Review of Neil deGrasse Tyson’s Video on Special Relativity at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n2s1-RHuljo

and London City Girl at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ttZCKAMpcAo

By Robert Sungenis

At 0:34, Tyson says Relativity assumes two things:
1) speed of light is constant in a vacuum for all observers, regardless of their motion, and
2) the laws of physics are the same for all observers.

He admits these are “assumptions” that one “has to buy into.”

What is behind Tyson’s claim?

First, that light can travel without a medium. To Tyson, a vacuum is nothingness. Light has the ability (in Relativity theory) to travel in waves without a medium to make the waves. Essentially, Special Relativity theory claims that light makes its own waves, but it does not explain how this happens.

Before we proceed, there are two important things to know about Einstein’s Relativity theories in general:

1) Special Relativity [SRT], invented in 1905, took away the aether that was previously the accepted medium for light propagation in the 1800s (including Maxwell’s equations in 1865), and left a “nothingness” vacuum, which went by the name of “spacetime,” but for which no physical description was forthcoming, only a mathematical equation \(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 – c^2t^2\), which is essentially Descartes’ matrix with time added as a fourth dimension.

2) General Relativity [GRT], invented in 1915, took back the aether precisely for light propagation in a medium, which Einstein admitted in his 1920 Leyden paper, saying: “Recapitulating, we may say that according to the general theory of relativity, space is endowed with physical qualities; in this sense, therefore, there exists an ether. According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense.”

So, basically, the two theories contradict one another in regards to the existence of aether. Einstein tried to mollify the contradiction by claiming: “But this ether may not be thought of as endowed with the quality characteristic of ponderable media, as consisting of parts which may be tracked through time. The idea of motion may not be applied to it.”

What Einstein is referring to is that Hendrick Lorentz’s version of aether was always in motion. For example, Lorentz claimed that the aether rotated with the Earth.

---

2 Ibid.
Einstein wanted aether, but aether that was motionless and therefore could not be tracked in time, which would essentially be an “imponderable” or “immaterial” aether.

So, the first thing we would refute is Tyson’s claim that light is constant in a vacuum. For what is a vacuum? Does it have aether or not? Relativity gives us two different answers. SRT says there is no aether; GRT says there is. Here’s why it is important: If light moves through aether and the aether moves while the light is propagating through it, what is the true speed of the light with respect to the observer? It would be $c + \text{speed of the aether}$, or $c + v = \text{true } c$.

Now we can see why Einstein didn’t want his aether to move. If it moved, then $c + v$ would be the reality. But since Einstein wanted $c$ to be constant, he said his revived aether could not move (although he never gave a physical explanation of what that particular aether was composed of or why it couldn’t move).

Why didn’t Einstein want aether for Special Relativity? Because it was the only thing he had to answer the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment [MMX]. Based on the behavior of light in a medium, MMX said that a light beam discharged in the direction of the Earth’s presumed movement around the sun through the medium should affect the light beam. That is, since the Earth was moving 66,000 mph through the aether as it revolved around the sun, the light beam should decrease from its normal speed, $c$. Since MMX did not show the required decrease in speed (NB: it only showed one tenth of what was required if the Earth was moving around the sun), science was in a quandary how to explain this? There were three choices. The three are recorded in a biography of Einstein:

“The problem which now faced science was considerable. For there seemed to be only three alternatives. The \textit{first} was that the Earth was standing still, which meant scuttling the whole Copernican theory and was unthinkable. The \textit{second} was that ether was carried along by the earth in its passage through space….The \textit{third} solution was that the ether simply did not exist, which to many nineteenth century scientists was equivalent to scrapping current views of light, electricity, and magnetism, and starting again.”

Notice that one of the solutions was Earth was not moving around the sun, but it was “unthinkable.”

Einstein picked the “third solution,” which claimed that the aether did not exist, and therefore there could be no significant effect on the light beam discharged in the direction of the Earth’s presumed motion around the sun. (Incidentally, the one-tenth of aether presence measured by MMX Einstein chalked up to “experimental error”).

