Re: LIGO.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−02/msg00980.html

- *From*: cliff wright <c.c.wright@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 13 Feb 2007 17:30:48 +1300

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

> On Feb 11, 7:40 pm, cliff wright <c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> ...
>
> > No I'm not one of those people you speak of with regard to science being
> > a con job. Just as well that it usually isn't. Religion and Politics are
> > quite enough in that department.
> > I might add that it would be remarkable if I gave up many hours of my
> > time to listen to a lot of Con men while spending a lot of my time in
> > retirement building telescopes and observatories and researching the
> > history of electronics, one of my pet subjects, if I was anti science.
> > The fact is most people think of me as fanatically pro Science
> > especially the local Creationists and members of the anti Space lobby.
> > regards Cliff Wright.
>
> Cliff makes a point, we can all see faces
> in clouds, that's human, but what he fails
> to realize is the effort put into the evolving
> the algorithm that combines the signals.
> Dr. Baez explained that awhile ago, it takes
> serious processing power + algorithm.
> Ken
> BTW, Al Gore did NOT invent the algorithm!

Oh Dear Ken! I'm afaraid I still don't seem to be getting through!
My son for example is an expert (and highly qulified and experienced) software engineer so I have acess to pretty good technical advice on software.
My WHOLE POINT is that the detection of a previously unobserved phenomenon requires definitive and independent proof. This was for example fortunately insisted on in the case of "Cold fusion" and the infamous "n" rays early last century. No matter what results the 2 LIGO's give the definitive prooof of "gravitational radiation" is not in until a source for the signal can be at least strongly suggested which agrees with the current state of Physics knowledge, or which by observation extends our knowledge.
I have seen just how far astray the use of massive computing power can lead in the case of Acoustics modelling. Indeed a post doc student I was working with once discovered that the algorithm used in the standard reverberation tests for auditoria by some of the worlds best equipment companies was seriously flawed.
No matter what the old maxim still applies GIGO to LIGO just as much as any other use of computing analysis.
Doing maths on its own does not constitute complete scientific investigation, it remains a thought experiment or model until tested in the real world.
Regards Cliff Wright.
.