined to die in public.

References

M. Scholl, *Neutron Decay as Octonion Algebra* (this series, Paper 5) — the closure angle and the tetrahedral factor; *The Pauli Exclusion Principle as a Theorem of Quaternion Algebra* (Paper 3) — the wedge $Q \wedge Q = 0$ and the closed-shell = real-quaternion reading; and the standard structural chemistry of water, methane, diamond, benzene, and the conducting-polymer literature (MacDiarmid, Heeger, Shirakawa, Nobel 2000). *(Citations from memory; the literature-verification pass applies.)*

Acknowledgment: drafting assistance by machine (Claude, Anthropic); interpretations and flags are the author's.