Prior to Einstein taking Door #3, however, was Hendrik Lorentz’s taking Door #2 in 1892 but with the added feature that the aether through which the Earth traveled as it went around the sun put pressure on the MMX experimental apparatus and made it shrink. It ended up being called “the Lorentz Contraction” and was then put into an equation:

\[
\text{The New Length} = \text{The Old Length} \times \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}},
\]

which was called the “Lorentz Transformation” equation. As Lorentz explained it, the aether pressure shrunk the apparatus just enough to make it appear as if “the Earth was standing still.”
But Einstein, although stuck with the notion that the MMX apparatus had to shrink (since there was no other way to make it appear the Earth was moving when, in fact, MMX showed it wasn’t moving), didn’t like Lorentz’s cause for the shrinking. One of the main reasons was that prior to MMX aether was known to be a frictionless substance that could not put pressure on material objects so as to shrink them.4

So Einstein’s solution was to assume the aether did not exist and claim that the MMX apparatus shrunk not because of friction but because of the “principle of relative motion.” In other words, when an object moves it shrinks due to a mysterious phenomenon of nature, as yet unexplained by Einstein or his followers to this very day. Einstein then used the same equation as Lorentz to measure the shrinkage, namely,

\[
\text{The New Length} = \text{The Old Length} \times \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}.
\]

At that time, Einstein was accused by various philosophers of violating the philosophical foundation of ‘cause and effect.’ But since there was really no other answer (except Lorentz’s contradictory aether theory) to MMX’s finding that the Earth was “standing still,” modern science was stuck with Einstein’s Door #3, and Einstein became world famous.

In essence, Einstein had two choices to answer MMX:

(1) he could say the Earth was constant (i.e., not moving).
(2) he could say light is constant (since he dispensed with the aether to affect it)

He chose #2 because, well, #1 was “unthinkable.” But in choosing #2, it created a whole new set of problems. The first was the ‘cause and effect’ violation. The second was length contraction, since no one had ever physically measured one. It was all theory with no substance.

The third was that if one makes light constant, which then requires length contraction, it will also require time dilation. For if an object is traveling from point A to point B and its length is contracted while moving to point B, then the object will not reach point B in the same time it would have reached point B if the object had not been contracted. To solve this problem, Einstein was required to dilate (increase) the time that the object is allowed to reach point B. The increase in time was calculated by the same equation that length was contracted, namely,

\[
\text{The New Time} = \text{The Old Time} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}.
\]

4 Einstein writes: “Guided by purely formal points of view, H. A. Lorentz was the first to introduce the hypothesis that the form the electron experiences a contraction in the direction of motion in consequence of that motion, the contracted length being proportional to the expression $\sqrt{(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2})}$. This hypothesis, which is not justifiable by any electrodynamical facts, supplies us then with that particular law of motion which has been confirmed with great precision in recent years.” (Relativity: The Special and the General Theory, p. 57). The other reason Einstein didn’t want Lorentz’s aether was that he was trying to find a solution to Maxwell’s equations wherein he could reduce Maxwell’s two equations for a magnet moving with respect to an electric charges into one equation. Einstein believed that if he set aside Maxwell’s aether, he could reduce the two equations to one equation.
NB: You will notice that the equation for time dilation is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$ instead of $\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$. This is because it all depends from what source one measures the change in time. If you measure it from the moving object’s reference frame, the time is contracted. If you measure it from the finish line, point B’s perspective, the time is dilated. Hence, if you use time dilation you must put the contraction formula in the denominator, under 1. If you use the contracted time, you make the contraction formula the nominator.

But the distortion of time created all kinds of paradoxes in Relativity theory (e.g., the twin paradox that Tyson tries to explain in the rest of his four minute video) that, to this day, have not been explained by Relativists to anyone’s satisfaction.

The fourth was that if an object moves from point A to point B and its length is contracted, then the same amount of mass will not cross point B as it would if the length had not been contracted. Thus Einstein had to increase the mass of the object, and did so by the same equation he increased time, namely,

$$\text{The New Mass} = \text{The Old Mass} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}. $$

Essentially, in order to keep the Earth moving when, in fact, MMX showed it wasn’t moving, and in order to declare the corollary point that light was constant in speed, Einstein had to revamp all of physics, and he did so by making length, time, and mass changeable, and by declaring that the change in all three had no direct physical cause other than “relative motion.” But neither Einstein nor his colleagues ever explained how “relative motion” could change physical dimensions like length and mass or abstract dimensions like time.

The simpler solution, of course, was to admit that Earth wasn’t moving and that light was, indeed, affected by aether, but that solution was “unthinkable.”

But, as we saw earlier, Einstein got caught having to take back in 1915 the very aether he rejected in 1905, but this contradiction was glossed over in the media as if it never happened. This was demonstrated no better than in the headlines of the New York Times on January 25, 1925 as it commented on the next experiment Michelson did with Henry Gale in 1925 [MGX]. This time, instead of trying to measure if the Earth was revolving around the sun, Michelson set up his apparatus to measure the Earth’s rotation, and he used the same principle of aether’s retardation of light speed that he had used in 1887.

