Question 130: Interview Request from Der Spiegel in Germany on Geocentrism

Hallo Mr. Sungenis, I'm a science writer from SPIEGEL ONLINE - the website of the german magazine DER SPIEGEL - see http://www.spiegel.de/

I'm planning an article about geocentrism and have some questions to You. Exuse me, they may sound a littly bit silly to You, but I'm not sure if I have understood geocentrism right.

It would be great, if You could send me Your short answers til end of this week. Thanks a lot!

Regards

Holger Dambeck

R. Sungenis: I will answer these questions and send them to you tomorrow. If you use them I would ask that my words be quoted verbatim and not edited. Is that agreeable to you?

Holger: Yes, that's ok for me.

1) Helicenric vs. geocentric: Are the sun and the planets moving around the earth or do the planets move around the sun and the sun ist rotating around earth?

R. Sungenis: The most likely model is the Tychonic, that is, that the planets go around the sun, and the sun goes around the earth. The larger question concerning the Tychonic model is one not addressed by Tycho Brahe, however. Brahe believed the stars were centered on the earth. If so, no stellar parallax would exist, but in Brahe's day no parallax had been discovered. But if the stars are centered on the sun, then the stellar parallax of the geocentric system matches precisely that of the heliocentric. This is often referred to as the Neo-tychonic model. But other models may also work, and even Ptolemy's model can be made to work. The objection that Ptolemy's model would not work due to the phases of Venus is unfounded, since the diagrams drawn to demonstrate the discrepancy are never drawn to scale, and thus distort the issue in favor of heliocentrism. Also, we must understand that Ptolemy did not believe there were actual epicycles in space; rather, his epicycles were merely mathematical/geometric explanations to account for the movements made by human observation. In the end, the foundation for any model, however, is that the earth is motionless in space and serves as the central point, or even the center of mass, for the rest of the universe. This possibility is confirmed by Newtonian physics, since it states that any point could serve as the center of mass if the masses surrounding it are equally distributed. Hence, all that needs to occur for the earth to serve as the center of mass (and thus the motionless center of the universe) is that all the stars and their accompanying bodies be equally distributed around the earth. Once set in motion, the combined inertia of the universe's masses will keep them rotating around that center of mass ad infinitum.

Holger: Are epicycles real?

R. Sungenis: Yes and no. Yes, in the sense that neither the sun nor the planets revolve in perfect circles, since the gravity of each of those bodies will cause distortions in their movements that make them deviate, to one degree or another. The first heliocentric model was that developed by the Greek Aristarchus of Samos. He used perfect circles for the revolutions but his model never worked correctly, which was pointed out by his opponent Hipparchus. The Greeks were divided on whether the universe was geocentric or heliocentric. Aristarchus followed the Pythagorean school, while Hipparchus was in the school of Plato and Aristotle. Ptolemy, a Greek from Egypt, knew of the discrepancies in Aristarchus' model and tried to correct them, but in favor of the Aristotelian geocentric model. In order to compensate for the perturbations caused by the gravity of the sun and planets, Ptolemy was forced to abandon the perfect circles of Aristarchus and use circles with epicycles. Although there was definitely an improvement, we now know that it was next to impossible for Ptolemy to make his model perfect due to the inordinate amount of perturbations in the movements of celestial bodies. Fourier analysis shows us that the more we try to obtain a precise mathematical/geometrical model of how the sun and planets revolve about each other, the more complicated and futile the exercise becomes. When Copernicus came on the scene, he readopted Aristarchus' model and went back to using perfect circles for the revolutions due to his philosophical presuppositions. But, of course, the same problems erupted as they had with Aristarchus. Consequently, Copernicus' system was actually less accurate than Ptolemy's. In order to compensate for his errors, Copernicus himself employed epicycles, but he called them epicyclets, but in the end he had more epicycles than Ptolemy. Kepler was partially successful in improving on Copernicus' model by making the celestial bodies move in ellipses rather than epicycles, but even then there was only marginal improvement, since the sun and planets do not move in perfect ellipses anymore than perfect circles. Kepler also knew that if the same ellipses were applied to Tycho Brahe's geocentric model it would produce the same accuracy for geocentrism as Kepler had claimed for heliocentrism.

Holger: 2) Why there are so few scientists supporting the idea of geocentrism?

