

## Re: Proof for E=mc2

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/6183.html>

---

**From:** Androcles (*dummy\_at\_dummy.net*)

**Date:** 01/16/05

Date: Sun, 16 Jan 2005 11:14:35 GMT

"Zigoteau" <zigoteau@yahoo.com> wrote in message  
news:1105869214.559400.75740@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...

> *Hi, Androcles,*

>

>

>> *I cannot agree with that. Newtonian physics readily accepts potential  
>> energy, given up as kinetic. The cork bobbing on water or the mass on  
>> a spring are examplars.*

>

> *Nobody is denying it.*

>

>> *We accept the sun is constantly pouring away  
>> enormous quantities of energy, the potential form of which is it's  
>> mass,*

>

> *?? That's a relativistic concept.*

Whatever you call it, it happens.

Why does it need to be called "relativistic"?

>

>> *> and mass is measured as force.*

>

> *?? No it's not*

No? Oh... I'll throw away my bathroom scale, shall I?

Just how DO you measure mass, then?

$F = dp/dt$ , I thought.

Hmm.. maybe I don't have mass if I'm not moving, huh?

I'm willing to learn new tricks, go ahead and tell me how its done.

>

>> *The potential energy (mass)  
>> concentrates into a small space by some force we call gravity,  
>> (again in NM)*

>

> *OK*

>  
>> *and the resultant pressure at the core gives rise to*  
>> *the release of the mass as radiation.*  
>  
> *No*

Ok, have a nice day.  
Androcles

>  
>> *Finding an equation relating*  
>> *the two was not something Newton did, that is agreed, but Newton's*  
>> *physics didn't end with Newton. They continued once experiments*  
>> *with electricity and magnetism were made, and diverged when*  
>> *Einstein began guessing with his "thought" experiments.*  
>  
> *They . . . Newtonian physics? . . . started running into trouble at the*  
> *end of the 18th century with various discoveries, including*  
> *radioactivity.*  
>  
>> *Any equations you write are intended to represent the world*  
>> *in which we live,*  
>  
> *Absolutely*  
>  
>> *not a wild imagination where time, previously*  
>> *invariant, and distance, previously invariant, give up those*  
>> *properties in favour of light's speed being invariant, and gives*  
>> *up the PoR as well.*  
>  
> *Since when has imagination been a bad thing per se? Are you taking*  
> *pride in your lack of it?*  
>  
>> *Einstein states:*  
>> *"But this result comes into conflict with the principle of*  
>> *relativity set forth in Section V. "*  
>> *ref. <http://www.bartleby.com/173/7.html>*  
>> *He is in fact stating that the velocity of A with respect to B*  
>> *differs from the velocity of B with respect to A.*  
>  
> *Isn't that something to be bothered by?*  
>  
> *And I do like the story about Einstein imagining himself sitting on a*  
> *light beam, which would then apparently have an impossible*  
> *distribution*  
> *of electric and magnetic fields.*  
>  
>> *How can you reconcile the collision energy? Does the stationary*  
>> *car do less damage to the moving car than the moving car*  
>> *does to the stationary?*  
>

sci.physics: Re: Proof for  $E=mc^2$

- > *The risk of death or serious injury in a road accident is much greater*
- > *in a SUV than in an ordinary car. (Just to join in the spirit of the*
- > *thing and bring in a completely irrelevant fact.)*
- >
- > *Cheers,*
- >
- > *Zigoteau.*
- >