

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01866.html>

- *From:* "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 06:18:22 -0700
-

mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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
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.

The references I gave confirm this claim.

[...]

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

as a normal
part
of beamline
monitoring
operations.
The fact
that the
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 ?

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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?

The two primary papers I gave you are unambiguously pertinent. You want
to be spoon fed. I don't have a spoon that will fit your mouth.

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 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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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?

I have my share of published papers, thanks, and I'm not in need of fame, thanks. And yes, indeed, my experience of the experimental evidence informs my personal conclusion. A personal conclusion that is not based on experimental evidence, on the other hand, but is based on intuition and incredulity, does not carry a whole lot of weight.

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.

I don't care what you think about my personality, Marcel. Physics doesn't have to be nice. You *are* expected to do some homework if you want to do some physics.

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Nonsense. Popularity contests and impassioned debates about what *should* be so have no place in physics. Bucking the status quo for the sake of doing just that serves no useful role in physics. This ain't no coffee shop, this ain't no steenking philosophy club.

Marcel Luttgens

PD

Marcel Luttgens

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

Given previously, Marcel. Do your own homework now.

Marcel Luttgens

Re: HOCUS POCUS