The results in 1925 were very different than in 1887. Michelson found 98% of a relative rotation between the Earth and space in his 1925 experiment, while his 1887 experiment found, at most, only 10% of an Earth revolving around the sun. These results meant, of course, that aether existed, but that it only showed a rotation of the Earth but not a revolution of the Earth around the sun (which is perfect for geocentrism, since it only needs to show a relative sidereal rotation between Earth and space).

Here is how the New York Times explained the results. The headline reads:

“Michelson Proves Einstein Theory: Experiments Conducted with 5200-Foot Vacuum Tube Show Light Displacement: Ether Drift is Confirmed: Rays Found to Travel at Different Speeds When Sent in Opposite Directions.”

In the body of the article it says:
The register in the flight of these beams was an instrument known as the interferometer, which Professor Michelson has been perfecting for forty years. Through it was visible a white circle striped with vertical lines like hair drawn tightly across the face of an oval mirror. These were called interference fringes due to the fact that if the beams reached home at different times it would be recorded by a displacement of these lines. This displacement was shown in the experiment.’

Clearly, the article admits that: (1) Michelson found the aether drift he had been looking for and (2) light was found to “travel at different speeds,” yet no one at the New York Times or anywhere else in the world admits that both of these discoveries falsified Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity, which theory claimed that there was no aether and that light never traveled at different speeds! Instead, the headline says: “Michelson Proves Einstein Theory,” which was a bald-faced lie.

Of course, the fact that Einstein had taken back an aether for his 1915 General Theory of Relativity would be of no help here in 1925 for, as we saw, Einstein’s 1915 aether was “immaterial” and “could not be tracked by time.” But the 1925 MGX found a “material” aether, and did so by “tracking it in time,” which produced significant “interference fringes” in his apparatus. In case you can’t believe your eyes, the GWW dvd shows the actual article from 1925:
1:09: Tyson claims “all experiments have shown those two tenets are correct.”

R. Sungenis: Not so. No one has ever measured length contraction, ever. In fact, there are a number of theories of how to explain length contraction.5

Let’s look at one of the claims made for “time dilation.” It is claimed that muons or mesons from outer space have such a short half-life that they should not be able to hit the Earth’s surface, yet we find various muons and mesons hitting the Earth’s surface. Special Relativity [SRT] claims that this proves “time dilation,” that is, the life of the muon or meson is dilated by $\sqrt{1/c^2}$. But what the Relativists conveniently forget is that SRT must also include length contraction, since it is required by the theory to occur every time there is a time dilation. If length contraction is added, then the length the muon or meson has to travel must be shortened by the same ratio as the time dilation, and therefore it is a wash. As such SRT has no explanation for why muons or mesons hit the Earth.

Let’s look at one of the claims made for “mass increase.” It is claimed that when a proton is accelerated in a cyclotron, it gains mass, and this gain has been measured. Granted, they have measured something, but

5 1) “The contraction is real.” Lorentz stated in 1922 that the “contraction could be photographed” (Lectures on Theoretical Physics, Vol. 3, Macmillan, p. 203); C. Møller writes: “Contraction is a real effect observable in principle by experiment…This means the concept of length has lost its absolute meaning” (Moller, The Theory of Relativity, 1972, p. 44); Wolfgang Pauli: “It therefore follows that the Lorentz contraction is not a property of a single rod taken by itself, but a reciprocal relation between two such rods moving relatively to each other, and this relation is in principle observable” (The Theory of Relativity, Dover Publications, 1958, pp. 12-13); R. C. Tolman: “Entirely real but symmetrical” (Relativity Thermodynamics and Cosmology, pp. 23-24).

2) “The contraction is not real.” E. F. Taylor and John Wheeler write: “Does something about a clock really change when it moves, resulting in the observed change in the tick rate? Absolutely not!” (Spacetime Physics: Introduction to Special Relativity, p. 76).

3) “The contraction is only apparent.” Aharoni writes: “The moving rod appears shorter. The moving clock appears to go slow” (The Special Theory of Relativity, p. 21); McCrea writes: “The apparent length is reduced. Time intervals appear to be lengthened; clocks appear to go slow” (Relativity Physics, pp. 15-16); Nunn: “A moving rod would appear to be shortened” (Relativity and Gravitation, pp. 43-44); Whitrow: “Instead of assuming that there are real, i.e., structural changes in length and duration owing to motion, Einstein’s theory involves only apparent changes” (The Natural Philosophy of Time, p. 255).

