



**My Ph.D. from Calamus International University
by Robert Sungenis**

The Controversy	2
My Present Degrees and Accomplishments	4
Why Did I Pursue a CIU Degree?	5
Jacob Michael Investigates CIU	8
Jacob Michael, the Person	23
More About Degrees	24
Distinctions of CIU	26
The Faculty at CIU	27
Additional Information	30
Endorsements for my Dissertation/Book	31
Concluding Statement	41

The Controversy:

To all the patrons of Catholic Apologetics International, now in its 14th year of serving our Lord Jesus Christ and his Catholic Church:

It seems that I have become quite a controversial figure today. Unfortunately, some of my worst enemies are a renegade assortment of “Catholics” who simply refuse to accept my ongoing warnings about the Jewish, Zionist and Neocon infiltration into the heart of the Catholic Church today. They will accept the fact that things like liberalism or homosexuality have infiltrated the Church, but if you say one negative word concerning Jewish influence, you will suddenly find yourself ostracized and ridiculed to no end. These dozen or so critics simply will not accept anything I have to say on this subject. In order to stop me they have engineered an agenda-driven smear campaign, the likes of which I have never seen in my whole life. How do I know this? You only need to read one comment from one of my most dubious critics, Jacob Michael. At the conclusion of an essay he wrote whose sole purpose was to discredit me for the doctorate I received from Calamus International University, he writes this closing sentence:

It can only be hoped that the reader will, after considering what has been written here, think twice before uncritically accepting anything Sungenis has to say, especially on matters relating to the Jewish people.

Certainly. I would “think twice before uncritically accepting anything” that anyone has to say, including Jacob Michael. We would be fools not to do so, “especially on matters relating to the Jewish people.” I dare say that people like Mr. Michael are so blinded by their unconditional acceptance of anything that the Jewish people do or say that they simply can’t see the truth. But the difference between me and Mr. Michael is that he doesn’t “think twice” about engaging in one of the most vociferous smear campaigns ever devised against me to come to a conclusion about “critical” evaluation that everyone with common sense already knows. Mr. Michael isn’t telling us anything new, except, perhaps, who he really is. Unfortunately for Mr. Michael, after you are done

reading my essay and observing all the false accusations, biased viewpoints, lack of evidence, sloppy scholarship, and just seeing what a fool Mr. Michael makes out of himself, I believe you are going to think less than twice about who Jacob Michael is and whether you can uncritically accept “anything” he has to say, whether its about me or anything else.

Let me begin by pointing out that I find it rather humorous that Mr. Michael tries in his own inimitable way to associate me with anti-semitism, or imply that I’m anti-semitic, in his various website postings. I’m not an anti-semite, don’t tend toward it, and I detest anyone who is or does, respectively. For the umpteenth time, and I don’t have any animosity toward the Jewish people. I merely reject their politics and their religion because I’m a Catholic apologist who is supposed to do such things for those under my tutelage. The idea, common among today’s crop of Catholic apologists, that it’s ok to speak against the Protestants and the Muslims but we can’t do the same against the Jews, is pure hypocrisy. Mr. Michael must reject the politics and religion of the Jewish people, that is, if he claims to be a true Catholic. So why does Mr. Michael have such a bee in his bonnet when we should, in fact, be preaching the same thing about the Jewish people? Very puzzling, indeed.

Interestingly enough, for all his implying that I’m anti-semitic for my pervasive and detailed critiques of Jewish politics and religion, Mr. Michael is the only one I know of who makes sweeping and detailed claims (in his recently self-published book dealing with the Jews), that “Judaism,” (which obviously includes the Jews) is “the Beast of the Apocalypse”! A few weeks ago I told Mr. Michael to submit that particular sentence of his book to Abe Foxman, head of the Anti-Defamation League. I told Mr. Michael not to be surprised if Mr. Foxman immediately classifies him as an anti-semite for such openly denigrating words against the Jewish people and their religion. You see, in Mr. Michael’s world, its quite acceptable to broad brush the Jews with demonized apocalyptic identities, just as long as you don’t name specific people and make a big fuss out of your findings. The duplicity speaks for itself. Interestingly enough, my published book on *The Apocalypse of St. John* due out from Queenship Publishing this spring, doesn’t say that Judaism is the Beast of the Apocalypse. Hey, maybe Abe Foxman will have a change of heart? Nah.

I will deal with Mr. Michael's charges regarding Calamus International University later in this essay. Suffice it to say for now, he has created a whirlwind of gossip, innuendo and slander about me that makes Bill Clinton look like a choir boy. All I can say is that I would not want to be Jacob Michael and have to stand before God's judgment seat. It is amazing to see someone get so incensed and spend hours at his computer typing thousands of words trying to discredit me. This has become a sick obsession of his. It is no exaggeration to say that Jacob Michael has made a cottage industry out of trying to destroy me. What I ever did to Mr. Michael to deserve this treatment I'll never know. He left CAI a few years ago on good terms and did some work for me thereafter for our website. It wasn't until he connected up with Michael Forrest a few months ago that he suddenly became my worst enemy. Apparently, Mr. Forrest really did a job on Mr. Michael's young and impressionable mind. Michael Forrest used to be my best friend, that is, until I wouldn't capitulate to his demands to change the CAI website for his budding career as a speaker and singer. But that is another story altogether. Suffice it to say, I have been continually surrounded by Judas-like figures since this apostolate started 14 years ago, but, as you can see, I have survived. And that is because God has been with this apostolate since its inception.

Mr. Michael has incited a whole legion of other malcontents. Their uncharitable name-calling and personal vilification of me is almost commonplace on selected Internet forums. They often resort to attacking me at what they believe are my weakest points. As noted above, one of the more popular points they wish to exploit is the doctoral degree I earned from Calamus International University. Because CIU, as the saying goes, "is not accredited in the United States," my critics have sought destroy me by trying to convince the public that I got my degree from a "diploma mill." Obviously, as Mr. Michael admitted above, they believe that attacking my degree and making it appear as if it is bogus will discredit all my work, and in that way they believe they will win their battle against me. One thing is certainly true in the midst of all this: they know that my work is making an impact and they simply don't like it, thus they become obsessed with me and continually think up ways to silence me. They will never be successful, of course, because God is on my side.

Many of my critics chat on Internet forums under fictitious names. A few have blogs and websites that promote themselves as the definitive answer to the world's problems. In either case, these venues have become sounding boards for every Tom, Dick and Harry who has an unqualified opinion but who has never been recognized by any established market (e.g., books, articles, television, radio, public debate, etc.). Many of them don't have academic degrees, and the few that have a baccalaureate often don't have it in the field with which they are now claiming expertise. Since they have no academic credentials of their own, they hide this fact from their audience, but they make their forums and blogs appear to be official clearinghouses for the final word of commentary on whoever and whatever crosses their paths. Many of them have not been successful in the normal avenues of life, and to make up for it they assume an anonymous identity on the Internet and rip apart other people who have become successful. Relying only on what they hear from their like-minded anonymous collaborators, their world is a unique mixture of prejudice, innuendo and cheap shots. Often their derisive comments are filled with so much venom and animosity it is easy to detect that hate and jealousy have become primary motives for their gossip train. In short, Internet forums are becoming little more than cesspools of sin.

My Present Degrees and Accomplishments:

As opposed to most of my outspoken critics (including Jacob Michael), I have both baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degrees from United States accredited institutions. Unlike most of them, my expertise as a Catholic apologist coincides with the field in which my degrees were granted. I received a bachelor's degree in religion from George Washington University (1979) and a master's degree in religion from Westminster Theological Seminary (1982). As such, Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism and Eastern Religions were my main diet of study for eight years. Anyone who will take the time to check out these two institutions will see that they are in the upper echelon of the academic world. In addition, if we include my private studies, I have spent the last 32 years in intensive study and writing about theology and religion.

Additionally, my books have received the Catholic Church's imprimatur; my articles have been published by over a dozen reputable journals and periodicals; I have written and hosted television programs for EWTN; I have been a guest commentator on CNN and the BBC; I have debated the best and brightest of opposing religions before live audiences, and I continue to be a sought after speaker. Most of my critics have no such credentials or audience.

Why Did I Pursue a CIU Degree?

