

Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-01/3798.html>

bryant_j_j_at_yahoo.com

Date: 01/18/05

Date: 18 Jan 2005 13:15:52 -0800

David Thomson wrote:

> *It's not trivial. It's proof that E does not equal m . E cannot be*
> *converted to m . The whole mass/energy paradigm is a fraud.*
>

geez Dave. who ever said that $E=m$? even if one sets $c=1$, one can
adjust the other units accordingly to make the equation meaningful.

>
> *Bill, you are amazingly scientific in your responses. You probably*
think
> *very highly of yourself for comments like that.*
>

he is just as "scientific" as you are, if not more so. your babbling
also does not have any scientific content to it.

what happened to helping me answer my freshman physics homework
problem? you do know what an integral is, right?