

# **Relativity scandal revealed in semi-banned lecture by Rupert Sheldrake**

**Roger J Anderton**  
**R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com**

Rupert Sheldrake gave a lecture for TED talks, which some people are saying has been banned, but its status is much more ambiguous as being - partially or semi-banned. As part of that talk he made a significant exposé of a scandal in Einstein's relativity; it does not seem to me that he fully realised what he has exposed and went onto talk about other things, as of which consequence his lecture caused controversy. The way that the mainstream deals with Einstein's relativity is to try to cover-up a scandal, and he accidentally exposed it; this paper is now dealing with the Relativity part of Sheldrake's talk.

TED talks is a series of talks by people deemed leaders in new ideas. Graham Hancock's talk as well as Rupert Sheldrake's talk were deemed controversial, and Ted Blog says [1]:

“After due diligence, including a survey of published scientific research and recommendations from our Science Board and [our community](#), we have decided that Graham Hancock’s and Rupert Sheldrake’s talks from TEDxWhitechapel should be removed from distribution on the TEDx YouTube channel.

“We’re not censoring the talks. Instead we’re placing them here, where they can be framed to highlight both their provocative ideas and the factual problems with their arguments. See both talks after the jump.

“All talks on the TEDxTalks channel represent the opinion of the speaker, not of TED or TEDx, but we feel a responsibility not to provide a platform for talks which appear to have crossed the line into pseudoscience.”

In this paper I am not dealing Hancock's talk because that does not deal with what this paper is about, namely - relativity.

It was not censorship of the talk by Sheldrake, but “they” did not approve of it as being science, and wanted to think of it as pseudoscience. One problem with those who are ardent supporters of mainstream Einsteinian-type science is that they don't want to accept the criticisms of Einstein's relativity, and make false claims such as that.

However, TED talks criticism of Sheldrake is not focused on the Relativity part of the talk and says [1]:

“According to our science board, Rupert Sheldrake bases his argument on several major factual errors, which undermine the arguments of talk. For example, he suggests that scientists reject the notion that animals have consciousness, despite the fact that it's generally accepted that animals have some form of consciousness, and there's much research and literature exploring the idea.

“He also argues that scientists have ignored variations in the measurements of natural constants, using as his primary example the dogmatic assumption that a constant must be constant and uses the speed of light as example. But, in truth, there has been a great deal of inquiry into the nature of scientific constants, including published, peer-reviewed research investigating whether certain constants – including the speed of light – might actually vary over time or distance. Scientists are constantly questioning these assumptions. For example, just this year Scientific American [published a feature](#) on the state of research into exactly this question. ([“Are physical constants really constant?: Do the inner workings of nature change over time?”](#)) Physicist Sean Carroll [wrote a careful rebuttal](#) of this point.

“In addition, Sheldrake claims to have “evidence” of morphic resonance in crystal formation and rat behavior. The research has never appeared in a peer-reviewed journal, despite attempts by other scientists eager to replicate the work.”

Sheldrake complains [1]:

“This discussion is taking place because the militant atheist bloggers Jerry Coyne and P.Z. Myers denounced me, and attacked TED for giving my talk a platform. I was invited to give my talk as part of a TEDx event in

Whitechapel, London, called “Challenging Existing Paradigms.” That’s where the problem lies: my talk explicitly challenges the materialist belief system. It summarized some of the main themes of my recent book *Science Set Free* (in the UK called *The Science Delusion*). Unfortunately, the TED administrators have publically aligned themselves with the old paradigm of materialism, which has dominated science since the late nineteenth century.”

It is the usual way of a few closed-minded people that try to block progress, and such people have done their best to similarly block progress in the mess made by Einstein and keep things stuck in the mess.

What Sheldrake has to say in his defence is interesting, and the consciousness issue is tied to the Unified Field theory research I am engaged in, but I wish to now get to the relativity:

The part of Rupert Sheldrake's talk - The Science Delusion - see link [2] is as follows:

Picking up on the relevant part of the talk, he was interested in the speed of light  $c$  and the gravitational constant  $G$  being constant. I am only concerned with the  $c$ - that is the speed of light in vacuum, free of influences on it and with respect to an inertial frame.

Sheldrake asks:

”.. fundamental constants, are they really constant? Well I got interested in this question. I tried to find out, they are given in physics handbooks; the handbooks of physics list the existing fundamental constants, give you their values. But I wanted to see if they changed. So, I got the old volumes of physics handbooks; and went to the patent office in London and there was the only place I could find that they kept the old volumes, because normally people throw them away when the new values come out, they throw away the old ones.

“When I did this I found that the speed of light dropped between 1928 and 1945 by about 20km/sec, that's a huge drop because they are given with errors of only a fraction .... of decimal points of error. And yet all over the world it dropped and they were all getting values very similar to each other with tiny errors. Then in 1948 [he corrected himself from

1945] it went up again and then people started to get very similar values again.