So why would a guy like me, who has all these accomplishments under his belt and who is well-respected in the academic world, decide to obtain a doctorate from an institution of secondary distinction and which has no accreditation status in the United States? Why would I want to put myself at risk to receive a backlash from the critics I mentioned above? Contrary to what many are saying, I do have a method to my seeming "madness." You will see that my critics have simply exploited what little knowledge they have.

One reason I was not bothered about pursuing a degree from CIU was that I was prepared to make a statement to the academic establishment in the United States that I refuse to conform to their status-quo, agnostic and often atheistic philosophies and sciences that inundate our universities, including most Catholic universities in the United States which are little more than rebellious liberal institutions that departed from true Catholicism many decades ago. The educational system in the United States is deplorable, both on the university and the secondary level, and it is one of the reasons that the United States finishes near the bottom when compared to other established nations of the world. It has turned out to be a conglomeration of godless think-tanks who are only interested in preserving their economic fortunes and powerful political positions.

Secondly, in the beginning of 2003, I became quite infatuated with geocentric cosmology. It was one of those "eureka" moments in my life in which I knew instinctively that I had stumbled onto something great, even though most people looked at me cross-eyed whenever I brought up the subject. In the course of my long and detailed investigation, I found that the Church Fathers had an absolute consensus on

geocentrism; three of the Catholic Church's popes with their investigative commissions condemned Copernicanism in official documents in the 1600s, not to mention that Scripture itself was replete with geocentric cosmology. The only thing that was needed to confirm this line up of illustrious witnesses was the scientific evidence for geocentrism. So I made it my goal to do a thorough investigation. I already had the necessary theological background to conduct the study, but I also had a sufficient science background to begin the investigation, since I was initially a Physics major at George Washington University.

At the same time I began to pursue the study of geocentrism, I was in a doctoral program at Maryvale Institute in Birmingham England, writing my dissertation on an entirely different theological topic. I was about halfway through writing the dissertation when I fell in love with the subject of geocentrism and I simply didn't want to do anything else. I considered this the greatest opportunity of my life, and I thanked God for giving it to me. I asked Maryvale officials if they would allow me to change my dissertation topic to a treatment of the history of heliocentric/geocentric debate. Unfortunately, they declined. So I had to make a big decision. Would I continue with my present dissertation at Maryvale, which would have taken a couple more years to complete, or would I drop the program and pursue my newfound love of geocentrism? For me it was an easy decision. It was like the man who sells all that he has so that he can buy the pearl of great price.

I began to make inquiries to U.S. accredited institutions to see if they would allow me to do a research program on the heliocentric/geocentric debate with special emphasis on the merits of geocentrism, but they all declined. Many of them thought it quite odd that someone would want to do a research project and write a dissertation on a subject that, in their words, "had already been scientifically disproved." The message was coming to me loud and clear: Galileo was their man and they simply did not want to give a platform to anyone who would challenge his doctrine. After all, Western thought has been built on the Copernican revolution. They simply were not going to allow someone to challenge the status quo. I also had this agenda proven to me a few years later when I submitted my manuscript to various publishers across the United States. Every one of

fifty publishers who were sent the manuscript, even though many of them said that it seemed to be a very detailed and comprehensive defense, declined to publish it.

Enter Calamus International University. This was one university that was not afraid to entertain new ideas and new research in fields of science and history. Being quite disillusioned that my proposal to defend geocentrism had been negatively received by all other U.S. universities, I was determined to find an institution that would allow me to do the research and write the dissertation outside the U.S., mainly because I wanted at least some recognized institution to make a publication of the dissertation under an academic flag. Anyone in the future who wanted to read up on the subject of geocentrism could do so at an officially recognized institution, even if it was not accredited in the United States. Calamus International University fit that bill quite handily. The academic dean, Dr. Morris Berg (who, for the record, is Jewish), informed me of a “Research-Degree” program he had available at CIU that would allow me to write a dissertation on the theological, biblical and scientific aspects of geocentrism as partial fulfillment toward a doctorate in Religious Studies. It was the same kind of research-degree I had been pursuing at Maryvale Institute, the only difference was that Calamus was not accredited by a governmental body, only by private bodies.

In any case, Dr. Berg proposed that as long as I could find a qualified academic mentor to assist me in the scientific portion of the book, he would accept my dissertation proposal. I did find such a mentor, Dr. Robert Bennett, who has his Ph.D. in Physics and General Relativity from Stephens Technical Institute, which is accredited in the United States. Dr. Bennett has since become my co-author in the book “Galileo Was Wrong” (published by Catholic Apologetics International Publishing, Inc., in 2006). Everything was now in line for me to begin the dissertation for the research degree. This was a tailor-fit program for me, not only because of the research-degree that CIU offered, but for a man in his late 40s who is trying to raise eight children on a Catholic apologist’s income and has little time to spare, there were no other options available to me.

So, over the course of the next three years, I wrote a 700-page, 1400-footnote, single spaced dissertation, which my academic peers, seven of them who have Ph.D.s in the sciences and who gave endorsements for my book in its opening pages, say it is the best and single most comprehensive treatise ever written on the subject of geocentrism. I

am very proud of this work, and I invite anyone, friend or foe, to read it and find out for themselves why our Church Fathers and our past popes were unashamed to advance the cosmology of geocentrism. But it wasn't just the ecclesiastical and scriptural information that was convincing. The scientific information supporting geocentrism is absolutely overwhelming. Dr. Bennett himself, who did his Ph.D. dissertation in 1971 defending Einstein, suddenly rejected Relativity theory after he became thoroughly convinced of geocentrism's scientific and theological merits, and thus agreed to be my mentor and eventual co-author for the book that was made from the dissertation.

Jacob Michael investigates CIU:

As it stands, Calamus International University is the academic institution that possesses my dissertation. Anyone can inquire about Calamus or my dissertation by writing to Dr. Morris Berg (<http://www.unicalamus.org/>). In fact, my self-proclaimed critic, Jacob Michael, did just that. He made an inquiry by email to Dr. Berg in mid-2006. After he corresponded with Mr. Michael, Dr. Berg informed me of the dialogue. I related to Dr. Berg that I thought Mr. Michael was fishing for information to discredit me. In any case, Dr. Berg sent me the whole correspondence he had with Mr. Michael. It is now an official part of my file with Calamus International University. Here's how it went:

Mr. Michael: What field of expertise is Dr. Sungenis' Ph.D. in? Theology? Metaphysics? Another field?

Dr. Berg: Religious Studies, with an emphasis on the religious foundation of cosmology. Dr. Sungenis already possessed Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Religious Studies from United States accredited institutions, and this allowed him to pursue the doctorate in Religious Studies at Calamus.

Mr. Michael: Is the Ph.D. "honoris causa"?

Dr. Berg: No, it is earned.

Mr. Michael: Who were his academic advisors, what are their degrees in, and where did they obtain those degrees?

Dr. Berg: Robert Bennett, Ph.D. in Physics, obtained from Stevens Institute of Technology (New Jersey), 1971.

Mr. Michael: Was there a public defense of the dissertation, and if so, who was on the doctoral committee?

Dr. Berg: No, Dr. Sungenis' degree is an independent research-study degree, and does not require a public oral defense, as is the case with most research degrees. The dissertation was read and was given an evaluation of "Excellent" in each of the nine categories for which it was analyzed, including:

- 1) Quality of English Language and Composition,
- 2) Literature Search and Breadth of Knowledge,
- 3) Organisation and Form,
- 4) Methodology of the Study,
- 5) Research Design,
- 6) Research Questions or Experimental Hypotheses,
- 7) Scope and Findings of Analysis,
- 8) Selection of Appropriate Research Tools,
- 9) Advancement of Knowledge, Final Conclusions and Recommendations.

In addition, Calamus closed its comments with these words:

In the opinion of the Independent Studies Committee this is a challenging and extremely erudite interdisciplinary thesis which makes a significant

contribution to the field of history and philosophy of religion and also to the history of science. The work is of publishable quality and will stimulate further research and debate in a number of areas. Calamus International University expresses its thanks to the external supervising professor, Dr. Robert Bennett, for his academic support of the candidate throughout this project.

