

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01884.html>

- *From:* "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 10:59:36 -0700
-

mluttgens@xxxxxxxx wrote:

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxx wrote:

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxx wrote:

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxx
wrote:

PD
wrote:

There
are
three
facts
that
remain

—
The
correct
formula
for
combining
velocities
(independent
of
what

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

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.

The references I gave confirm this claim.

[...]

Proton–proton
collisions

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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
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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

"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.

As I told you Marcel, I did the work and gave you explicit references nearly a year ago. You can surely do some Google work to at least find out where I did that, especially since you say you remember it. I'm not about to make things lapdog-easy for you, Marcel. I wouldn't do it for a serious physics student, either, because knowing how to dig this stuff up is as basic a skill as using a timing light is to a car mechanic.

Now, you have three choices at this point:

- a) You can say you don't want to work that hard at figuring this stuff out, in which I'd invite you to steer clear of the business entirely because there are plenty who are willing and eager to do that.
- b) You can say that you don't know how to look stuff up, and you need

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

more basic training in how to do library research and how to find out what work has been done on a topic that you're unfamiliar with. In this case, I can recommend some options for getting that training other than dawdling in newsgroups.

c) You can say that you are willing to work hard at figuring this stuff out, and that you do know how to do library research, and then you go do it.

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

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

In science, Marcel, experimental evidence carries enormous weight. It trumps intuition, it trumps common sense, it trumps what looks to be really good ideas. If it ain't confirmed by experimental evidence, then it ain't worth squat.

Now, you may be of the opinion that for every bit of experimental evidence that supports one idea, then there is other experimental evidence that supports a completely different idea. This is tantamount to rejecting the value of experimental evidence in science. If this is what you think, then you either do not know what role experiment plays in science, or you shouldn't be trying to do science, or both.

PD

Marcel Luttgens

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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