

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01877.html>

- *From:* mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 09:34:49 -0700
-

PD wrote:

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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
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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

[...]

Proton–proton
collisions
and
electron–electron
collisions
(for
example)
are
routinely
done
in
both
collider
and
fixed–target
environments.
The
physics
of
these
collisions

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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?

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.

According to Google, there are about 52,200 papers about rapidity distributions in proton-proton collisions, so I would be grateful if you gave the exact references of those two primary papers. As you seem to be the only person claiming that the relativistic addition formula is validated by experiments, I am convinced that a lot of people would also be grateful to get those references.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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 properties of rapidity. And so when I see rapidity distributions that

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Wow, your experience of the subject matter justifies your personal conclusion. Scientifically, "seeing" 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.

And you think that your experience of the experimental evidence alone does carry much weight ?

Marcel Luttgens

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

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.

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 steinking philosophy club.

Marcel Luttgens

PD

Marcel Luttgens

Where can
their articles
be found ?

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

(Exact
references,
please).

Given previously, Marcel.
Do your own homework
now.

Marcel
Luttgens