

## Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/3300.html>

---

**From:** David Thomson ([news5\\_at\\_volantis.org](mailto:news5_at_volantis.org))

**Date:** 01/08/05

Date: Sat, 8 Jan 2005 14:58:31 -0600

"Bjoern Feuerbacher" <[feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)> wrote in message  
news:crgh8c\$4no\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

>> *Even still, E cannot be the unit of energy*

>

> *What on earth do you mean with this sentence? No one ever*

> *said that E \*is\* the unit of energy! 1 Joule is the unit of*

> *energy; E is simply the symbol used for energy in equations!*

Do you know what the difference is between an equation and an expression? I fully agree with you if you're saying that E is merely a symbol. Because if E is merely a symbol, then  $E=mc^2$  is not an equation. There is no equality. All there is is an expression of  $mc^2$ . That's what I've been saying all along.

Everybody talks about  $E=mc^2$  as though it were a real equation. It's not. There is no equality between the two sides.

Now, if there is no equation, there is no way to make energy equal to mass. E is just a symbol, it is not the unit of energy, just as you state.

Dave