

# Re: HOCUS POCUS

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01856.html>

---

- *From:* [mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 03:43:51 -0700
- 

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

PD wrote:

There are three facts that remain

– The correct formula for combining velocities (independent of what assumptions are made to \*derive\* that formula) has been completely verified in particle experiments. Call it an empirically confirmed formula, if you like, and forget about deriving it from any assumptions. It's nevertheless a confirmed relation.

Exact references, please.

I've done this for you before Marcel, almost a year ago. Your memory is

Re: HOCUS POCUS

short. That, or you learn nothing. That, or you didn't read what I pointed you to. I pointed to the comparison of rapidity distributions in proton–proton collisions at fixed target and collider experiments.

Yes, I remember, but I didn't find any experiment whose data allowed to confirm your claim.

I gave you references to the papers at the time. I don't know why you wouldn't have been able to "find any experiment".

Any experiment that confirmed your claim.

[...]

Proton–proton collisions and electron–electron collisions (for example) are routinely done in both collider and fixed–target environments. The physics of these collisions is simple enough (at least for some measurable distributions) that comparison of the nature of the collisions in both environments is tantamount to measuring the same process in two very different frames of reference. The relative speed of the colliding particles is measured in both cases as a normal part of beamline monitoring operations. The fact that the

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

distributions are identical if and only if the relative speeds in the two reference frames are related exactly by the relativistic prescription, is compelling evidence that the relativistic prescription is correct.

Exactly related, thus no error bars ?

Don't be ridiculous. A measurement always involves error bars. You should never use the presence of experimental error bars as an argument that the evidence is not compelling enough. The measurement should be sufficiently precise that it can clearly distinguish between a tested model and a competing model. That is true in this case.

"Exactly" was a bit exaggerated. Anyhow, a statistical analysis is needed to claim that such distinction exists. Where is it ?

In the papers. This is part and parcel of an experimental paper. Hint: You may need to read some of the references to get a complete picture.

Among those many papers, at least one of them should be unambiguously pertinent. Which one?

Did the experimenters expressly claimed that their observed distributions are explained by the relativistic addition of velocities?

No, they did not. This has to be inferred from the background information supplied in the references. If you're hoping that

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

physics  
articles are explicitly laid out to answer the specific question  
you  
ask (as though the article is written in response to your  
question),  
then your expectations about reading scientific articles  
probably needs  
to be adjusted.

As the experimenters seemingly didn't mention your alleged relation  
with the "relativistic prescription", I presume that you did the  
analytical job  
yourself.

Actually, I didn't need to do that because I had already read and was  
familiar with most of the papers referenced in the articles I referred  
to you, or I was separately familiar with their results through contact  
with the experimenters. Moreover, I'm familiar with the definition and  
properties of rapidity. And so when I see rapidity distributions that  
are identical at the same root-s, then I know what that means. People  
that aren't as familiar with the field have to do a bit more background  
reading to catch up, but it's not a huge issue.

Low, your experience of the subject matter justifies your personal  
conclusion.

Scientifically, "seing" something is not enough. As you are so sure,  
why  
don't you publish a paper, that would bring you some fame?

If this is the case, perhaps could you show us how you  
reached your conclusion. Otherwise, the readers could remain skeptical.

It's not my task to make you less skeptical. It's not my job to educate  
you in a newsgroup. I am giving you enough information so that you can  
correct your misconception and lack of familiarity with experimental  
results on your own without too much difficulty. Now, do some homework.

Those are rather arrogant words, revealing a strong personality.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Don't forget that the burden of the proof lies with the "claimant", not with the reader.

This newsgroup is not the courtroom where such issues are decided. You are owed no burden of proof here. The information you've been afforded here in response to your error is a luxury. Anyone can \*choose\* to not learn something if they're really not interested in learning it, and that in no way places the burden on anyone to teach them anyway.

In a sense, it \*is\* a courtroom, where paranoia is condemned.

Marcel Luttgens

PD

Marcel Luttgens

Where can their articles be found ? (Exact references, please).

Given previously, Marcel. Do your own homework now.

Marcel Luttgens