

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-02/msg00834.html>

- *From:* "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 11 Feb 2006 16:07:00 +0100
-

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?

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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

That's wrong.
That only applies to LET where the Lorentz transform apply,
not to what commonly is meant by "ether theories" where
the Galilean transform apply.

> How does SR differ from that?

SR is not different from LET when it comes to its predictions.

But you are clearly not thinking of LET by "ether theories":

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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

See?

In "ether theories", like the one Michelson thought was correct, light behaves like "sound in air".

In SR and LET, it does not.

BE A MAN AND ADMIT IT.

I never disputed that SR's Sagnac explanation is identical to that which applies to sound in still air.
(That is non rotating air stationary to the centre of the ring.)
Quite the contrary, I have agreed to it before.

It is your conclusion drawn from this that is incredible naive:

SR is just another aether theory.

You don't get it, do you? :-)

Why is SR's Sagnac explanation different to that which applies to sound in moving air, Henri?
Could it be because there is no ether which could be moving in SR?

The two statements below are not identical, Henri.
The speed of light is c in the ether frame.
The speed of light is c in all inertial frames.

But you don't see the difference, do you? :-)

Paul

.