

Re: Physics without energy

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-09/3992.html>

mobydick_at_gmail.com

Date: 09/09/04

Date: 9 Sep 2004 10:36:09 -0700

Bjoern Feuerbacher wrote:

- > *A much better argument is that energy is simply *defined* as the ability*
- > *to do work. If Mike wants to talk about a "byproduct" instead of a*
- > *"prerequisite", then he can't call it "energy", plain and simple.*

Your argument is that by refining the role of energy, I am creating something new and cannot call it energy.

This is a horrible practice in physics. In the 20th century the role of energy was greater refined from being something very different from matter to being nearly identical to matter itself, as the poster YT points out:

<http://penguin.servehttp.com/sven/physics/b998cbbe-9901-448d-b9a0-b940d51e7d66.pdf>

The inability to refine a concept that you are enforcing is more reminiscent of religion than an evolving framework of conjectures and theories.

- > >> *If correct, then to actually model nature, we don't need to include*
- > >> *"energy" as any kind of constituent of the model. If built correctly,*
- > >> *energy should be a by-product of the functioning model.*
- >
- > *If one builds something which is a byproduct of work, then one is not*
- > *allowed to call it "energy" anymore, plain and simple. Words have*
- > *defined meanings in science. Simply asserting that the word should mean*
- > *something else than its defined meaning makes you only look silly,*
- Mike.

Making the assertion that words have defined meanings and can't change makes you look religious. And silly.

I'd rather be just silly.

Re: Physics without energy