Resolution of the Committee:

RESOLVED that the candidate, Robert Albert Sungenis, be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Religious Studies....Degree of Doctor of Philosophy to be AWARDED on 5th April 2006.”

Mr. Michael: What was the length and subject of his dissertation?

Dr. Berg: The length was approximately 700 pages, single-spaced and typewritten with well over 1000 detailed footnotes. The subject was “The Heliocentric Model of Cosmology Introduced by Nicolaus Copernicus and Advanced by Galileo Galilei, is an Unproven Scientific Hypothesis; a Faulty Interpretation of the Bible; and in Conflict with official Magisterial Decrees of the Catholic Church.” In it, Dr. Sungenis showed the connection between the theories of cosmology and their relation to religious beliefs and scientific evidence.

6) Who read the dissertation and approved it?

Dr. Berg: Dr Robert Bennett performed an initial reading on behalf of the University and his approval was tabled at the Independent Studies Committee. The Committee, which is chaired by myself, Dr Morris Berg, looks at general issues of acceptability such as the standard of writing and presentation, length of the work, quality of argument, depth of literature

research, use of primary sources where necessary, and other matters such as copyright issues and permissions. The Committee may co-opt any suitable member of the Advisory Board or outside advisors, some of whom may work at other universities and wish their names to be confidential. The Committee may convene by electronic conferencing and names of those present at each session are not published.

CIU may use a different model to traditional institutions that allows interdisciplinary work. The following is an extract from the CIU brochure regarding the PhD by dissertation:

“In ‘non-traditional’ universities such as ours, the locus of expertise may often be assigned to the scholar rather than the supervisor. This enables an independent study contract to be negotiated between university and student so that the student may pursue the project largely on his or her own. Such an arrangement can be invaluable when the scholar already has the knowledge and resources to complete the project, or where supervision is otherwise hard to obtain, e.g. for a pioneering work. In such instances the University will give general guidance concerning thesis requirements and the thesis will be read and assessed by a panel who might not necessarily be experts in the particular field. It is the student’s responsibility to present the final work with sufficient clarity to make it comprehensible to the educated general reader (which is the test of the best technical writing).”

Now, what did Mr. Michael do with this detailed information? Nothing but make derogatory comments of both of me and Dr. Berg on his website. In an article he published after his correspondence with Dr. Berg, he wrote:

It would appear, then, that CIU is little more than a degree mill, just as I originally had said. In his own defense, Sungenis stated that “Calamus

International University is not a ‘degree mill’“, adding that “The Oregon Office of Degree Authorization, which did an exhaustive study of over 300 institutions around the world, had no negative comments about Calamus International University, except to list them as an unaccredited university in the United States.” ([source](#)) The reader is invited to consider what the same Oregon Office of Degree Authorization had to say about what constitutes a “degree mill”:

What is a diploma mill?

Diploma mill: An institution of higher education operating without supervision of a state or professional agency and granting diplomas which are either fraudulent or because of the lack of proper standards worthless. - Webster’s Third New International Dictionary

Diploma mills (or degree mills) are substandard or fraudulent “colleges” that offer potential students degrees with little or no serious work. Some are simple frauds: a mailbox to which people send money in exchange for paper that purports to be a college degree. Others require some nominal work from the student but do not require college-level course work that is normally required for a degree. (source, italics added)

As you can see from his first sentence, Mr. Michael is prone to using such phrases as “It would appear that...” or “It seems that...” without committing himself to actually saying “It is the fact that...” He uses the same choice of words in a later sentence, saying, “Looking at CIU’s web site, it would appear that the OODA’s definition of “diploma mill” fits CIU quite well.” What does this choice of words show? It shows that Mr. Michael can’t make up his mind about his own accusations, and/or it means that Mr. Michael is no more qualified to judge whether an institution is a “degree mill” than the man in the moon. Did the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization give Mr. Michael a course or authorization in assessing whether an institution is a “diploma mill”? No. Has

Mr. Michael ever had any qualified experience in making such determinations? No. So how is it that he suddenly becomes the authority to make such determinations, and in the process, sully someone's reputation (mine) in a calumny so broad and so pervasive it borders on mental instability?

Note also that Mr. Michael invites his reader to engage in the same unauthorized assessment by saying: "The reader is invited to consider what the same Oregon Office of Degree Authorization had to say about what constitutes a 'degree mill.'" We could just consider this a product of Mr. Michael's over-enthusiastic efforts to toot his own horn, but the bare fact is, the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization never designates CIU as a "Degree Mill" or "Diploma Mill," whereas it designates hundreds of other institutions as "Degree Mills" or "Diploma Mills." You can check it out for yourself by going to their website.

As it stands, we have caught Jacob Michael in either a bold-faced lie or such a serious oversight that it calls for an immediate apology, the same apology I asked from him previously but which he refused to give me because he was basing it on his own biased interpretation of the OODA website.

But while we are at it, let's look a little more closely at the definitions of a "Diploma Mill" that Mr. Michael obtains from Webster's Dictionary and the Oregon website. After we do, you will see why the Oregon Degree Authorization does not call Calamus a "diploma mill."

1) Does CIU have a "professional agency supervising them"?

Yes, CIU is a member of the Adult Higher Education Alliance, which includes such member universities as DePaul University, George Mason University, Marquette University, Texas A&M University, Concordia University and 36 other recognized and accepted universities in the United States and abroad. (<http://www.ahea.org/about/institutions.htm>). CIU has private accreditation from the International Interfaith Accreditation Association, a non-profit body whose headquarters are in Florida, and CIU is an Approved Member of the International Association for Distance Learning. CIU's chancellor, Dr. Dominique Boubouleix-Hearntown holds the

Doctorate of the EPHE, a college of the Sorbonne in Paris. He is a supervising professor at the School of Anthropology, Paris, and an Academic Member of the London Diplomatic Academy. He has been awarded the medal of the Albert Schweitzer International University, is listed in the *International Who's Who of Intellectuals* and has published in a number of academic journals. His fields are Sanskrit, Thai Language, Linguistics, Anthropology of Religion, Archaeology, Ethnology, Comparative Mythology, Diplomacy, and Bioethics. Dr Boubouleix-Hearntown supervises CIU research students in his areas of expertise.

Let's look at the other definitions of a "diploma mill":

2) Is CIU a "fraudulent college"? No, obviously not, since it has the above recognition from various agencies and other like-minded organizations.

3) Does CIU "offer potential students degrees with little or no serious work"? No. In fact, I had to pass through the same rigors that any doctoral candidate in a European research-degree has to pass through.

4) Does CIU possess merely "a mailbox to which people send money in exchange for paper that purports to be a college degree"? No, CIU has an established and degree-possessing faculty that examines the work of its students and only issues a degree if the student passes the academic standards listed in the university's curriculum guidelines.

5) Does CIU require just "nominal work from the student but do not require college-level course work that is normally required for a degree"? Certainly not. In fact, in order to be considered for the doctoral program, a person must have a high school and college diploma from an accredited institution.

So we see, after analyzing Mr. Michael's attempt at classifying CIU as a "diploma mill," he has engaged in one of the most serious and sinful acts of slander that has ever been perpetrated on a Catholic scholar.

But let's give the dear Mr. Michael one more chance to redeem himself. Even though the Oregon Degree Authorization did not designate CIU as a "diploma mill," is it possible that Mr. Michael sees something here that the Oregon team might have missed? Mr. Michael writes the following:

Looking at CIU's web site, it would appear that the OODA's definition of "diploma mill" fits CIU quite well. A "degree mill" is not simply a place that hands out degrees in exchange for money, but may also be an institution whose "lack of proper standards" renders their diplomas "worthless." A recap may be in order here. Calamus confirmed that Sungenis gave no defense of his dissertation; he only had to submit it for review by an "Independent Studies Committee." So who actually read the dissertation and approved it? Dr. Berg himself related to me that it was none other than Dr. Robert Bennett who did the initial reading on behalf of CIU. The Committee, which is chaired by Dr. Berg (of course - he is the Dean, the Rector, the Chair of the ISC, and Sungenis' academic advisor - apparently the man wears many "hats"), reviewed the dissertation to see that it met general standards, such as "Quality of English Language and Composition", "Literature Search and Breadth of Knowledge", "Methodology of the Study", "Research Questions or Experimental Hypotheses", "Selection of Appropriate Research Tools", and so on.

