

## Re: The Myths Examined

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/5915.html>

---

**From:** Dirk Van de moortel ([dirkvandemoortel\\_at\\_ThankS-NO-SperM.hotmail.com](mailto:dirkvandemoortel_at_ThankS-NO-SperM.hotmail.com))

**Date:** 07/29/04

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 2004 20:11:32 GMT

"greywolf42" <mingstb@marssim-ss.com> wrote in message  
news:10gikkupdne8t20@corp.supernews.com...

> Harry <harald.vanlintel@epfl.ch> wrote in message

> news:4108c32b\$1@epflnews.epfl.ch...

>>

>> "greywolf42" <mingstb@marssim-ss.com> wrote in message

>> news:10gglcbaqils03c@corp.supernews.com...

>>> Harry <harald.vanlintel@epfl.ch> wrote in message

>>> news:4107d128\$1@epflnews.epfl.ch...

>

>> SNIP

>>

>>>> what was predicted is by definiton a "null result" in physics, as I

>>>> explained some time ago (you can "Google" it).

>>>

>>> You were wrong then, and you are wrong now. Even David knows better.

>>> Finding "less" than was predicted (as in the case of the MMX) is not a

>>> 'null' result.

>>

>> Not just "less" but "very different".

>

> Null means 'nothing'. Zip. Nada. Zero. None. Empty set.

Then you have a null head.

<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22null+result%22+statistics>

Idiot.

Dirk Vdm

>

> "Amounting to nothing, lacking, absent, non-existent." From old French

> 'nul', meaning 'zero.' Which was from latin 'nullus': 'ne' NOT 'ullus'

> ANY." (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.)

>

> Null does not mean 'different than we expected.'

>

>> You mean also David still doesn't know that?

- >
- > *David provided a standard definition of what an experimental null would be.*
- > *That no signal of any sort is fo*