

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-07/msg03230.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 28 Jul 2008 09:04:16 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 28, 9:42 am, srp2...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On 28 juil, 09:06, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 27, 3:46 pm, srp2...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On 27 juil, 14:56, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Jul 26, 11:01 am, srp2...@xxxxxxxx
wrote:

On 25 juil, 16:58, PD
<TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Jul 25,
9:04 am,
srp2...@xxxxxxxx
wrote:

Measuring
the
lifetime
of
muons
in
no

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

way
proves
time
dilation
except
in
you
credulous
mind.

???
What
do
you
think
time
dilation
means,
Andre?
Supposing
time
dilation
were
to
have
tangible
effects,
just
for
a
moment,
how
do
you
suppose
it
would
show
up
in
the
measured
lifetime
of
decaying
particles?

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Exactly
like
any
recorded
decay
time
of
free
neutrons
show
up
with
respect
the
the
formally
recognized
mean
decay
time.

Not at all.
Populations
of free
neutrons
with
different lab
speeds
have
different
mean decay
times.

Definitely, just like muons
with different lab speeds
will
have a different rate of
decay inducing interaction.

Really? Why?

Because possibility of interaction is related to relative
velocities

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

of the interacting particles.

How so? What is the relation? Please derive a relation between the possibility of interaction and relative velocity of interacting particles.

Do you really think that I am open to discussing physics with you ?

Delusion.

Ah. I'm disappointed, of course.

Different mean interaction
delays with thermal
neutrons
and higher energy neutrons.

Really? Why?

Same reason. Some decaying interactions can occur only at low relative velocities while others can occur only at higher relative velocities.

Please show this. I'm sure I can follow a derivation.

I'm sure you can. See above.

Each type has its own characteristics. How can you not know that ?

The same for all unstable
particles.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

No relation whatsoever with any time dilation, except for whoever wants to see it there.

Not a proof of time dilation, just an interpretation as proof.

In other words, wishfull thinking.

Special relativity is not proven at the exclusion of all other possibilities.

You bet.

No theory ever is.

I disagree.

Please give me an example of a physical theory that is *proven*. Also please check in with some basic materials about the scientific method. I recommend Hatton and Plouffe.

The physical theory that the mass of an electron at rest is $9.10938188E-31$ kg.

Do you know the difference between a theory and a measurement, Andre?

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

And what you say is correct: "It could be due to something else entirely that mimics the same results."

Not that "mimics" the same results. That "explains" the same results.

However, such a quantitatively accurate model has yet to be put forward, that is competitive in predicting the same things that relativity predicts.

Not good enough. It will have to predict all of what SR and GR "correctly" predict within their limited frame and also, on top of this explain all other now know phenomena that neither SR nor GR can explain.

OK, if you wish. Such a model has yet to be put forward successfully.

It has been put forward. You just don't know about it and couldn't even understand it even if you tried.

If it's in your little book, then I'll be delighted to look it over when it arrives. If it's not there, but is hidden in a little wooden box under your mattress, then I guess it hasn't been put forward. If it is not hidden, but also not in an orderable ISBN, then I'm not sure what you mean by "put forward".

You are welcome to put forward a model that explains why *all* unstable particles, regardless of the fundamental interaction or selection rules that control their decay, decay at slower rates

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

if they are traveling faster through the
miasma of things they
could interact with.

Not even need for a new model for this. Plain and simple
common sense is enough.

I disagree. Theories make *quantitative* predictions. Common sense
rarely does.

There is a vast difference between a model *allowing* for a
phenomenon, and a model *insisting* that a particular phenomenon will
occur and at such-and-such a rate under such-and-such conditions.
Witness "intelligent design" which *allows* for any number of
phenomena, but *predicts* none.

I simply disagree.

I see. Then you and I disagree on what science is. You disagree as
well with the majority of scientists and philosophers about what
science is. That is your option, of course.

You are welcome to put forward a model that *quantitatively predicts*
the relationship between the rate of interaction and the velocity
between interacting particles.

Making the statement that "there obviously is such a relationship"
does not cut scientific mustard.

Obviously it doesn't cut mustard with your flavor of scientific
method.

Well, to be frank, it doesn't cut mustard with the prevailing flavor
of the scientific method, which is, by the way, the same method that
is described in the opening chapters of textbooks in biology,
chemistry, geology, as well as physics, as well as the scientific
method that is taught in schools from the 6th grade on. But again, if
you don't agree with the scientific method, that's good to know.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

It does with mine.

Yes, creationists feel the same way about their approach.

Note that relativity was able to *predict* this well in advance of even the discovery of neutron and muons and most of the other unstable particles.

SR did not predic in any way the then unknown existence of neutrons nor of muons neither of any other then undiscovered unstable states.

No, but it *certainly* predicted the dependence of their measured lifetime as a function of their velocity in the laboratory, even before they were discovered!

It didn't predict it. It only mimics it by coincidence. Just like the triceratop mimics the rhyno.

Sorry, it gets the answer right and does so before the measurement is made. That is what is connoted by the term "prediction".

This was accomplished through fine analysis of experimental scattering results. That's all.