And we are just waiting with bated breath to see what is so wrong about my Supervising Advisor, Dr. Robert Bennett, who is an expert on cosmological topics. Mr. Michael continues:

It might be appropriate to step back and consider what this means for a moment. The primary judge of the dissertation was the same individual who served as Sungenis' academic supervisor, the same individual who contributed a chapter for the dissertation when it was submitted for publication under the title *Galileo Was Wrong*, the same individual who

has at least had a working relationship with Sungenis since 2001, when he joined Sungenis as a speaker at the first international Kolbe Center for the Study of Creation Conference in Virginia ([source](#)). This would be a little like me signing up for a degree from Calamus, asking Dr. Scott Hahn to serve as my supervising professor (CIU allows the doctoral candidate to propose his own supervising professor), and having him serve as the primary reader for my dissertation - a dissertation which would then later become a published book co-authored by Hahn himself! The phrase that comes to mind here is “conflict of interests.”

Actually, the phrase that comes to mind here is “utter audacity.” Mr. Michael knows next-to-nothing about Dr. Robert Bennett, much less is he able to make himself the judge of whether Dr. Bennett could serve as a supervisor of my dissertation. The utter audacity of this man is almost frightening.

And now we will see Mr. Michael put his foot in his mouth once again:

Recall again that Sungenis’ degree, as awarded to him in April of 2006 by CIU, is in Religious Studies. For this *Religious* Studies doctoral degree, Sungenis was supervised by an expert in *Physics*, and his dissertation was approved by a *Physics* expert and a doctor of *Hypnotherapy*. A short comparison should clarify what is wrong with this picture: I have a copy of Dr. Hahn’s dissertation; in the back are the names of the four individuals who sat on the doctoral committee, and to whom he had to defend his work. All four of them are recognized scholars and doctors in the field of biblical studies (Drs. [Laurence](#), [Kurz](#), [Schmitt](#), and [Dempsey](#)), which is only appropriate, since that was the subject of Hahn’s dissertation. Again, to contrast: Sungenis’ dissertation was for a degree in Religious Studies, but he was not required to defend the work, and the men who approved his work were experts, not in Religious Studies, but in Physics and Hypnotherapy.

The interesting fact about this defense of Scott Hahn is that it is not a description of his doctoral experience that Hahn would want to sign off on, and never has been. I was visiting with Scott Hahn at his home in Steubenville in 1997 some time after he received his doctorate from Marquette. In brief, Hahn didn't have very nice things to say about Drs. Laurence, Kurz, Schmitt and Dempsey. In fact, Hahn more or less denounced them all as heretics. Hahn told me that at one point during his oral examination one of the female members of the doctoral committee asked him: "What do you think of the God's of the Old Testament"? Now you and I might think she was merely speaking of the false gods who really didn't exist, but Hahn assured me this was not the case. She actually believed that there were real God's (plural) in the Old Testament, and Israel had only one of them. Oh sure, the members of this "doctoral committee" may have degrees after their names and sit in chairs of importance on the Marquette faculty, but the fact is that everyone of them, according to Hahn, were so far out in left field when it came to knowing and practicing the Catholic faith, that we stand in shock and awe that people in this kind of apostasy actually run our Catholic institutions of higher learning. So how would they, being so opposite Hahn regarding the content of his dissertation, actually agree with and approve the dissertation? Don't kid yourself. Stuff like this goes on all the time at our illustrious American institutions, and there are many worse stories I could tell you about.

Speaking of Scott Hahn, even though we differ on a variety of issues, I still respect him. At least Scott Hahn is a gentleman and he tries very hard to live his Catholic faith the best he can. I think I could walk up to Scott and slap him on the face and he would, in all sincerity, turn the other cheek. Mr. Michael is quite another story. I don't think he represents the Catholic faith in the slightest. Besides all the calumny he has raised against me, I've seen him the past few years try to make a name for himself by climbing up the back of Scott Hahn. I read a few of Mr. Michael's articles on his website. There is a common theme among them: Mr. Michael steals ideas from Scott Hahn without giving credit to Scott Hahn, but makes it appear as if these ideas originate with Mr. Michael.

Incidentally, Mr. Michael tries to make quite a case that Dr. Berg has a doctorate in hypnotherapy, as if this is going to discredit *my* doctoral dissertation. First. Dr. Berg

has about a half-dozen more degrees than Jacob Michael (because Mr. Michael doesn't have any), but if Mr. Michael would be careful to read the correspondence that Dr. Berg sent him he would find that Dr. Berg is accompanied by other judges on the committee, many of which have expertise in religion and related fields. He wrote the following to Mr. Michael:

The Committee, which is chaired by myself, Dr Morris Berg, looks at general issues of acceptability such as the standard of writing and presentation, length of the work, quality of argument, depth of literature research, use of primary sources where necessary, and other matters such as copyright issues and permissions. The Committee may co-opt any suitable member of the Advisory Board or outside advisors, some of whom may work at other universities and wish their names to be confidential. The Committee may convene by electronic conferencing and names of those present at each session are not published.

Let's move on. Mr. Michael then says:

This leads us to the inevitable conclusion: the standards at Calamus are undeniably lower than they would be at an accredited institution of higher learning, and thus, according to the OODA's definition, Calamus has the marks of a degree mill. But it really matters very little what the OODA thinks about what constitutes a degree mill...

Yes, we found out loud and clear that Mr. Michael doesn't care what OODA's definition of a "degree mill" is, since, although OODA never said that CIU was a "degree mill," Mr. Michael inserts his unauthorized opinion and claims that it IS a "degree mill." It sounds like Mr. Michael has his beef more with the OODA than he has with me. But all the wishing in the world is not going to make CIU something it is not. Shame on Mr. Michael. The only "inevitable conclusion" we can reach is that Mr. Michael, as is his

usual fare, makes himself an authority on any issue he desires and doesn't care the least who he slanders by his unqualified judgments.

Then Mr. Michael adds more fuel to the fire...

...what matters is what Sungenis himself thinks. In an email discussion in 2004, Sungenis, commenting on the doctoral degree possessed by a certain well-known Protestant apologist, said, "If his outfit is a United States recognized accredited school, then I think we would have to accept his Ph.D. If it's [sic] accreditation is not accepted by the US, then we don't have to accept it. (I found out that the U.S. is the *key to almost all accrediting in regards to overseas institutions*)." (Sungenis, email discussion of February 6, 2004, emphasis added).

In his usual underhanded activity, Mr. Michael thinks nothing of divulging my private emails, but allow me to explain it in any case. The U.S. does not reject or accept CIU's accreditation because CIU has never applied for accreditation in the U.S. CIU is a private university. That is why the Oregon Degree Authorization says "not accredited in the U.S.," not "has been rejected for accreditation in the U.S." The fact is, in the above email I was explaining that if the school from which Eric Svendsen received his doctorate applied for and was accepted by the U.S. for its accreditation, then we have to accept it. As for my statement that "the U.S. is the *key to almost all accrediting in regards to overseas institutions*," this applies only to an academic institution overseas that is under governmental jurisdiction. That being the case, the U.S. can approve or disapprove of the accreditation based on whether the academic institution is approved by its own government. If it is approved by the institution's government, it is usually approved by the United States governing boards. So, for government-based academic institutions, one only need look at what the United States governing boards have said. But this is not the case with private universities in foreign countries, such as CIU. The United States government has no relationship with these types of universities.

Next, Mr. Michael tries to discredit my whole dissertation on ONE misquote that came to light. In one of the quotes I had in an ad for the book, I assumed, without looking

up the actual quote, that the author's rendition was correct. I knew this author very well so I didn't think I needed to look up this particular quote. I just trusted he got it right, but it turned out to be more of a paraphrase. My oversight. When I was alerted to this, I apologized and quickly corrected the mistake. But what does Mr. Michael make of this one mistake? You guessed it – a mountain out of a mole hill. Mr. Michael is famous for the *damned if you do, damned if you don't* school of justice. Get a load of this:

Apparently Sungenis used the same “seriously sloppy scholarship” in his doctoral dissertation. The example given by “Sylas” is just one verifiable example, one place where Sungenis got caught; how many other examples could be shown, if someone had the time and energy to comb through 1,000+ pages of text, double-checking every reference? The point is that such an exercise is unnecessary; once it has been demonstrated that Sungenis regularly dispenses himself from any obligation to follow scholarly standards as long as he is already convinced of his conclusions, all of his work becomes suspect. How many times has he paraphrased other writers and misquoted them in his other books? He does it in his articles, and apparently he did it in his dissertation, so how many other times has he done this?

