

Re: Why is the speed of light what it is?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-10/1220.html>

From: Androcles (*androcles_at_nospamblueyonder.co.uk*)

Date: 10/04/04

Date: Mon, 04 Oct 2004 13:50:33 GMT

"The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@sirius.athghost7038suus.net> wrote in message news:fr8732-595.ln1@sirius.athghost7038suus.net...

| In sci.physics.relativity, Bill Bowden

| <wrongaddress@att.net>

| wrote

| on 3 Oct 2004 20:06:10 -0700

| <ad025737.0410031906.50d5a073@posting.google.com>:

| > Why is the speed of light 186,000 miles per second?

| > Why not 187,000 miles per second, or 185,000 miles per second,

| > or some other number?

| >

| > -Bill

| What, precisely, did you expect as an answer?

| Presumably, c is a condition of space;

That's aether theory, and MMX disproved it.

Your presumption is incorrect.

| one method by which

| one can derive c is from the permittivity and permeability

| of free space.

You can derive the volume of a gas from Boyle's law too.

It is zero at zero degrees Kelvin.

Funnily enough, something strange happens before you get there.

You can derive the speed of sound in empty space also, simply measure it as you gain altitude.

Funnily enough, there is no meaning to the velocity of sound in a vacuum.

You can derive the axis of a spinning sphere, too.

Funnily enough, it doesn't have one when it stops.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Why is the speed of light what it is?

So tell me, how do you derive c when there is no property of permeability or permittivity in nothing? Pretend there is aether to have that property, perhaps?

| Other methods of deriving c might be possible;

Sure, you can simply use a ruler and a fast watch.

| I'm not up on electromagnetics.

Then why claim there is?

Androcles

|

| --

| #191, ewill3@earthlink.net

| It's still legal to go .sigless.