

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-02/msg00779.html>

- *From:* "Androcles" <androc1es@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 10 Feb 2006 14:14:31 -0800
-

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Fri, 10 Feb 2006 15:54:57 +0100, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Mon, 06 Feb 2006 23:20:06 +0100, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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?

I have discovered the real reason for the sagnac fringe shift.

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

It fully supports the BaTh.

Of course you have. Of course it does.
Interferometers are governed by hitherto unknown laws of nature,
newly discovered by you.
Since you assert the BaT CANNOT be wrong (how could it be?),
nature MUST obey and change it's laws accordingly.

Nature doesn't have to change one iota to obey the BaTh. It obviously does
already.

We know that the SR explanation is identical to that which
would apply to a
'sound sagnac' in still air. In other words SR relies on aether
theory to
explain sagnac.

Quite.
The speed of light is c in the ether frame.
The speed of light is c in all inertial frames.
The latter relies on the former.
Another world shattering Wilsonian discovery.

In aether theories, the speed of light will be MEASURED as ' c ' in all inertial
frames.

How does SR differ from that?

You SRian sagnac explanation is identical to that which applies to sound in
air.

BE A MAN AND ADMIT IT.

Coming from you that's rich. You still owe me 3 cases of Glenlivet,
abo.
Androcles.

SR is just another aether theory.

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Paul

HW.

www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/index.htm