I think it's easy to see Mr. Michael's motivation. He is on a search and destroy mission. Ironically, it is this obsession to discredit me that totally discredits himself. Note what's happening here. Because he has evidence of ONE misquote in the over 1400 footnotes of the book, Mr. Michael quickly concludes that this must be the case with the rest of the book! But how does Mr. Michael know this? By nothing more than his own biased conjecture. In order to prove his point, Mr. Michael would have to take the time to look up many more of my citations to see if they were accurate. If he found, say, a dozen instances where I misquoted or paraphrased incorrectly, he would have a case. But, of course, that would take too much time. It's easier just to accuse someone of doing “seriously sloppy scholarship” than it is to actually look up the various quotes to determine if his judgment is correct. Talk about “seriously sloppy scholarship”? Mr.

Michael takes the prize on this one! Just for the record, to this date, no one of the hundreds of people who have read *Galileo Was Wrong* and its now 1500 footnotes, has found any misquote or any questionable reference. In fact, if Mr. Michael wants to redeem himself, I challenge him to find some that are misquotes, that is, if he wants to deal with reality and not his own fantasy world. Let's see if Mr. Michael really wants to stick his neck out to prove his point, or will we see that he's just another opportunist waiting to churn the gossip mill?

Interestingly enough, Mr. Michael does take the time to speak about one more reference in my book, but he makes the wrong diagnosis on this one as well.

...if he feels justified in doing so, he sometimes doesn't even bother to properly reference a source (as is the case in *Galileo Was Wrong* on page 434, where he quotes "one author" - who is unnamed - and gives as a reference "physics.fsu.edu," which is nothing more than the home page for Florida State University's Department of Physics, on which no article or essay of any kind appears); these are not the habits of someone who is a "stickler for literary accuracy."

You see, in the world that Mr. Michael lives in, if he can't find the specific reference in the thirty seconds he read the Florida State homepage, he concludes that the reference does not exist, and in his mind, this allows him to make further denigrating remarks against me. If Mr. Michael would have taken the time to either plug in the words of the quote into the Physics.fsu.edu search engine, when he got to their home page, or any search engine, he would have easily found the precise quote and its source in about a half-second. It would have taken him to the following website address which has the quote in question:

<http://www.physics.fsu.edu/courses/spring98/AST3033/Quantum/QuantumWorld.htm>

The reason I did not put in the whole website address in the footnote was because it was simply too long to fit in my margins without causing a double blank line. But I'll make

sure I put it in future editions so that Mr. Michael is not tempted to engage in his usual calumny and character assassination over something so trivial. This is really hard to believe, isn't it?

So who has the “seriously sloppy scholarship”? Obviously, it's Jacob Michael, because he was simply too lazy or too biased to press the tab on his keyboard to see if his calumnious-prone mind was keeping pace with the scientific facts. And yet this 20-something upstart has the gall to accuse me of the very thing he is doing! Such hypocrisy. God has set a trap for people like Jacob Michael, and unfortunately for him, he fell right into it. The irony of this whole thing is that, before Mr. Michael started collaborating with Michael Forrest in order to silence me on Jewish issues, he was an ardent advocate of geocentrism. Imagine that. He had already conducted one interview with me a couple of years ago, and he was set to do another one. How sad now it is to see this same person do everything he can to discredit it simply because he disagrees with me on another issue. That's what the lack of maturity will give you every time.

Back to the interview Mr. Michael had with Dr. Berg. Again, Mr. Michael said these denigrating remarks after Dr. Berg was kind enough to answer all Mr. Michael's detailed questions and clear the air about the origin, purpose and policies of Calamus International University. After he found out this information from Dr. Berg, rather than retract his slanderous statements, Mr. Michael continued the calumny by accusing Dr. Berg of running a “store front” in the United Kingdom and “not having an on site campus” – topics that he and Dr. Berg never discussed in their emails and both of which are untrue in any case. Additionally, on his website Mr. Michael divulged NONE of the exculpatory information he received from Dr. Berg concerning my degree. Of course, we know why. It is not Mr. Michael's intention to give me any credit whatsoever in this endeavor, but to make me look as bad as possible to advance himself among his peers, including keeping the rumor mill churning that I somehow bought my degree without doing any qualified work to get it and, of course, that I “hate Jewish people.” Nothing could be further from the truth, of course, but Jacob Michael is not interested in truth. He is only interested in promoting himself.

Jacob Michael, the person:

You'll have to forgive me for digressing here for a moment to say something about critics like Jacob Michael. I find it quite humorous when I see how vociferously Mr. Michael attacks my academic credentials when I take into consideration his own vacuous academic background. Of course, he does not advertise these academic lacunas about himself on his website. He just hopes people won't notice. For instance, Mr. Michael has no degrees in theology, religion, history or any related field. In fact, he has no degrees in any academic field. His day-job is in computers. He has been in the Catholic Church for only about ten years. He has no independently published books. He has never been recognized by any official of the Catholic Church as being an authority, a theologian or even a qualified commentator on any subject whatsoever. He is only in his 20s and he lacks the experience, maturity and qualifications of a professional. He has no public endorsements from any prominent Catholic figure. He is not even recognized by the U.S. government as a religious entity for tax purposes.

Yet in the face of all these glaring inadequacies, he runs a website with all the glitter of a Madison Avenue ad campaign that tells everyone in the world how they should understand Catholic theology and how they should live the Catholic faith! It is one of the most amazing instances of self-promotion, and self-delusion, I have ever seen. He even keeps a tally on his homepage of how many people read each of the articles he has written! Talk about ego. This guy is a real couch case.

As I noted above, I've read a few of his website articles and his self-published book. I noticed a common thread running through them. He commandeers a lot of ideas from Scott Hahn, yet without giving credit to Scott Hahn. Mr. Michael merely puts these ideas on his website and makes it appear as if he is the original source. Some people would call this plagiarism. I will not enter into a judgment here. Suffice it to say it wouldn't be so bad if Mr. Michael would tone down his rhetoric and curtail himself from relying on the devilish caricatures he creates of those he considers his opponents, but unfortunately, unlike Scott Hahn who is a gentleman, Jacob Michael is one of the most belligerent and caustic voices on the Internet today.

Again, forgive me for the digression but in some cases it is necessary to give examples to my CAI patrons concerning the character and background of my critics so

that you may be aware of the possible motivations they have in attacking me and promoting themselves.

More about “Degrees”:

One reason I have little problem in promoting my Ph.D. from CIU is, not only did I put in three years of hard work to obtain the degree and see it past muster with qualified academic peers, it is a doctorate in Religion, not Medicine, not Law, not Engineering or any other discipline wherein one would be expected to pass rigorous standardized tests due to the fact that he will be directly involved with the physical health and welfare of the public. I won't be performing surgery on anyone, or defending anyone in court, or building a bridge. I will be doing what I have always been doing for the last 30 years – teaching people about religion and related fields. I have two degrees in Religion from U.S. accredited institutions already under my belt, and by the accolades that the public has given me for my books and other work, they have already acknowledged that I am an expert in my field. Moreover, since Religion is such a subjective and wide-open field (i.e., we have tens of thousands of religions in the world), having a doctorate in Religion is not a degree that should cause much consternation in people's minds. Only those who seek to disparage me for their own gain have made my doctorate in Religion an issue of suspicion and calumny.

