

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-02/msg01020.html>

- *From:* "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 13 Feb 2006 21:20:17 +0100
-

Henri Wilson wrote:

On Sat, 11 Feb 2006 16:07:00 +0100, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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.
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.

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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":

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".

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

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.

Thank you. Now tell the ever-stubborn Dishman.

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?

It wouldn't matter if there was and it did.

The LET analysis of how an object moving in the aether will appear in the frame of an observer also moving in the aether but at a different absolute speed is exactly what SR says.

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? :-)

Re: The H&K Flying Circus

The difference is that SR has no physical significance at all. It merely reverts to LET in any practical situation.

There are no differences between LET and SR when it comes to what they predict.

But the state of motion of the ether of LET has no physical consequences whatsoever. All predictions are exactly the same regardless of what speed you assume the ether to have. (Which is very different from "sound in air".) This ether is undetectable by principle. If it is detected, then both SR and LET are falsified. Does such an ether really exist? The question is pure metaphysics, not physics.

So if you insist to call SR an ether theory like LET, do so. It is a bit stupid, but of no practical consequence.

The important point is that SR/LET (with or without an ethereal ether) is very well confirmed and never falsified.

As opposed to the ballistic theory.

We were talking about Sagnac. SR/LET correctly predicts the observed fringe shifts. The ballistic theory predicts no fringe shifts. SR/LET is confirmed. The ballistic theory is falsified. Insisting that SR is an ether theory cannot change that.

Paul

.