

# Re: why lorentz transformation?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-09/msg00046.html>

---

- *From:* [D.McAnally@i'm\\_a\\_gnu.uq.net.au](mailto:D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au) (David McAnally)
  - *Date:* Thu, 1 Sep 2005 07:49:15 +0000 (UTC)
- 

"Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

>francisco wrote:

>> galileo's principle of relativity states that the laws of mechanics should  
>> be the same for all inertial observers. and indeed, newtonian mechanics is  
>> unchanged under galilean transformations. the problem is that maxwellian  
>> electrodynamics is not the same in every inertial frame under that  
>> transformation. so what to do? find a set of transformations under which  
>> both mechanics and electrodynamics are the same for all inertial frames.  
>> this leads to the lorentz transformation.

>Since Maxwell's equations don't predict radiation either

As the softrat points out, Maxwell's Equations do predict the existence of electromagnetic radiation. What line of reasoning could possibly have led you to believe that they don't? Seeing that you have made this demonstrably false claim about Maxwell's Equations, how could anybody trust your word on anything else?

-----  
.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ [\*Re: why lorentz transformation?\*](#)  
    ◇ *From:* Sue...

- *References:*

- ◆ [\*why lorentz transformation?\*](#)  
    ◇ *From:* francisco
- ◆ [\*Re: why lorentz transformation?\*](#)  
    ◇ *From:* Sue...

- Prev by Date: [\*Re: twin patadox question\*](#)
- Next by Date: [\*Re: why lorentz transformation?\*](#)
- Previous by thread: [\*Re: why lorentz transformation?\*](#)
- Next by thread: [\*Re: why lorentz transformation?\*](#)
- Index(es):

Re: why lorentz transformation?

- ◆ Date
- ◆ Thread