

# 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

.