

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01898.html>

- *From:* mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 14:50:41 -0700
-

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

(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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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
is
simple

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

stuff up is as basic a skill as using a timing light is to a car mechanic.

About one year ago, you claimed that papers about rapidity verified length contraction. Now, they allegedly verify the relativistic addition of velocities. You are acting like a snake oil seller ! The snake oil is of course SR.

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 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.

I will not repeat the "job" I did last year, as nowhere did I find a confirmation of your claims.

Did
the
experimenters
expressly
claimed
that
their
observed
distributions
are
explained

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Iow, 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.

Shaky or alledged experimental evidences demonstrate nothing.

Marcel Luttgens

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

PD

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

13

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 steenking philosophy club.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Marcel Luttgens

PD

Marcel
Luttgens

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

Given
previously,
Marcel.
Do
your
own
homework
now.

Marcel
Luttgens