

Re: Photon, Momentum, Mass

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-05/msg00734.html>

- *From:* John Kennaugh <JKNG@xx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 5 May 2007 11:34:12 +0100
-

Tom Roberts wrote:

John Kennaugh wrote:

Tom Roberts wrote:

What "physical process" makes it be _straight_?

As per Newton's laws of motion.

This is not at all a "physical process".

I did not say it was.

If you like it is an axiom of physics that 'straight' is natural and a physical process is required to change it from that natural state.

So you DON'T really expect a "physical process", even though you have repeatedly demanded one.

I don't expect a physical process when none is required.

This is in essence an assumption that Euclidean geometry applies (geodesics in E^3 are where "straight lines" come from).

Laws of motion have nothing to do with Euclidean Geometry. Euclidean Geometry has been retrospectively (in the 20th century) grafted onto Newtonian Mechanics as a way of supporting the ridiculous suggestion that because SR can be put in the diagrammatic form of a totally artificial invented geometry that somehow that makes it OK.

Re: Photon, Momentum, Mass

What justification do you have for this assumption,

I did not mention Euclidean Geometry neither did I use it to justify my answer. Your argument is completely circular. Einstein started from two postulates based upon his understanding of the physical processes involved. From the equations Einstein produced, Minkowski showed them in diagrammatic form. That diagrammatic form is now described as 'geometry'. The artificial mathematical trick of showing time and distance on the same diagram is now assumed to have physical if not mystical significance when there is absolutely no justification for doing so and now you are telling me that that replaces the physical processes which Einstein wrestled with to come up with his postulates in the first place. OF COURSE the geometry says that the speed of light is c in every inertial FoR – The geometry was invented based totally on the assumption that that is the case. As I say it is circular. It may help you sustain your faith but it does nothing for objectivity and it is of no help to me.

[snip]

—

John Kennaugh

.