

Review of: "The Sagnac-Wang Interferometers and Absolute vs. Relative Simultaneity"

Prof. Espen Gaarder Haug¹

¹ Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Dr. Justo Labare:

In the linear Sagnac experiment, the length of the arms can, in principle, be made very long, and the turns at the ends where acceleration is occurring can then be shown to have close to no significant effect on the first-order effects that are easily measurable. This indicates that General Relativity Theory (GRT) is not needed to explain the linear Sagnac experiment. In the Lorentz Transformation (LT), one has to introduce concepts like time gaps to explain the experiment, something that is not needed in LTA. Thus, multiple models are mathematically consistent with the observed linear Sagnac experiments, but LTA seems to provide a more logical interpretation that can be easily explained, etc.

However, based on Dr. Justo Lambare's comments, one can question if he is interested in discussing this in depth; instead, he makes claims such as:

"All I can tell you is this. I do not believe in conspiracies, so I don't believe that our best scientists and Nobel prize winners are incompetents unable of critical thinking that can bindlessly be indoctrinated to believe obviously incorrect theories such as Einstein relativity." – Dr. Justo Lambare

Such discussion does not seem to be based on scientific reasoning. Lorentz had already received the Nobel Prize in 1902, and for many years, there were discussions even among Nobel Prize winners about what the best model for the theory of relativity was. Einstein and de Broglie, both Nobel Prize laureates, did not agree on certain aspects of quantum mechanics, for which other Nobel Prize winners were recognized. Nobel Prize winners even disagree on many points in physics. To claim that someone who does not agree with an idea published by a Nobel Prize winner is indulging in a conspiracy theory is not a scientific way to discuss matters. It is a simple attempt to label your opponents as unscientific. You seem to be faltering in your arguments.

In a comment further down Lambare claim:

"Regarding the "principle of authority", such a principle has little value in science. It could be useful for very conservative scientists who tend to automatically reject new ideas but the truth and the evidence always end up being

accepted. Let me give two examples, Fritz Zwicky was a very original and far-sighted scientist, he proposed dark matter in the 1930s but his colleagues dismissed his original ideas. Dark matter was finally accepted in the 1970s when it was independently confirmed.”

What do you mean by 'Dark matter finally accepted?' Are you referring to the majority of physicists or something else? There is no complete consensus on dark matter to this day. All we can say is that the majority of researchers think there is dark matter. Dark matter has never been directly detected, and there are numerous suggestions in the literature that provide potential explanations for this. It's also possible that dark matter may not exist at all. That's why a significant number of physicists, for instance, are actively researching the MOND theory, which has been gaining increasing recognition in prestigious journals in recent years, and naturally also in popular science articles such as

<https://scitechdaily.com/dark-matter-may-not-exist-these-physicists-favor-of-a-new-theory-of-gravity/>

In addition, there are at least 5 or 6 other minimum acceleration theories, many of which have also been published in well respected journals. Furthermore, there are also other types of “alternative” gravitational theories that claim they do not need dark matter to explain such things as galaxy rotations. Additionally, solutions to Einstein's field equations that have not been well studied could possibly also shed new light on this topic.

I personally have not formed my opinion on dark matter, but it is evident that there is no full consensus, except perhaps within parts of General Relativity (GR) circles that have built their careers on such as dark matter. The topics should naturally be discussed further until one get closer to some real consensus. By spending times in some Ecco chamber some perhaps thinks there is already a full consensus, however the many papers published in respected journals on the topic with alternatives to dark matter do not seem to agree.

Therefore, it is unclear what your point is; you seem to be avoiding a discussion of the central points, such as the idea that General Relativity may not be necessary to describe the linear Sagnac experiment. Moreover, the Lorentz Transformation (LT) leads to peculiar interpretations, such as the necessity to include a time-gap, as discussed in the literature we have referenced.