The subject of Religion also reflects directly on whether one actually needs a US-accredited degree in Religion in order for the degree to be accepted by the rest of the world. The United States is not, and does not consider itself, the final authority on things religious. The United States specifically avoids such designations and categories. The very principles of the United States Constitution accept any religion as viable within its contiguous borders. Moreover, the United States is a country that holds less than 7% of the world's population and is less than 250 years old. With all these limitations, how could the United States ever be considered an authority on Religion or pronounce that its academic degrees in Religion are better than another nation's degrees in Religion? In essence, having a degree in Religion from an institution that does not have accreditation status in the United States doesn't really mean a whole lot. In fact, technically speaking,

since Calamus International University is not a United States university it cannot come under the official United States regional accreditation system. CIU is an international private university. Accreditation of such universities is voluntary and there is no government-approved accreditation system for such private universities. Usually the university will be accredited by one or more private bodies that do not need government recognition. This allows them the freedom to choose their own curriculum without having to get approval from the government.

Moreover, I do not need a United States accredited degree simply because I have no intentions of teaching in a United States university. If I did intend to teach in a United States university, it would behoove me to attain a United States accredited Ph.D., otherwise, I would never find a job. But I already have a profession, and my peers and patrons acknowledge that I'm quite good at what I do. In that sense, the Ph.D. from CIU is just icing on the cake, as it were. I don't need it to get a job or make my job viable. The only thing it does is allow me to show the world, in a glance, that I have the same academic credentials as those who receive a Ph.D. in Religion from a United States accredited institution. In fact, I dare say that most Ph.D.s in Religion from United States accredited institutions haven't accomplished even half of what I've accomplished, or gone through half of the rigors that I've gone through in the last 32 years, and few of them could be called upon to give a faithful representation of the true meaning of religion. Almost all of them in the United States are anti-Catholic, and the ones that are Catholic are so liberal it's difficult to acknowledge that they are, indeed, Catholic.

Distinctions of Calamus International University:

As I noted earlier, Calamus International University has its own marks of international distinction. CIU is a member of the Adult Higher Education Alliance, which includes such member universities as DePaul University, George Mason University, Marquette University, Texas A&M University, Concordia University and 36 other recognized and accepted universities in the United States and abroad. (<http://www.ahea.org/about/institutions.htm>). Each of these universities offer flexible and innovative curriculums for older adults who are already employed in their chosen

field of work yet who want to obtain an advanced degree without having to fulfill all the classroom requirements of the typical university (although CIU offers various classroom curriculums at different locations e.g., Greece, Dubai, Malaysia, etc). With eight children and a job that keeps me quite busy, CIU was the best option for me, especially in the age of the Internet.

Calamus Extension College Limited and Calamus International University are fully accredited by the International Interfaith Accreditation Association, a non-profit body whose headquarters are in Florida, and CIU is an Approved Member of the International Association for Distance Learning. The degrees it offers are legal degrees issued under the jurisdiction of the British West Indies.

As I noted above, the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization, which did an exhaustive study of over 300 institutions around the world, had no negative comments about Calamus International University, except to say that it does not have accreditation status from the United States. In most critical evaluations, Calamus International University is recognized as a “non-traditional” university, since it does not require classroom education for all of its degree programs. Similar to many universities in Europe, CIU offers Research-Degree programs, whereas these are not common in the United States. Unfortunately, the United States has a “one-size-fits-all” mentality when it comes to higher education. Those who go into United States programs of higher education are more or less put on a tracking system and forced to fit an academic mold. In any case, for any person to be considered a candidate for a doctoral program at CIU, he must already have a bachelors and masters degree from an accredited institution.

The Faculty at CIU:

Calamus International University makes use of a consortium of degree-qualified educators from various parts of the world. In this way, it is truly an international university. Its present faculty include the following:

Chancellor:

Professor Dominique Boubouleix-Hearntown assumed the honorary position of Chancellor of the University with effect from 1 December 2005. Dr Boubouleix-Hearntown holds the Doctorate of the EPHE, a college of the Sorbonne in Paris, together with other higher degrees. He is a supervising professor at the School of Anthropology, Paris, and an Academic Member of the London Diplomatic Academy. Dr Boubouleix-Hearntown has been awarded the medal of the Albert Schweitzer International University, is listed in the *International Who's Who of Intellectuals* and has published in a number of academic journals. His fields are Sanskrit, Thai Language, Linguistics, Anthropology of Religion, Archaeology, Ethnology, Comparative Mythology, Diplomacy, and Bioethics. As well as having the role of Chancellor, Dr Boubouleix-Hearntown supervises CIU research students in his areas of expertise.

Acting Rector and Hon. Academic Dean (International Students):

Dr. Morris L. Berg, B.Sc. (Hons) Psychology, M.A., M.B.A., Ph.D. (Hypnotherapy), Psy. D, D.Litt., D.C.H., D.T.H., Dip.THP, D.HP, C.Ht., APLH, CPM-IARRT, FHS (Emeritus), FHRS, FCPS, FNCH, FIMS (Dip.IMS), MNGH, FAZWHS, MPNLP, MNFNLP, CRM. (Dr Berg also holds a number of other qualifications and honorary degrees). Dr Berg is also Professor of Change Agent Studies and is Course Director for a number of areas including Hypnotherapy.

International Adjunct Faculty:

Dr. David Brewster, Professor of Counselling Psychology, B.Sc. Zoology, Univ. of London, M.Sc. Univ. of Liverpool, Ph.D. Psychol., Univ. of Birmingham, Dip. Couns. Guildford College of Further and Higher Education, PGCE, Kingston Univ., Adv. Dip. Professional Stress Management, Kadmon Academy, MNCH (Acc), FHRS, FHS, FCPS

Dr. Adrian Greaves, Associate Professor of South African History, B.A., Psychology, Open University, M.A. (USA), S. African History, D. Hum. (USA), History, M. Phil., Ph.D., Calamus Int'l Univ., FHS, FHRS, FCPS, FRGS, MInstM

Dr. Greg A. Grove, Professor of Music, B.A. Secondary Music Education, San Jose State Univ. School of Music, M.A. Music (Piano), San Jose State Univ. School of Music, Ph.D. Education, Pensacola Christian College, D.R.E. Christian Psychology and School Administration, Citadel Baptist Theological Seminary, Bsc.M., Msc.M., Msc.D., Univ. of Metaphysics (University of Sedona), M.S Christian Counseling, Evangel Christian Univ. of America, Psy.D, D.Sc. (cand) Calamus International University

Dr. Tamlyn Llewellyn-Edwards, Professor of Homeopathy and Energy Therapies, Postgraduate Certificate In Homeopathy, American School of Classical Homeopathy, PG.Dip. Nuclear Physics, Royal Naval School, Greenwich, Ph.D., Open University, FRSA, FBIH (Fellow, British Institute of Homoeopathy), MARH, MHMA, MAAMT

Ria Keen, Instructor in Contemporary Singing, Cert.Ed.(FAHE), Univ. of Wolverhampton, B.Phil., M.F.A., Calamus Int'l Univ.

Most Reverend Robert King, Associate Professor of Mysticism and Metaphysics, Doctor of Sacred Theology honoris causa, Holy Trinity Seminary, Bachelor of Metaphysical Science, College of Metaphysical Studies.

Dr. Sue Oliver, Associate Professor of Dance Education, B.A. Social Science, Univ. of Stirling, M.Ed., Univ. of Edinburgh, PGCE, Moray House College of Education, Cert. in Dance in Education, Moray House Institute, Heriot-Watt Univ., Ph.D., Calamus International University.

Francesca A. Wilson, B.A.(Hons), Univ. of Leeds, Dip. Couns., Guildford College of Further and Higher Education, Dip. Stage Management, Guildford School of Acting, Accredited Counsellor (BACP), M.Univ.

International Academic Advisory Board:

Dr. Max J. Ellul, K.L.J., M.B.A., D.B.A, D.Litt., (Region: Malta. Fields: Entertainment and Leisure Management; Medieval and Chivalric Studies; Church History; Gnosticism; Early Christianity)

Ms. Ursula Jeffries, M.A. (Oxon), Cert. TEFL (Trinity) (Region: UK. Fields: English Language and Literature; French Literature; TEFL)

Dr. Gareth Hayes H.N.D., C.Biol, MIBiol, D.Univ. (Region: UK. Fields: Clinical Research; Industrial Training; Comparative Religion; Works of Will Hayes)

Prof. Terence F. Lynn, M.Ed., CAGS, LMHC, Ph.D.(c), D.Sc. (Region: USA. Fields: Criminology & Social Deviance; Forensic Psychology.)

