

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01936.html>

- *From:* mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 20 Sep 2006 03:48:27 -0700
-

PD wrote:

mluttgens@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

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

—

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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
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 distributions are identical if and only if the

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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?

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

About one year ago, you claimed that papers about rapidity verified length contraction. Now, they allegedly verify the relativistic addition of velocities.

Yes, indeed. Both are confirmed in the same pair of experiments.

Another of your proofs by assertion !

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

You are acting like a snake oil seller !
The snake oil is of course SR.

Well, once again, if experiment says the oil works, it works. You can call it snake oil all you want, but it works.

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.

Really? Then apparently you don't know how to read scientific papers. In that case, I recommend option (b). Would you like some suggestions?

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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.

Shaky? And on what basis do you say the evidence is shaky?

See messages n° 369 sq. at

http://groups.google.fr/group/sci.physics.relativity/browse_frm/thread/151c620970e5b236/621b142dbc78068f?lnk=st&

Marcel Luttgens

You are beginning to sound like Henri Wilson who says that any experiment that provides support for SR obviously has something wrong with it, without even looking at it.

As I said, if you're the kind of person that rejects the value of experimental evidence, or decides whether experimental evidence is shaky based on whether it agrees with your expectations, then you've got no business attempting to do science.

PD

Marcel Luttgens

PD

Re: HOCUS POCUS

17

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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

Re: HOCUS POCUS

Re: HOCUS POCUS

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