

## Questions from Rene on the Universe's Barycenter

Dear Dr Sungenis:

I only recently became aware of geocentrism. First, I was very skeptical about it, but after reading about a few experiments, I am about to change my beliefs toward "Einstein's" theory of relativity and the Earth being in the center of the Universe.

This said, there are still a few questions and I'd appreciate if you could comment on them, or give your insights.

1) Is it correct to say that the Earth being in the Universe's center means that the Earth is at the Universe's barycenter, that is, that the Earth doesn't experience a gravitational force at all? I understand that this is a requirement for the Earth to "rest".

**R. Sungenis:** Yes, this would be the most likely scenario. END

**Rene:** 2) In order to observe parallaxes, stars are "fixed" with regard to the sun. Is this right?

**R. Sungenis:** It depends on what one means by "fixed to the sun." The stars do not revolve around the sun and thus do not have the sun as their center; rather, the sun and the stars revolve around the earth. But the stars are aligned with the sun, and in that sense they are "fixed to the sun." END

**Rene:** If both 1) and 2) are right (but I might be wrong here, so please correct me), then I cannot see how the sun orbits the Earth within 23h56min, while the stars orbit the Earth within 24h AND the barycenter doesn't move.

**R. Sungenis:** (Actually, the sidereal day is 23h56m and the solar day is 24h). It's not just the stars and sun that create the barycenter of the universe. The main ingredient in determining the barycenter is the ether, a substance that modern science now admits exists. It is much more massive than all the celestial objects in the universe. Hence, when we calculate the miniscule effect of the sidereal year as opposed to the solar year, it will not cause the barycenter (the earth) to move, but it will most likely cause a wobble in the celestial revolutions, and this would answer to the cyclical precession (or gyroscopic) patterns we observe (e.g., 19 years, 26000 years), and might also answer why the plane of the sun's orbit shifts 46 degrees every sixth months. END

**Rene:** Also (still assuming 1) and 2) being correct): If the Universe (and thus the stars) revolve around the Earth (with different angular speed than the sun), wouldn't that make 2) wrong, that is, that the stars don't move with regard to the sun?

**R. Sungenis:** Well, that's why we say the stars are not "centered" on the sun. What we can say is that the stars and the sun have the same planer alignment but they move independently of one another. In fact, on an annual basis, the sun goes in the opposite direction than the stars, since it traverses the entire zodiac once per year. On a daily basis, the sun and stars travel together with the rotating universe, except that the annual motion of the sun against that revolution causes it to lag behind by 4 minutes per day. END

**Rene:** 3) When I googled on Michelson Morleys experiment 1881 and 1887, I found a few (german) websites, that were skeptical with regard to the theory of relativity, but still supporting the heliocentric (or

acentric) position. Their claim was mainly: Michelson Morley wanted to find an orbiting speed (of the Earth around the sun) of 30 km/s, but only found something around 9 km/s. This was too little, therefore Michelson and Morley considered it a NULL-Experiment. Now, you claim, that they measured almost no speed, indicating the Earth being in the center. So, I am not sure why there are differing speeds given.

**R. Sungenis:** Well, what happened is that all the subsequent MM type experiments, especially the ones that Dayton Miller did from 1904 to 1930, had differing km/s. Miller got as high as 8km/s, and (without going back over my notes) I think Kennedy got 10km/s while the rest were between 1km/s and about 4km/s. This is because when one does interferometry there are always outside conditions that will affect the results, so one has to take these into account and settle on an average. I don't remember seeing an MM experiment with 9km/sec, however. I would have to see the footnote from where they document that figure. The important thing is that they ALL got fringe shifts and the results were not "null." They were only categorized as "null" because they were expecting 30km/s for a revolving Earth. I show in GWW that the results are very close to what we would expect if an ether tied to the universe was rotating around a fixed earth. (Heliocentrists cannot rebut this by saying that it could be a rotating earth against the fixed ether of the universe, since in order to have a rotating earth they must also have a revolving earth, but MM discounted a revolving earth). END

**Rene:** 4) Obviously, Dayton Miller conducted a few experiments himself (allegedly some 200'000), all indicating that there is an Ether, but also, that the Earth is moving ("drifting") through this Ether with some 208 km/s in direction of a stellar formation called dorado in the Southern Celestial Hemisphere. I cannot reconcile this finding with Michelson Morly.

**R. Sungenis:** We can if we understand how Miller did his calculations. The actual interferometry experiments done on earth by Miller showed about 4km to 8km/sec. But he, still being a heliocentrist, also assumed that the sun was revolving around the Milky Way galaxy. So he used a Pythagorean triangulation method to determine what his original readings of 4-8km/sec would translate into if he included the assumed movement of the whole solar system. Hence, he didn't actually measure 208km/sec; rather, his calculations afterward resulted in 208km/sec. END

**Rene:** 5) Obviously, it can be proven that Foucault's Pendulum also moves if there is revolving mass around it. I believe this Barbour and Bertotti "Gravity and Inertia in a Machian Framework".

Now, it seems to me that this "force" or whatever we'd like to call it should also influence the rotation of the Earth, that is, that sooner or later the Earth is going to revolve with the same speed as the Universe around it.

**R. Sungenis:** It would, unless there was a counter force stopping it from doing so. We cover this issue in Chapter 9 of GWW. It just so happens that, in a fluid (such as ether) counter rotating forces are created by a rotating fluid, and this happens at the equatorial plane. You'll need to get Galileo Was Wrong to see how this is worked out mathematically. Misner, Thorne and Wheeler actually worked out the math in their 1973 book "Gravitation." END

Please understand that English is not my mother tongue. I really hope you address my questions although I'd understand if you don't have the time.

Best regards  
René