“I was very intrigued by this and I couldn't make sense of it. So, I went to the Head of metrology at the National Physical Laboratory in Teddington. Metrology is the science in which people measure constants and I asked him about this.

“I said – what do you make of this drop in the speed of light between 1928 and 1945.

“And he said - oh dear, you have uncovered the most embarrassing episode in the history of our science.

“So I said – well could the speed of light have actually dropped and that would have amazing implications, if so.

“He said – no, no, of course it could not have actually dropped, its a constant.

“[Sheldrake replied]- so well then how do you explain the fact that everyone was finding it was going much slower in that period, is it because they were fudging their results to get what they thought other people should be getting and the whole thing was just produced by .. in the minds of physicists?

“[He replied] – we don't like to use the word 'fudge'.

“I said what do you prefer? He said well we prefer to call it intellectual phase-locking (laughter from the audience).

“So, I said -if it were going on then, how can we be sure its not going on today and the present values produced by intellectual phase-locking.

“And he said – oh, we know that's not the case.

“I said – how do we know? He said – well we solved the problem.

“I said – how?

“He said – well we fixed the speed of light by definition in 1972 (more laughter from audience).

“But, I said – it might still change.

“He said – yes, but we would never know it, because we defined the metre in terms of the speed of light, so the units would change with it.

“So, he looked very pleased about that; they fixed that problem (laughter from audience). But I said what about big G.....”

Sheldrake went onto worry about the gravitational constant  $G$ , whether that was really constant because the values for that fluctuate a lot in the scientists'

measurements over the decades. The expert in metrology dismissed that as measurement error.

Worrying about  $G$  is not what I want concern myself here in this paper, I want to emphasis about  $c$ . Sheldrake seems to have missed the massive whatever you might call it - hoax – fraud- cover-up – fudging- intellectual phase-locking going on with the speed of light.

A lot of people have been fed the false information that the speed of light has been measured as constant and hence confirmed Einstein special relativity (SR), and now have that belief.

But the head of metrology pointed out that never happened up to 1972, and that was a major problem, so they fixed the problem by defining the speed of light as constant.

What we have then here is two different theories, because can do experiments in two different ways:

There is the option of doing experiment by imposing pre-conditions before doing the experiment or not (i.e. doing experiment free of pre-conditions).

So when doing a light speed measurement the option is

(1) impose on the experiment that the speed of light is to be set as constant

or

(2) do experiment free from defining light-speed as constant

There has never been an experiment of type#2, although some people are being allowed to falsely think there has been.

So if you think Einstein's SR is saying (2) then you have been deceived.

In the period up to 1972 – and this was the major crisis in physics – Einstein's SR based on the belief in experiment of type (2) had never been proved. Instead they had to define the speed of light as constant.

Einstein's SR is two possibilities:

theory #1 – adjust experiment to set light-speed as constant

or theory#2 – find from experiment that light-speed is constant.

Up to 1972, a person could think Einstein's SR was theory #2 but without any experiment being able to prove that. From 1972- Einstein's SR became theory #1.

Reading Einstein it can be unclear what he means SR to be as either– theory #1 or theory #2. From 1972 they solved the problem by making SR as theory#1.

In other words – what they are trying to do is adjust physics to conform to what Einstein wants, so that Einstein cannot be proved wrong, because now as the head of metrology notes – the unit of metre has been defined so that it is not possible to ever measure light-speed variation.

People are still being allowed to be deceived in the physics education system as to what Einstein's SR is, and despite this head of metrology knowing what SR really is, many are being taught it is theory#2 when it is really theory#1. And that's the big scandal in physics. Sheldrake seems to have missed that because he was more concerned with G, which is of course another problem.

The scientific method as understood by many people and taught to people is that a claim such as  $c$  being constant should be tested by experiment. But that is no longer the case of what some of them are doing – the scientific method and everything else has had to be adjusted to conform to how Einstein and his followers want to do science.

(Note: in the above - by constancy of  $c$  this is meant in inertial frame, the issue of constancy of  $c$  in non-inertial frames present more ambiguity as to how Einstein and his followers want to deal with that. )

The implications of this are indeed amazing, it means light-speed can still be treated as constant in the Newtonian physics context; it being just a fudge in the maths to set light-speed as constant from the more general mathematics of Newtonian physics.

There was no change from Newtonian physics by Einstein, it was just a maths trick, and some people are being allowed to falsely believe otherwise; hence the laughter of the audience. The Head of metrology knew what he had done and so did the audience – he did something that is not what many people consider to be science.

## References

[1] [News TEDx](#) Open for discussion: Graham Hancock and Rupert Sheldrake from TEDxWhitechapel Posted by: [Tedstaff](#) March 14, 2013 at 11:59 am EDT  
<http://blog.ted.com/2013/03/14/open-for-discussion-graham-hancock-and-rupert-sheldrake/comment-page-10/>

[2] Rupert Sheldrake - The Science Delusion BANNED TED TALK  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JKHUaNAxsTg>

c.RJAnderton 24July2013