

# Re: Simple Sagnac

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-08/msg00495.html>

---

- *From:* "bsr3997@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <bsr3997@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 4 Aug 2005 18:57:33 -0700
- 

sal wrote:

> Hey, Sock, who's your puppeteer?

>

>

> On Wed, 03 Aug 2005 21:59:15 -0700, bsr3997@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

>

>>

>> sal wrote:

>>> On Tue, 02 Aug 2005 21:32:21 -0700, bsr3997@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>> Leaving out the + or - wrt is what caused your time to come out the

>>>> same in both directions.

>>>

>>> No, it's not. It's assuming the signal moves at C/N relative to the

>>> cable (rather than C relative to the fixed frame), combined with vector

>>> addition of velocities, which leads to the time coming out the same in

>>> both directions.

>>

>> Ah, so you found your error, And I assume you will correct it on your web

>> site :)

>

> Ah, so you intentionally misunderstand.

Not sure what you are talking about here but I don't intentionally misunderstand things. It is not my intention to be a troll. I commend you for the effort you have put into building your site. I was just trying to correct a few things that I knew were not quite right. It wasn't meant as an attack. Sorry if it came off as one.

As for my being a crank, I do not claim that there is anything wrong with relativity. And I am not the only one that said there were a few questionable things about your page. Bill Hobba questioned the use of SR with a rotating system. Your own page says that you can not sync clocks in a rotating frame. That should have been a clue that something was wrong. What you have done is show why SR can't be used in rotating frames. Bilge and Dirk also raised some questions. Are

## Re: Simple Sagnac

they puppets as well?

- > That was the reason that a purely Newtonian argument with fixed signal
- > speed relative to the cable which leads to no Sagnac ... it wasn't any
- > "mistake" on my web page, nor any mistake in relativity.

The reason it was a mistake is because you claimed to be viewing things classically from the stationary frame. Making the "fixed signal speed relative to the cable" is right out of relativity, and frame jumping to boot.

- > Whoever your puppeteer is, you're boring.
- >
- > **\*\*plonk\*\***
- >

I have no puppeteer. Bruce S Richmond

- >
- > --
- > Nospam becomes physicsinsights to fix the email

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: sal

- *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: Bilge
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: Dirk Van de moortel
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: sal
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: sal
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: Daniel Cook
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: sal
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: bsr3997@xxxxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: sal
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: bsr3997@xxxxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: Simple Sagnac**  
◇ From: sal

Re: Simple Sagnac

- Prev by Date: [\*Re: Why Sagnac disproves Special Relativity.\*](#)
- Next by Date: [\*Re: SR vs GR\*](#)
- Previous by thread: [\*Re: Simple Sagnac\*](#)
- Next by thread: [\*Re: Simple Sagnac\*](#)
- Index(es):
  - ◆ [\*Date\*](#)
  - ◆ [\*Thread\*](#)