

## Interview of Robert Sungenis by Simran Matthews on Geocentrism

Hello. My name is Simran Mathews and I am taking part in a project called National History Day. Basically, my group and I will create a website discussing the different views of the Geo-centrists and the Heliocentrists, past and present. We've looked up your impressive list of books written and read about your conference. We would greatly appreciate it if you would answer a few questions so that we can use you as a primary source of information. It doesn't have to be too detailed, and we would appreciate just any basic ideas that you would share. Thanks for your time.

1.) What are your views on the Heliocentric theory?

**Robert Sungenis:** Mathematically and kinematically it can be made to work just as the geocentric can, since the main difference between the heliocentric and geocentric systems is merely what is used as the center. But as  $2 \text{ apples} + 2 \text{ oranges} = 4 \text{ pieces of fruit}$ , so does  $3 \text{ apples} + 1 \text{ apple} = 4 \text{ pieces of fruit}$ . The question then becomes, which of the two addends represents reality,  $2 + 2$  (heliocentric) or  $3 + 1$  (geocentric)?

2.) Why do you support the Geocentric theory?

**Robert Sungenis:** Several reasons: (1) cosmological studies of the Red Shift showing isotropy; isotropic Gamma Ray Burster distribution; isotropic Quasar distribution; Cosmic Microwave Background isotropy; isotropic Galaxy formation and distribution – all show the Earth in the center of the universe; (2) the Michelson-Morley experiment (1881-1887); the Michelson-Miller experiment (1904); the Sagnac experiment (1913); the Michelson-Gale experiment (1925); the Airy experiment (1871), and many more similar experiments show the Earth is motionless in space.

3.) Would you agree or disagree with the Roman Catholic Church's ideas on the subject?

**Robert Sungenis:** In 1616 and 1633 the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) officially declared that heliocentrism was a “formal heresy,” and that decree has never been rescinded by the RCC, including any motions by John Paul II. So yes, I hold to the RCC “ideas” on the subject.

4.) How do you separate what scientific theories you agree and don't agree with?

**Robert Sungenis:** If there is empirical evidence for a scientific theory, that is the first stage of studying it and possibly accepting it. See my answers to # 2 for examples. What the empirical evidence shows us is that a series of experiments performed during the 1800s demonstrated the earth was fixed in space. This is noted in many quotes from the scientists of that day: e.g., “There was just one alternative; the earth’s true velocity through space might happen to have been nil.” Arthur Eddington (Arthur

Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, 1929, pp. 11, 8; “The failure of the many attempts to measure terrestrially any effects of the earth’s motion...” Wolfgang Pauli (Wolfgang Pauli, *The Theory of Relativity*, 1958, p. 4); “We do not have and cannot have any means of discovering whether or not we are carried along in a uniform motion of translation.” Henri Poincaré (From Poincaré’s lecture titled: “L’état actuel et l’avenir de la physique mathématique,” St. Louis, Sept. 24, 1904, *Scientific Monthly*, April, 1956); “A great deal of research has been carried out concerning the influence of the Earth’s movement. The results were always negative.” (From Poincaré’s report *La science et l’hypothèse* (“Science and Hypothesis”) published in 1901, now published in Paris, Flammarion, 1968, p. 182, Ludwik Kostro’s, *Einstein and the Ether*, 2000, p. 30); “This conclusion directly contradicts the explanation...which presupposes that the Earth moves.” Albert Michelson (Albert A. Michelson, “The Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether,” *American Journal of Science*, Vol. 22, August 1881, p. 125, said after his first interferometer experiment could not detect the movement of ether against the Earth); “The data were almost unbelievable... There was only one other possible conclusion to draw — that the Earth was at rest.”; Bernard Jaffe (Bernard Jaffe, *Michelson and the Speed of Light*, 1960, p. 76. Jaffe adds this conclusion to the above sentence: “This, of course, was preposterous”); “...nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the Earth actually is in motion.”; Lincoln Barnett (Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, 2nd rev. edition, 1957, p. 73). To escape this consequence, modern science did not have its own empirical counterevidence; rather; it choose to reinvent physics in order to put a different interpretation on the empirical evidence, since a fixed earth solution was preposterous to them. That reinvention is known as the Special Theory of Relativity (STR). This allowed the world to temporarily escape the implications of the empirical evidence, but it didn’t last long, since STR was found to be inadequate in itself, which then led to the invention of the General Theory of Relativity, which not only supports geocentrism as a “relative” alternative, but also modified the postulates of STR to the point that they could not answer the empirical evidence from the 1800s any longer.

5.) Has the geocentric theory evolved over the years and if so, how?

**Robert Sungenis:** Depends on what you mean by “evolved.” If you are referring to modifications in the theory to fit the scientific evidence, the answer is yes. For example, there was a shift from the Ptolemaic geocentrism to a Tychonic or Neo-Tychonic system, but they are merely different ways to account for all the motions we see in the sky while retaining the essential concept of a fixed Earth. There is also more scientific evidence as to what comprises the ether. But if you are referring to a complete revamping of the issue, no.