

Re: [OT]: Ping Kevin Aylward – re your "scientific paper"

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004–09/4810.html>

From: Guy Macon (<http://www.guymacon.com>)

Date: 09/20/04

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 11:49:33 -0700

Don Pearce <dona1d@pearce.uk.com> says...

>It is not only a lack of clarity – it is your lack of understanding of
>– say – quantum mechanics that is the problem. Here we go with a few
>quotes:

>

>"No Two places at Once

>

>It is often stated that Quantum Mechanics implies that a particle can
>be in two places at the same time. This is false, and at no time has
>any experiment ever been performed that detected co–incidence of the
>same particle in two different positions at once.

>

>The reason for this erroneous notion, is again, due to the non
>existing collapse of the wave function."

>

>Nowhere in quantum mechanics is there a claim that a particle can be
>in two places at once – all you get is a probability field that makes
>no claims about position, until you make a measurement and force a
>collapse into a location – and that is always just one location.

>

>Next quote:

>

>"The collapse of the wave function or reduction of the state vector is
>simple not required in the correct ensemble interpretation, nor is it
>supported experimentally. No experiment has ever measured an object in
>two states simultaneously. Objects have only ever been measured in an
>eigen state, so to postulate that they do is unsupportable
>metaphysics. Objects only exist in eigen states, it is just not known
>which one they are in prior to a measurement. There is arguably,
>little place in physics for notions that cannot, in principle, be
>measured."

>

>Duh! Of course no experiment ever placed an object in two states
>simultaneously – the observation forces a single state. Have you not

>read the books?

>

>If objects only existed in Eigen states, but we didn't know what they
>were until we measured them, then the two slit experiment applied to
>individual photons would yield two bunches of hits, in line with the
>slits. It doesn't – there is interference.

>

>Next quote:

>

>"Schrödinger Cat was introduced to prove that one interpretation of
>the Copenhagen Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics was false. It
>achieved this, yet many simply failed to notice. The fact that a cat
>can not be both dead and alive at the same time was simple ignored.
>The reason for this was that the mathematics worked, irrespective of
>the fact that the metaphysical interpretation to the mathematics was
>>false. However, the mathematics simply does not require this
>metaphysical add on. "

>

>You've misunderstood – this was always an allegory. The idea was to
>consider the condition of the cat to be included within the wave
>function of the system inside the box. Obviously an object of that
>size collapses the wave function as quickly as any observer, and the
>cat is indeed either dead or alive in any real-world scenario. Imagine
>a putative cat made of a single electron, and you have a better idea
>of what the story is all about.

>

>Will that do for now?

I predict that Kevin will continue to claim that nobody has made a
single comments on the echnical merits of his paper.