4) “The contraction is the result of the relativity of simultaneity.” Bohn writes: “When measuring lengths and intervals, observers are not referring to the same events” (The Special Theory of Relativity, p. 59). See also William Rosser, Introductory Relativity, p. 37; and A. P. French, Special Relativity, p. 97; and Stephenson and Kilmister, Special Relativity for Physicists, pp. 38-39.

5) “The contraction is due to perspective effects.” Rindler writes: “Movement lengths are reduced, a kind of perspective effect. But of course nothing has happened to the rod itself. Nevertheless, contraction is no illusion, it is real” (Introduction to Special Relativity, p. 25).


7) “The contraction is real but invisible.” James Terrell writes: “…the Lorentz contraction will not be visible, although correction for the finite velocity of light will reveal it to be present” (“Invisibility of the Lorentz Contraction,” Physical Review, Vol. 116, No. 4, Nov. 15, 1959, p. 1041).

8) “The contraction is real and not real.” Einstein writes: “The author unjustly posited a distinction between Lorentz’s conception and my own with regard to the physical facts. The question of whether the Lorenz contraction really exists or not is deceptive. It doesn’t ‘really’ exist insofar as it doesn’t exist for a non-moving observer; it does ‘really’ exist, in that it can be proven principally through physical means for a non-moving observer” (“Zum Ehrenfestschen Paradoxon. Eine Bemerkung zu V. Varičaks Aufsatz” Physikalische Zeitschrift 12: 509-510; Original German: “Der Verfasser hat mit Unrecht einen Unterschied der Lorentzschen Auffassung von der meinigen mit Bezug auf die physikalischen Tatsachen statuiert. Die Frage, ob die Lorentz-Verkürzung wirklich besteht oder nicht, ist irreführend. Sie besteht nämlich nicht ‘wirklich,’ insofern sie für einen mitbewegten Beobachter nicht existiert; sie besteht aber ‘irklich,’ d. h. in solcher Weise, daß sie prinzipiell durch physikalische Mittel nachgewiesen werden könnte, für einen nicht mitbewegten Beobachter.”)
it isn’t necessarily mass. What they actually do in the “measurement” is note how much more energy is present on the proton when it is accelerated. They then convert this energy to mass by way of $E = mc^2$ (an equation, incidentally, that was not invented by Einstein, but by about a half-dozen scientists before him), and then claim that the increased energy on the proton can be understood as an increase in mass. Not so fast, Nellie. If the proton is traveling against an aether (which in both 1887 and 1925 Michelson showed existed) then the proton will increase in heat energy caused by friction against the aether, and one can figure out what this heat energy is by using the same $E = mc^2$.

The upshot? There is no proof for Special Relativity. But there is plenty of disproof for it, staring with Michelson’s two experiments of 1887 and 1925. This is precisely why Michelson never accepted Einstein’s Special Relativity theory (but if you read the rest of the January 25, 1925 New York Time article, Michelson is made to appear as if he accepted Relativity theory after he did his 1925 experiment).

The most interesting irony about SRT and GRT is, whereas SRT was invented in 1905 to make it appear as if the Earth were moving and not fixed in the center of the universe, by 1915 when Einstein was forced to invent GRT because SRT did not include gravity and inertial forces, Einstein found that GRT allowed the Earth to resume its fixed position in the center of the universe with the universe rotating around it. You might say that Einstein was hoist by his own petard.

--------------------------------

Review of London City Girl at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ttZCKAMpcAo

At 0:21 to 1:09, City Girl says, “Let’s start with things we must accept. There is no such thing as absolute motion or absolute rest. Objects move relative to each other….The Earth is constantly in motion, the sun is constantly in motion, and the galaxy is constantly in motion.”

From the above analysis of Tyson, we can see why City Girl wants her viewer to accept no absolute motion or absolute rest right from the start. That stipulation immediately eliminates a fixed Earth as the answer to the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment. If the Earth is fixed, there is both absolute motion and absolute rest, for the Earth would be in absolute rest and all the celestial bodies would be in absolute motion with respect to the absolute rest of the fixed Earth.

NB: what City Girl calls “classical relativity” is a bit confusing. It is well known that if a baseball is thrown at 10mph on a train moving at 50mph, the baseball is moving 60mph with respect to an observer at rest who is not on the train. This is known as Galilean Relativity.

