

# New version of a relativity FAQ

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-06/msg00951.html>

---

- *From:* "Pmb" <[peter.m.brown@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:peter.m.brown@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 21 Jun 2008 23:21:52 -0400
- 

Hi folks

A new version of the FAQ "Does mass increase with speed?" was written and is now online at

<http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/SR/mass.html>

This is a well written article on this whole relativistic mass thing. The author makes a great point

---

A common argument against the use of relativistic mass is the fact that the equation  $E=mc^2$  says that a body's relativistic mass equals its total energy, so why should we use two terms for what is essentially the same quantity? We

should just stay with energy, and use the word "mass" to refer only to rest mass. But this argument neglects the definitions of the words mass and energy. Mass is a property of a body that we have an intuitive feel for; its definition as a resistance to acceleration is very fundamental. Energy, on the other hand, is defined in physics in rather ad hoc ways. Neither concept is even remotely understood by modern physics.

---

sniff sniff. I'm getting all misty at the quality of his writing :)

To the author – Well done sir!

Best wishes

Pete

.