Dr. Barry Neale, Ph.D. (Region: UK. Fields: Hypnotherapy, Medical Hypnosis)

Dr. Tracie O'Keefe, B.C.H., D.C.H., CIU Emeritus Professor.

Dr. Kostadinos Papaderakis, B.Sc., Ph.D. (Region: Greece. Fields: Hypnotherapy, Metaphysics, Esoteric Studies)

Louise Prunty, B.Sc., M.Sc., Reiki Master. (Region: Scotland. Fields: Complementary Therapies)

Y. L. Shum, B.B.A., Dip. Personnel Mgt., M.Sc., D.B.A. (cand.) (Region: Malaysia. Field: Management.)

Dr. Ioannis Skellas, Ph.D. (Region: Greece. Fields: Biophysics; Metaphysical Studies)

Dr. Barbara Sourmeli, M.A., Ph.D. (Region: Greece. Fields: Esoteric Studies; Metaphysical Studies)

Dr. Tan Chai Ching, M.Sc., Ph.D., D.Litt. (Region: Thailand. Fields: Management, Corporate Spirituality, TQM, Mechanical Engineering, Robotics, Surface Engineering)

Dr. Woo Kong Chee, Ph.D., Psy.D. (Region: Malaysia. Fields: Management, Psychology)

Professor Dr Mohammad-Ramin Zia, B.A., M.A., D.F.A., Ph.D., D.Sc. (Hons) (Region: Dubai. Fields: Complementary Health; Graphic Arts)

Additional Information:

As noted above, I was enrolled in CIU's Research-Degree program. These programs are usually granted when the candidate has an established track record of expertise in his chosen field and has demonstrated that he has acquired sufficient experience in teaching or writing on the subject. In addition, Research-Degree programs are usually granted when the topic of study is rather obscure or technical, and thus will require an inordinate amount of independent research to defend the thesis. Calamus International University is one of them, as was the last institution I was previously seeking my doctorate, Maryvale Institute.

For those who have been accepted by CIU's Research-Degree programs, they are assigned to the Independent Studies curriculum, and their basic task is to do research in their chosen field of endeavor. They are assigned an Academic Advisor and a Supervising Professor who keep in regular contact with the doctoral candidate and offer advice and correction on the writing of the dissertation. Both the Academic Advisor and the Supervising Professor must have a Ph.D. My Academic Advisor was Dr. Morris Berg, and my Supervising Professor was Dr. Robert Bennett. Again, these kinds of programs are commonplace in Europe, but not in the United States.

Calamus International University requires the writing of a formal dissertation in the chosen field of study, and the dissertation must meet the same standards of excellence that are normally required of other university curriculums. The dissertation must be approved by the Independent Studies Committee, which is composed of three faculty

members. The dissertation is copyrighted and published by Calamus International University. As noted above, my dissertation was over 700 pages and contained 1400 footnotes and 65 pages of bibliography, and it received the highest academic marks in all nine categories it was analyzed. Most of the research and the analysis of the research is new, that is, it has never been published by any previously known author. In order to have such a work of this kind reach its intended academic audience, it is published as a doctoral dissertation.

Endorsements for my Dissertation/Book:

Lastly, I would like you to see the glowing endorsements I received from the book, “Galileo Was Wrong,” the book that was made from my dissertation with CIU. Whether you agree with geocentrism or not, the fact remains that qualified degree-possessing experts who have become leaders in their scientific fields, have heartily endorsed my thesis and conclusion. Interestingly enough, half of the quotes come from Protestants; the other half from Catholics. There are as follows:

A truly magnificent work. There exists no better exposition of the history and science of geocentrism. Very highly recommended and a must for all those interested in the issues surrounding geocentrism today. The animations of the CD are excellent. They illustrate the daily and yearly motions of the sun and planets about the earth, the seasons, retrograde motion, and parallax in a uniform way. The authors have done a very admirable job all around.

Gerardus Bouw, Ph.D.

Astronomy

Author of *Geocentricity*

In their over 700-page book, *Galileo Was Wrong*, Drs. Robert Sungenis and Robert Bennett make a convincing case for the special and central position of the earth in the cosmos, both

physically and spiritually. This is, of course, radically at odds from what everyone is taught from childhood; everyone “knows” the earth revolves around the sun. However, from time to time, like the little girl in Hans Christian Andersen’s tale *The Emperor’s New Clothes*, accepted “wisdom” is challenged; and what everyone “knows” to be true turns out to be merely a concocted fantasy. Drs. Sungenis and Bennett make a powerful case that the “truths” of heliocentric and acentric cosmologies aiming to describe the “fabric” of space-time may in fact be constructed out of the same type of “cloth” as the outfit of the Emperor. Admirably presented in a format accessible to a scientific layman, the authors dismantle “proofs” of the earth’s motion such as Foucault’s pendulum, stellar parallax, and stellar aberration. In exhaustive detail, the authors also present the results from modern physics (such as interferometer experiments) and astronomical observations, suggesting that in fact the position of the earth may be where it was held to be prior to the “Copernican revolution”; namely, the unmoving center of the universe. The authors provide quotes from eminent cosmologists admitting that this cannot be refuted by observation but is only rejected on philosophical grounds, and raise the disturbing possibility that part of modern cosmology and physics, including Relativity Theory, has been invented out of “whole cloth” precisely to avoid the philosophical implications of a universe with a motionless earth at the center.

While many of the arguments contained within *Galileo Was Wrong* have been previously presented by other geocentrists, it is unparalleled in the breadth and detail of the information presented supporting a geocentric cosmology and its accessibility to the lay reader. *Galileo Was Wrong* therefore stands as a unique reference and starting point for future debate among all who are searchers for the truth and willing to entertain the possibility that perhaps the little girl proclaiming the Emperor’s nakedness was correct.

Unfortunately *Galileo Was Wrong* is likely to be scorned not only by the mainstream scientific community but also by the mainstream creationist movement. But all who believe that man's creation was not by "accident" would do well to consider the following questions, posed by the authors. Is the earth an insignificant rock, a mere chance artifact of the Big Bang, one out of many planets in one out of many solar systems, of no special position but hurtling with great speed through the cosmos towards no final destination in particular? Or has the earth been specifically designed by a benevolent Creator as the habitation place for man, the highest creation in the physical universe, and therefore placed in the central position in the universe? For an important corollary to the question of whether man came into being only by accident or via the design of an omnipotent and loving Creator is whether the place of his habitation in the universe likewise came into being only by accident or by design of a Creator, and whether its place in the universe has any importance or special significance. As others strive to restore man to his rightful role as the crown of physical creation as opposed to a mere assortment of molecules arising by chance, Drs. Sungenis and Bennett have made a powerful case for restoring man's central physical position in the universe.

Vincent J. Schmithorst, Ph.D.

Physics

Imaging Research, Ohio

The confrontation between Galilei and the Catholic Church is consistently portrayed as a sort of David and Goliath struggle, where truth ultimately triumphs. When this episode is examined in greater detail, however, a different picture starts to emerge, as so often is the case with many things that we are taught as being fact. If there exists an obligation upon each of us to think and to reason for ourselves, then it follows that there is

also an obligation upon those who are able to conduct independent research to publish that research, no matter what ridicule and trouble is then heaped upon them for doing so. For unfortunately, in this Orwellian age of enlightenment in which we find ourselves, the Emperor's New Clothes fable has gone from being an amusing insight into human nature to a dangerous psychological weapon, with those who openly question and explore ruling paradigms being branded as extremists, fundamentalists, or conspiracy theorists.