At 1:27, City Girl claims as her next “must be accepted principle” that light must always be the same speed when observed by various observers. Notice, she hasn’t proven this assumption to be true (just as Tyson didn’t show any proof for it either).

We noted earlier that Einstein had two choices to explain the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment: (1) to make the Earth constant (i.e., not moving in space); or make light constant (always the same speed no matter who is observing it).
If you choose #2, then you are also required to dilate time, contract lengths, and increase mass in order to make everything else balance.

City Girl then presents the idea that Alex is moving near the speed of light and that as a result his clock is moving slower (i.e., time is contracting for Alex, not dilating). Hence, if his time is slowed, “his light can travel at a greater distance” apparently because it has more time to travel.

At 3:23, City Girl admits this is all confusing but, after all, it was given to us by “the most brilliant scientist of the 20th century” and the implication is you need to accept it because he was so much smarter than you. In reality, as we have seen, Einstein did whatever he could to defy the experiments that showed the Earth was standing still in space.

At 3:37, City Girl speaks of “length contraction.” She claims that since time dilation isn’t enough to compensate for what Alex will experience, “length contraction” has to be added to give the full effect. Actually, City Girl doesn’t understand her own theory. It is not because time dilation “isn’t enough” and thus one must add length contraction to make up for what time dilation lacks. In other words, it is not like adding 1 + 1 to get 2. The reality in Relativity theory is that time dilation must occur as a consequence of length contraction. It is more like 1 × 1 instead of 1 + 1.

Let’s review. As we noted earlier, if one makes light constant, it then requires length contraction. Why? Because since Einstein wanted to keep everyone believing that the Earth was revolving around the sun, he had to claim that the apparatus of Michelson’s 1887 experiment contracted just enough to make it appear as if the Earth was standing still in space. By what amount did the apparatus contract?

\[
\text{The New Length} = \text{The Old Length} \times \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}.
\]

But if you contract the length of an object, it will also require you to dilate the time the object was in motion. For if an object is traveling from point A to point B and its length is contracted while moving to point B, then the object will not touch point B in the same time it would have reached point B if the object had not been contracted. To solve this problem, Einstein was required to dilate (increase) the time so that the object can reach point B at the required time. The increase in time was calculated by the same equation that length was contracted, namely,

\[
\text{The New Time} = \text{The Old Time} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}.
\]

At 4:43, City Girl says that Einstein used the word “spacetime” to combine the effects of time dilation and length contraction. “Space” implies that when objects move they contract, and “time” implies that their time of travel is dilated (or contracted, depending from what frame of reference it is observed). It was Minkowski who put the concept of “spacetime” into an equation \((x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - c^2t^2)\), for modern science cannot propose a concept with having it put into an equation, whether the equation makes sense or not. Minkowski’s equation doesn’t make any sense, for it seeks to make a dimensional relationship between physical Euclidean space and the abstract entity of time.

But what we have seen is that the only reason Einstein added time to the mix was because he had contracted the Euclidean dimension of length (in an attempt to keep the Earth moving when the experiments showed it was standing still). And somehow, the constancy of the speed of light was to serve as the glue that held the heretofore ‘unglueable’ entities of Euclidean space and abstract time together into
one entity. Einstein never told us what made up “spacetime,” but it was treated in the physics after him as if it had a reality all its own.

At 4:50 City Girl states that “time slows down for objects traveling near the speed of light, and stops for object traveling at the speed of light…and time must go backward for objects that travel faster than the speed of light…this is why nothing can travel faster than the speed of light.”

These, of course, are natural consequences of the theory, but City Girl tries to turn them into practical necessities that make life possible, e.g., we can’t go backward in time because nothing can travel faster then light.

But here is where modern science is found, once again, contradicting itself. According to the Big Bang theory, space is being created as the universe expands, and this space, which would have to be the same “spacetime” that Einstein invented in Special Relativity, is said to be expanding way beyond the speed of light. So, the fundamental postulate of Special Relativity is being violated wholesale in the Big Bang theory – a theory which is said to be governed by Einstein’s Relativity theory.

At 5:30, City Girl says that Special Relativity only applies to objects moving at the same speed, and she is correct. But what she doesn’t say is that such a limitation makes the Special theory (setting aside its internal contradictions for the moment), a totally useless theory, since there is practically nothing in the universe that is moving at the same speed. If planets are revolving around stars, and galaxies are rotating on their axes and around each other, these are all in acceleration and never moving at the same speed.

