

Re: Orthodoxy's Opposition to Theories of Superluminality

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.research/2004-07/0692.html>

From: Norm Dresner (*ndrez_at_att.net*)

Date: 07/29/04

Date: 29 Jul 2004 05:59:35 -0400

"greywolf42" <mingstb@marssim-ss.com> wrote in message
news:10gfb8k9raqm5d@corp.supernews.com...

> *Mark Palenik* <markpalenik@wideopenwest.com> wrote in message

> news:RPmdndm8wcvinJrcRVn-tw@wideopenwest.com...

>> "greywolf42" <mingstb@marssim-ss.com> wrote in message

>> news:10gb3icit9n487e@corp.supernews.com...

>>> <snip>

>>> *You may note that your item number 1 is purely theoretical (even if it*

>>> **is* "mainstream"). Item number 2 is experimental. According to the*

>>> *scientific method, experiment trumps theory.*

>>

>> *I take it you haven't read any of the messages here explaining that that*

>> *information is out of dat, inaccurate, and was speculative at best, at*

the

>> *time.*

>

> *Sure I'd read the other posts. However, they are irrelevant to the claims*

> *and reasoning provided (which was snipped) by the prior poster (Norm*

> *Dresner). Norm posted a claim that Ockham's Razor would have us discard*

> *experimental results if it contradicted accepted theory. And solely*

because

> *it was 'simpler' to accept conventional theory. Norm did not provide any*

> *other reasoning. My post responded solely to the reasoning provided by*

> *Norm -- which was clearly unscientific.*

>

I would have you [as I do] intensely question unreproducible experimental

"data". After all, "data" is neither "information" nor "evidence" but

simply data. It's only when it's validated and properly interpreted that it

becomes believable. I was not questioning the "data" per se, though I

haven't seen it, but rather that it unequivocally supported the existence of

superluminal particles. Also see below for my comments on the meaning

attached to data. As far as my not providing any other reasoning, I was

speaking as a non-expert expressing belief -- actually more like trust -- in

the claimed results. Mathematics is solely governed by proof [based on a

possibly implicit set of hypotheses] but a vast amount of modern physics is

based solely on faith — faith in the Copenhagen Interpretation or the Bohem Paradigm or ... for example. Faith and belief are relevant for physics practitioners even those who come to the party without data.

>

> *As to your current claims:*

>

> *1) Experimental data is never 'out of date.' It does not have a shelf-life.*

> *This is merely a fallacy that 'new' interpretations or experiments must*

> *always be better than old ones.*

Experimental data taken with instruments that have been surpassed by new ones should be questioned, if not discarded, because of the greater accuracy of the newer devices. In this sense, then, the data *can* age. No one that I know questions the data in the original Michaelson–Morley experiment(s) but newer data have provided more restrictive limits on the ether. Galileo [IIRC] measured the speed of light. Surely you're not claiming that just because he had data that I have to take it as authoritative.

>

> *3) Experimental data is never speculative.*

>

> *> Am I the only one who thinks that whatever "orthodoxy's opposition to theories of superluminality" is, somebody would have realized the sheer usefulness of particles that can travel faster than the speed of light and which carry measurable properties like spin? I think the thought of getting rich would probably outweigh any "dogmatic opposition".*

Meter readings are never speculative [unless you're using my right eye, but that's another matter entirely]. Neither are particle tracks or scintillation counter events. But the meaning of any of these pieces of data can be entirely speculative — just look at the whole cold fusion brouhaha from a few years ago. AFAIR very few people argued with the readings — the raw data — but objected strenuously to the interpretation of them as supporting the occurrence of heterodox events.

>

>

> *Ah, but it is only those theories that are not mainstream that are considered refuted. Dr. Hawking's views -- though commonly embraced -- never reached the point of paradigm. And only Dr. Hawking was allowed to question Dr. Hawking's views. They have been questioned many times before by others -- and the others have been ignored.*

Not everyone ignored the questioners. Perhaps Dr Hawking did but I suppose that's his prerogative.