If your proposed alternate can make similar *predictions* rather than a collection of postdictions, you may be onto something.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

As I said, I am positive that you will be unable to understand the new space model. This doesn't mean that it could not predict, even if it frustrates you no end, the so-called "anomalous" acceleration of both Pioneer crafts, and also their less well known so-called "anomalous" axial spin slowdown.

It predicted both, as well as explaining atomic clocks rate change with altitude and also the fluctuations in Earth's and Moon orbits and earth rotation rate and slow Moon orbit expansion and all related astronomical phenomena from the very same and simple reason. A simple reason that you are unable to apprehend from your irrational Copenhagen viewpoint and that also reveals a new way to generate practically unlimited energy.

And even if I was "on to something" as you say, you will have no role to play either to defeat or promote it. All of this is way above your head, and even mine at this point. No turning back possible.

The box has been opened and when time is ripe, the Jack will jump out on its own. Just a matter of time.

[snip for brevity]

I know that's what they were not referring to. You have made the implication that they did not, that time dilation ONLY arises as the

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

result of gravitational effects and spacetime curvature. Nowhere do Ciufolini and Wheeler say that or imply it.

Never did I make such an assertion. I say that time dilation simply does not exist for the reason already explained, and is not required at all.

And certainly Ciufolini and Wheeler do not make THAT statement.

No. I made it.

Yes, and this is why it mystifies me why you would bring Ciufolini and Wheeler in as support.

I assure you that the authors of the papers referenced are also of considerable reputation, and I'll leave it to you to read those papers to see what they say. Your misconstrual of what Wheeler and Ciufolini wrote notwithstanding.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

I think you did.

As for the papers you are referring to, they all are dealing with the difference in behavior of energetic particles with respect to their behavior when less energetic.

No different from energetic protons with respect to thermal protons.

A no starter as far as proving any time dilation.

Feel free to keep on believing it however.

But you still need to provide ref to a paper that describes an experiment specifically designed to prove time dilation ...

No experiment PROVES A THEORY.

Meaningless sidestepping.

Either you can prove a theory right, or else it is wrong somehow.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

That is incorrect. That is NOT how science works.

Well, that's how I work. "science" will have to adapt.

OK, then. Have at it. As long as you are clear that what you are doing is not science in the *conventional* meaning of the term.

You may want to revisit the basics of the scientific method and how science does what it does.

Already visited. Disagreement with your sacrosanct method.

Either a theory correctly describes reality or else it does not and is worthless.

That is correct.

Bingo.

But correctly describing reality does not prove that it is the sole model that does so, at the logical exclusion of other possible models.

Illogical. Sorry. No ifs and no buts.

The scientific method chooses theories that agree on a class of experimental data, by developing the theories further to the point where they make *different* quantitative predictions. Then this prediction can be put to experimental test, so that a measurement unambiguously favors one experiment over the other.

If you didn't know how the scientific method works, then you should have said so in the first place, and we could have started back with real basics.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

I don't really care about your twisted flavor of scientific method.

Again, let me just reiterate that this is not "my" flavor of the scientific method. This is the scientific method that is taught in schools from the 6th grade on, and how it is described in virtually every introductory science text in any scientific discipline. Thus, if you consider the scientific *community's* flavor of the scientific method twisted, that is again your option, but it is a different kind of battle you're engaged in.

Either
a theory is right or else it is wrong. No half pregnancies allowed.

What a theory does is show results that are consistent with a theory or not consistent with a theory. If there is a large body of evidence from a number of independent experiments that are consistent with a theory, to a degree that is superior to any proposed, competing theories, then that theory gains favor.

That's baloney. If even one repeatable experiment proves a theory wrong, It is wrong however well it covers other cases.

This means that it is not extensive enough to cover all cases. Back to square one in search for a more extensive theory.

But no theory is ever proven. If your challenge is to demand proof of a theory, then you've come to the wrong place.

How so. This is sci.physics, an unmoderated group for conversation on physics. This is exactly the right place to air any opinion whatsoever on the matter. Anyone is free to participate.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Well, that's certainly true. You are free to express the opinion that the scientific method should be chucked and that science should go about its business differently, providing *proof* of its models to the exclusion of other models or you won't be satisfied. Good luck with that.

Thank you, but luck not required.

I just wonder what happened to you in your primary and secondary school science classes when the basics of what science *means* was discussed.

Fortunately, I was taught formal logic through the whole Euclidian theorems sequence before I was exposed to your tainted flavor of scientific method.

No effect can occur without a cause, cause happens before effect, and there has to be a continuous logical path between both.

Ah. And I think that Euclid, who I believed lived 2300 years ago, might indeed be surprised by how science has developed in the interim. You may not be particularly happy about that. Since Euclid is dead, it's not clear whether he would be happy or sad.

All else is pathetic and meaningless blah blah.

So you can stop wondering.

André Michaud>> The "pure of heart" can safely retreat to moderated groups.

Be my guest.

I gave you a number of experiments specifically designed to *test* special relativity, and the collection of these experiments also serve to test other theories, such as ballistic theory or Lorentz-ether theories or tired-light theories. To date, the theory that survives best is relativity.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

Re: The clock malfunctioned.

They survive through dogged blind faith of some and
absolute
indifference of a majority, not through actual scientific proof.