This reminds us, once again, that the Special Theory was not invented to explain natural phenomena in the universe, but solely as an answer to the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment which showed the Earth was standing still. Technically speaking, this was also a misapplication, since if the Earth is traveling around the sun then it is accelerating and thus doesn’t fit the precise criterion of the Special Theory. All in all, the Special Theory was an ad hoc theory invented to keep the Earth moving in the face of all the experiments that showed it wasn’t moving. The ad hoc nature of the theory was exposed when Einstein had to invent the General Theory ten years later so as to include gravity and inertial forces.

At 6:30, City Girl says that General Relativity (GRT) shows that “gravity occurs when a massive object warps spacetime.” But according to Special Relativity, space is empty. It is a vacuum. Nothing exists in it. So what is being “warped”? How can “spacetime,” which is merely a mathematical equation to combine Euclidean space and abstract time be “warped” by a massive object? Relativity doesn’t explain any of this to us. It just expects you to accept that this is the way it has to be, since, as City Girl said herself, Einstein was “the most brilliant scientist of the 20th century.”

Interestingly enough, what City Girl fails to reveal to her audience is that, in all practicality, the Special Theory and the General Theory contradict one another. For example, the Special Theory says that neither a material object nor light can exceed \( c \), which is the speed of light as measured on Earth. The General Theory says that both a material object and light can exceed \( c \), since the speed depends on the presence and application of gravity and inertial forces. (Incidentally, astrophysicists use General Relativity to explain why “spacetime” can expand faster than \( c \), in case you were wondering).
At 6:18, City Girl attempts to explain how all this can be true. She says, “Countless experiments have been carried out and Einstein’s equations hold true. Modern GPS uses Einstein’s Relativity theory to pinpoint our locations with impressive accuracy.”

Here is the real truth. Although many “experiments” have been done, none have proven Einstein’s “Relativity theory.” Let’s take the very example that City Girl uses – the GPS system. If anything, the GPS disproves Einstein’s theory. This was known when it was discovered that GPS signals going from east to west (ETW) travel faster than those sent from west to east (WTE), by about 50 nanoseconds, all day, every day. But this defies the Special Theory, which claims that the signals should travel at the same speed, since, as Relativists consistently tell us, “the speed of light is always the same.”

So, in order to compensate for this discrepancy in light speed, the technicians adjust the GPS satellites to absorb the 50 nanosecond difference in order to make the speed of light the same for both ETW and WTE. But they don’t tell the public that they make these adjustments. Instead, they make it appear that Special Relativity is supported by the GPS.

Laying aside the outright lying that the science establishment does with regard to the GPS, why would electromagnetic waves travel faster ETW than WTE? The reason is that there is a relative rotation between Earth and space, as we noted earlier. Space is going ETW but Earth is going WTE, relatively speaking. So, any signal sent WTE in space is going to run into space traveling ETW. Conversely, if the signal is sent ETW, it will travel with space that is already traveling ETW and thus move faster.

One thing more of note. Although the difference between ETW and WTE was discovered in the 1925 Michelson-Gale experiment, it was discovered earlier in an experiment performed by Georges Sagnac in 1913. He used the same principle of the interference of light waves as Michelson did in 1887, but oriented his interferometer in a different way. He noticed that light waves traveling ETW always went faster than those traveling WTE. The same phenomenon occurs in many applications today, and it is a common occurrence in physics. It is called the Sagnac Effect. Relativity has no explanation for why it occurs, but they do admit that it occurs. In fact, when the technicians adjust the GPS computers to compensate for the 50 nanosecond difference of signals from ETW to WTE, they call it “the Sagnac Correction.”

At 6:40, City Girl gives her version of the Hefele-Keating experiment performed in 1971 as proof for General Relativity. She talks about planes that carried cesium clocks westward and eastward. When the clocks returned, they were “not in sync.” Well, we know why they were not “in sync” and the answer has nothing to do with “Relativity.” It is explained by the very phenomenon we noted above concerning the GSP system. When planes containing cesium clocks are flown WTE they run slower than when flown ETW. The reason they do so is that the aether discovered by both Sagnac in 1913 and Michelson-Gale in 1925 (NB: both Sagnac and Michelson attribute their results to “aether” in their peer-reviewed papers), is traveling ETW and will resist light waves traveling WTE, by about 50 nanoseconds.

Conclusion: Einstein’s theories were invented to keep the Earth moving when all the experimental evidence showed it was not moving.
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