R. Sungenis: Mainly because the experimental and theoretical information supporting geocentrism is either quietly tucked away from public view, or ignored or obfuscated in some way. However, many modern physicists, astrophysicists and astronomers who have studied the scientific details and current data of modern cosmology are quite aware of the scientific viability for geocentrism. The honest ones admit it in their books, but they also admit that they will not accept geocentrism due to their philosophical biases and thus they prefer not to advertise too widely the geocentric possibilities of the scientific data. These scientists include popular names such as Stephen Hawking, Edwin Hubble, George F. R. Ellis, and many others. In other words, even though scientific evidence points to geocentrism, they do not want to accept it because it would force them to admit that such a universe could not have happened by chance. If Earth is in the center, there is only one way that could happen – Someone had to put it there. They must then find alternative ways of answering the scientific evidence in order to escape geocentrism. One of these alternatives was the Big Bang.

Holger: 3) If the earth is not moving around in the universe and not rotating, what are the consequences for our understanding of the universe? Is a big bang still possible?

R. Sungenis: If the earth is motionless in the center of the universe then the Big Bang is not possible. It is precisely the idea of the expanding universe of the Big Bang and the curvature of space that was sought after as the alternative to the scientific evidence that showed the Earth was in the center of the universe. Hubble himself said "the unwelcome position of a favored location (i.e., geocentrism) must be avoided at all costs…such a favored position is intolerable…Therefore, in order to restore homogeneity and to escape the horror of a unique position…it must be compensated by spatial curvature. There seems to be no other escape" (*The Observational Approach to Cosmology*, pp. 58-59). "Spatial curvature" was the cornerstone of Einstein's General theory of Relativity. He then proposed that the curvature would make it appear that everything in the universe looked the same from wherever one viewed it and thus be comparable to geocentrism. The point in fact remains that a central and immobile Earth was, and is, the simplest and best answer to account for the equi-distribution of all objects, energies and forces we see surrounding us in the universe, everything from gamma rays, X-rays, the cosmic microwave background radiation, quasars, galaxy distribution, etc. In fact, modern science has shown us that Newtonian mechanics (and Einsteinian as well, since Einstein's tensor equations merely worked backward from Newton's force laws) does not work in the universe at large, since there is not enough matter to fit their gravitational formulas. To compensate for this, modern science has postulated that the universe is made up of 95% "dark matter" just so they can get Newton's and Einstein's laws to work. What they don't tell everyone, however, is that a simple solution to the gravity problem is a geocentric universe. (see "Dark Energy: Is it Merely an Illusion?" *ScienceDaily*, Sept. 29, 2008). The choice today is between dark matter and geocentrism, but most scientists, guided as they are by their philosophical presuppositions and aversion to religion, will invariably opt for dark matter, even though they have never been able to find even an ounce of it with their highly sophisticated instruments.

Holger: 4) Which experiment(s) prooves that the earth is in the middle of the universe?

R. Sungenis: Not "experiments" but observational evidence. Whereas we cannot observe the Earth either rotating or not rotating since we have no absolute non-moving platform in space from which to make an accurate observation, we can, indeed, observe through telescopes where we are in the universe. For instance, the 2001 Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe led my Max Tegmark found that "our entire observable universe is inside this sphere of radius 13.3 billion light-years, with us at the center." The red shift also produces the same earth-centered geometry, so much so that when Edwin Hubble saw it he said "such a condition would imply that we occupy a unique position in the universe, analogous to the ancient conception of a central Earth" (*The Observational Approach to Cosmology*, pp. 50-51). I could give reams of such statements from qualified scientists today, including those who work with gamma ray bursts, X-ray bursts, quasars, and just about any energy source in the universe today – they are all positioned around the Earth as the center. You can find all this evidence and the scientific details in our book *Galileo Was Wrong: The Church Was Right*, pp. 61-102. As for a non-moving and non-rotating Earth, experiments performed from Arago in 1818 to Michelson-Morley in 1887 showed conclusively that the Earth was not moving. The only way modern science was able to at least make some escape from this startling evidence was to reinvent physical science, which

was the motivation and result behind the theory of Special and General Relativity. As Einstein's biographer put it, after the Michelson-Morley experiment, "the problem which now faced science was considerable. For there seemed to be only three alternatives. The first was that the Earth was standing still, which meant scuttling the whole Copernican theory and was unthinkable" (*Einstein: The Life and Times*, pp. 109-110). Scientific historian G. J. Whitrow summed it up as follows: "It is both amusing and instructive to speculate on what might have happened if such an experiment [i.e., the Michelson-Morley experiment] could have been performed in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries when men were debating the rival merits of the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems. The result would surely have been interpreted as conclusive evidence for the immobility of the Earth, and therefore as a triumphant vindication of the Ptolemaic system and irrefutable falsification of the Copernican hypothesis" (*The Structure and Evolution of the Universe*, 1949, 1959, p. 79).

Robert Sungenis, Ph.D.

September 14, 2010