In *Galileo Was Wrong*, Robert Sungenis and Robert Bennett have provided an excellent synopsis of a field of science that most people today have probably not even heard about. It is not a regurgitation of some ancient, debunked theory. Neither is this a lightweight paperback, in the vein of so many publications by scientists who have lost the dividing line between science and science fiction. Rather, *Galileo Was Wrong*, is a work of monumental proportion which ranks, in my opinion, on a par with the meticulous observations of the Danish astronomer, Tycho Brahe, and the tireless efforts of Walter van der Kamp who almost single-handedly raised geocentrism from the ashes in the 1970s and 80s. Although the World on which we all live gives an appearance of being located at the centre of the universe, is there any scientific evidence to say that it is at the centre? Conversely, is there scientific evidence to show that it definitely is not at the centre of the universe? What would a geocentric universe imply? To adequately contemplate these and similar questions necessitates our being in possession of facts, as opposed to simply making assumptions (even Albert Einstein took it as read that the World orbits the Sun, whilst acknowledging that there was no proof that this was indeed the case). In short, a formulated conclusion on such an important topic as this is only of value to anyone if it is based upon factual material. *Galileo Was Wrong* is a scholarly piece of work that should thus be welcomed by any thinking person, and that

provides ample food for thought on our place within God's universe.”

Neville Thomas Jones, Ph.D.

Physics

Imperial College, London

Galileo Was Wrong is an evocative book. It evoked memories which have lain dormant since my undergraduate days: things like the disturbing conclusions of the Michelson-Morley experiments; things like Leibniz's critique of Newton's system as shot through with appeals to occult properties; things like the fact that no one, least of all Newton, can explain what gravity is or refute the materialists' conclusion that it is intrinsic to matter. In their new book, Sungenis and Bennett take no prisoners. They look all of the anomalies in the current cosmological system in the face without fear and come up with conclusions that will startle the followers of Carl Sagan out of their dogmatic slumbers. Truth to tell, Newton was turned into an idol to serve the political purposes of the Whigs, who used him to bring down the House of Bourbon across the English Channel. His cosmological system was used as a justification of the Enlightenment. Now that the Enlightenment is over, it was inevitable that the system upon which it was based should come in for the powerful critique which Sungenis and Bennett provide. Not inevitable, however, was the brilliant way they provide it.

E. Michael Jones, Ph.D.

Editor: *Culture Wars*

Ironically, aerospace engineers assume an “earth-centered, earth-fixed” coordinate system when launching and flying satellites. The Global Positioning System (GPS) does the same for navigation on earth and in space. In *Galileo Was*

Wrong, Sungenis and Bennett examine the ‘anomalies’ that arise from the Copernican model, anomalies that are swept under the rug by the same scientists who assume the earth is immobile in order to ‘simplify’ complex problems. A must read for those who can set aside prejudices and a priori assumptions.

Joseph A. Strada, Ph.D.
Aerospace Engineer, NRO

The book, *Galileo Was Wrong*, forcefully addresses the history, science, theological, philosophical, and worldview implications of our place in the universe. It is virtually a one-volume encyclopedia on geocentrism. After the science has been discussed and the history has been told, it is a powerful reminder of the worldview struggle that faces Christians today.

Russell T. Arndts, Ph.D.
Chemistry, L.S.U.

It takes some measure of discipline to collate and assemble, in cogent form, the relevant scholarship touching on the matter of geocentricity. The task is complicated in no small part by the diversity of viewpoint evident among the adherents to this admittedly dissident approach to astrophysics. Well-intentioned but poorly executed attempts along such lines have tended to discredit the geocentric model, and it is not without reason that the opposition focuses attention on such blatant misfires (if they focus attention on the issue at all). This volume, however, achieves a cumulative effect that is formidable. No one geocentrist, aside from the authors, will agree with every scientific tenet in this work, and many geocentrists might detect the absence of their primary concerns or preferred theoretical

alternatives, myself included. How could it be otherwise? If the book were to be fully comprehensive, it could never enter print, its completion being diverted by continual data acquisition. It is right, then, that this effort storms the field in the powerful form it already exhibits, and it is my hope that it will become a living document, growing in value as new updated editions are issued.

I am not a Roman Catholic. Some may find it inexplicable that someone like myself, from the Protestant side of the aisle, would write an endorsement for this project. I believe that in the matter before us, we'd have to credit sectarian tunnel-vision for giving rise to such perplexity. My appreciation for the monumental labors of Drs. Sungenis and Bennett does not entail my adopting their views concerning the weight of Patristic evidence, for instance (although the difference between us is one of degree), and my endorsement of their work does not imply my repudiation of sola scriptura, among other distinctively Protestant positions. The critical question involves the value of the specific scholarship being presented. Just as the Chalcedon Foundation, a Protestant Christian educational institution, published the work of Notre Dame University's Prof. Edward J. Murphy due to the importance of his work, so it is fitting and right to extol this particular compendium for so clearly demonstrating that the emperor's wardrobe is not merely diaphanous, it's positively massless (or expressed more plainly, the emperor, modern science, is wearing no clothes).

It is with pleasure that I remand this volume into the hands of the reader, whether he or she is an atheistic scoffer, a Roman Catholic inquirer, a Protestant polemicist, an Evangelical skeptic, or is otherwise motivated to re-open an issue heretofore thought, wrongly, to have been settled nearly four centuries ago. I would recommend approaching this work with as open a mind as you can muster. More importantly, I would urge the Christian reader to come to grips with our built-in, and very human, "lust for credibility," our desire to have "friendship with the world"

and retain “the praise of man,” all of which have sapped our resolve and lead to slippery-slope compromises that continue to lead men into the ditch. This is all the more remarkable, insofar as the present volume exposes the dark, seamy underside of modern science and its Janus-like propensity for speaking out of both sides of its mouth simultaneously. For the critic consulting the volume with the sole intent of attacking it, Drs. Sungenis and Bennett have provided the right thing indeed: a big, fat, juicy target. Therefore, let the debate begin in earnest. With documentation this thorough, the opposition can be quickly called on the carpet for misquotation or taking points out of context. Such interaction with hostile critics can only strengthen future editions of this work. If more Christians would raise the bar like these two authors have done, we would more readily perceive that the Word of God is an anvil that has worn out many hammers ... and will continue to do so.

Martin G. Selbrede
Chief Scientist, UniPixel Displays, Inc.
Vice President, The Chalcedon Foundation

Once upon a time, there was a big bang. It filled the sky with debris that formed into stars and planets. One planet developed a special slime that brought forth plants, animals, and men. The men became wise and discovered the truths of the universe. Or did they? Fairy tales have their place, but they should not be confused with science. Why has speculation come to replace observation as the basis of science? *Galileo Was Wrong* takes a critical look at the thesis that the Earth is flying through space. Here you will find a thorough review of the scientific observations along with a review of the scientists themselves. You will see how their unquestioning support of the thesis led them to redefine the nature of the universe. You will

have the evidence to make up your mind for yourself. Robert Sungenis and Robert Bennett have done a great service to science and to men of good will. Those who see the universe as the handiwork of the benevolent God need no longer be subservient to fairy tales.

Anonymous, Ph.D.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Galileo Was Wrong is an amazing work which opened my mind to many things in the field of astronomy and cosmology. I am grateful to Robert Sungenis and his co-author Robert Bennett for this lucid, philosophically powerful and meticulously documented work. Looking at cosmology from the point of view of the “discredited” geocentric theory is a remarkable educational approach, and one that could be applied with profit to many fields today. Western culture reveals a hardening of the arteries of thinking all across the spectrum, and the recovery and exposition of alternative and dissenting views will be necessary to its regeneration. By its very nature, the geocentric theory occupies a central axis in this sclerosis of imagination and imperviousness to reality that so degrades the intellectual functioning of Western leaders and elites today. Many bad habits and automatic assumptions sprang from the rejection of geocentrism, and even to detail these, as *Galileo Was Wrong* does, is an achievement in itself. But there is more than excavation here. *Galileo Was Wrong* is a model for the kind of scholarship we need today – intellectual understanding not as an end in itself, but as a commitment to reality, infused with moral passion, love for the earth, common sense and philosophical sensitivity. We don’t need ‘new knowledge’ – as the peer-reviewed science establishment keeps forever intoning – so much as the ability to do things, and see things, differently. In

our moral darkness, *Galileo Was Wrong* opens up an important path to the reconnection of thought and life.

Caryl Johnston, M. Ed., M.L.S.

Jefferson Medical College

Author: *Consecrated Venom*

Thank you for taking the time to read my explanation. I hope it has been informative and helpful. As you can see, the reality of the situation is far different than what my critics have alleged. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at cairomeo@aol.com.

God be with you.

Robert A. Sungenis, Ph.D.

January 28, 2007