

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-02/msg00543.html>

- *From:* "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 06 Feb 2006 23:20:06 +0100
-

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Wed, 01 Feb 2006 14:50:37 +0100, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Tue, 31 Jan 2006 23:24:18 +0100, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Thu, 26 Jan 2006
23:05:32 +0100, "Paul B.
Andersen"
<paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Henri
Wilson
wrote:

Androcles
is

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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?

I understand it better than anyone. I have discovered the real
reason for the
fringe shift.

It fully supports the BaTh.

Quite.
The REAL reason is of course that interferometers
are governed by previously unknown laws of nature
newly discovered by Henry Wilson.

As this great genius has taught us, the laws of
nature are different for different phenomena.

Unlike Einstein worshippers, I still believe there are scientific questions to
be answered.

Like how an interferometer works?

Paul

.

Re: The H&K Flying Circus