

# Re: The H&K Flying Circus

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-02/msg00001.html>

---

- *From:* "Paul B. Andersen" <[paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 31 Jan 2006 23:24:18 +0100
- 

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Thu, 26 Jan 2006 23:05:32 +0100, "Paul B. Andersen" <[paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Henri Wilson wrote:

Androcles is correct for once.  
Sagnac is NOT understood.

The classical explanation - which is also SR's - is the same as that which would apply to a sound based sagnac interferometer in still air.

Right.  
The speed of light is isotropic  $c$  in an inertial frame.  
The speed of sound is isotropic  $c$  in the air frame.

So you do understand the Sagnac experiment.  
Then you also understand why the emission theory predicts no Sagnac effect.

Paul, you are behind the times.

Does that mean that you no longer understand the Sagnac experiment?  
The laws of nature have yet again changed?

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Paul

.