

Re: Only Some Energy Has Mass?.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/14030.html>

From: Nick (macromitch_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 03/28/05

Date: 27 Mar 2005 18:34:11 -0800

Stan Liou wrote:

> On 27 Mar 2005 18:13:50 -0800, "Nick" <macromitch@yahoo.com>

> wrote:

>

> >Mark Martin wrote:

> >> Do you not get it yet? MASS is not the be all & end

> >>all of a particle's existence.

> >

> >And energy is? But you can't seperate mass from energy.

>

> While technically correct, I don't think this means what
> you think it does. One can separate the energy contributions
> of rest mass and momentum, which is the real issue.

>

> >Why does light's energy not have mass when all other
> >forms do?

>

> The same reason a stationary object's energy comes only
> from mass. Or will you now claim that there is something
> wrong with that also?

It isn't an answer. It is just the reverse argument.

But if you say matters energy is solely in its mass

isn't to say it still isn't another form of energy.

why not say energy is another form of mass?

It goes both ways period.

You say not then why is light the exception?

> ---

> Stan Liou

>

> Posted Via Usenet.com Premium Usenet Newsgroup Services

>

> ** SPEED ** RETENTION ** COMPLETION ** ANONYMITY **

>

> <http://www.usenet.com>