

Re: Photons

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-08/msg00842.html>

- *From:* "Androcles" <Engineer@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 10 Aug 2007 13:56:07 GMT
-

"PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1186751892.803112.98930@xx
: On Aug 10, 6:50 am, John Kennaugh
: <J...@xx> wrote:
: > PD wrote:
: > > On Aug 9, 3:52 am, John Kennaugh
: > > <J...@xx> wrote:
: > >
: > >> That is sloppy thinking. In classical electrodynamics circa Maxwell a
: > >> 'field' was a physical stress in the aether. Action-at-a-distance
force
: > >> between charges was transferred via this stress and the stress could
: > >> propagate through the aether at c in the form of light. Despite the
fact
: > >> that relativity owes its existence to Einstein's belief in some sort
of
: > >> aether, the concept of the aether has become highly unfashionable
: > >> resulting in the almost universal acceptance of the 'no aether
: > >> doctrine'. The fallout of this is that while physicists still talk in
: > >> terms of 'fields' the word no longer has a meaning.
: > >
: > >> It is true that the term "field" means something different than it
: > >> originally did. That does not mean that it is now without meaning.
: > >
: > > I would be obliged if you would explain what meaning it now has.
: > >
:
: To explore that deeply would mean opening a book. But I'll give you a
: head start -- a pointer, if you will.
:
: The modern definition of a field means that every point in space (and
: time) is associated with a *value*, such that the value obeys certain
: constraints and has some physical relevance.

The modern definition of time is that it takes light the same "time" to
get from A to B as it takes to get from B to A.
It's totally wrong and stupid, of course.

Re: Photons

To explore that deeply would mean reading a web page. But I'll give you a head start -- a pointer, if you will.

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>