# Interview with Robert Sungenis on

# Phil Plait's Criticism of Geocentrism

**Interviewer:** Hi Dr. Sungenis, thank you for allowing me to ask you a few questions concerning the topic of Geocentrism. I am currently writing a short research paper on the topic of Geocentrism and am doing my best to corroborate Geocentric cosmology. I hope to incorporate a part of the interview into the paper itself if that is alright. Once again, thank you, and God bless.

Interview Questions:

1. Within an article titled "Cracked Earth and Crackpot Ideas" (Skeptic. 2013, Vol. 18 Issue 1, p20-23. 4p.) by Donald R. Prothero, the following "argument" is stated thus:

> **Prothero:** "In addition, we now have space probes visiting all the planets on paths predicted by the heliocentric model, and some have looked back and taken shots that show the layout of the solar system, and the earth where it really is -- and that it's round! But in this age of the Internet, silly ideas like **geocentrism** can reach an audience of millions in minutes, without editorial fact-checking or scientific peer review, which most mainstream media still practice. Anyone with a hot idea, a computer and possibly some decent graphics or animation can cook up a wild theory and quickly generate hundreds of thousands of hits, and hundreds of favorable comments from those who can't tell science fact from science fantasy."

Q: How would you respond to this objection to Geocentrism, namely that we use the Heliocentric model in predicting the paths of space probes to various other planets?

**Robert Sungenis**: Unfortunately such comments, such as those from Mr. Prothero, are made by people who do not do "editorial fact-checking or scientific peer review" before they state them. If he had done his fact-checking, he would know that NASA, for example, uses either a geocentric model, technically known as the Earth Centered Inertial Frame (ECIF), or a heliocentric model, known as the Solar-barycentric frame (SBF). They can do so because the geometry, distances and even the dynamical forces for the geocentric and heliocentric systems are all convertible. This is why even Albert Einstein said in his 1938 book: "The struggle, so violent in the early days of science, between the views of Ptolemy and Copernicus would then be quite meaningless. Either coordinate system could be used with equal justification. The two sentences: 'the sun is at rest and the Earth moves,' or 'the sun moves and the Earth is at rest,' would simply mean two different conventions concerning two different coordinate systems" (*The Evolution of Physics: From Early Concepts to Relativity and Quanta*, Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, 1938, 1966, p. 212).

Much of the confusion is caused by people who are ignorant of the modern geocentric system, which no longer uses the Ptolemaic model (which had problems because of the

erroneous placement of Mercury and Venus), but uses the Tychonian and Neo-Tychonian model. This system has been in place for almost 400 years as the reigning geocentric model. It was even adapted with elliptical orbits for the planets by Giovanni Riccioli in his 1665 book, *Astronomia Reformata*. The Tychonic system is just an inversion of the Copernican system, and thus all the geometry and distances remain exactly the same in both, and thus space probe trajectories can be calculated accurately in either model.

**Interviewer:** 2. In an article by Phil Plait titled "Geocentrism? Seriously? Plait goes on to say in regards to Geocentrism and relativity that "So geocentrism is valid, but so is every other frame. This is the very basis of relativity! One of the guiding principles used by Einstein in formulating it is that there is no One True Frame. If there were, the Universe would behave very, very differently. That's where Geocentrism trips up. Note the upper case **G** there; I use that to distinguish it from little-**g** geocentrism, which is just another frame of reference among many. Capital-**G** Geocentrism is the belief that geocentrism is the *only* frame, the real one. Geocentrists, at this point, fall into two cases: those who use relativity to bolster their claim, and those who deny it. Those who use relativity say that geocentrism can be right and is just as valid as heliocentrism or any other centrism. That's correct! But the problem is that using relativity *by definition* means that there is no One True Frame. So if you use relativity to say geocentrism can really be Geocentrism, you're wrong. You're using self-contradictory arguments." Plait then continues... ... "The other flavor of Geocentrist, those who deny relativity wholesale, are wrong as well. Relativity is one of the most well-tested and thoroughly solid ideas in all of science for all time. It is literally tested millions of times a day in particle accelerators. We see it in every cosmological observation, every star that explodes in the sky, every time a nuclear power plant generates even an iota of energy. Heck, without relativity *your GPS wouldn't work*."

Q: How would you respond to this objection?

**Robert Sungenis**: Mr. Plait is quite enthusiastic but he is very misinformed. Let's deal with each of his assertions, one by one.

First, let's deal with the assertion that the GPS wouldn't work without relativity. This is false. The GPS purports to use relativity, but the reality is quite different. Each GPS satellite is pre-programmed with the Sagnac effect, although neither NASA nor JPL advertise this fact. We should also mention that, perhaps for the same reason, Einstein never mentioned the Sagnac effect in any of his papers. Why is this important? Because Sagnac in 1913 disproved relativity by showing that there is absolute rotation, and he concluded that his experiment proved absolute rotation because there exists a substance, normally called "ether," that impeded one of the electromagnetic waves in his interferometer. (NB: we use "absolute rotation" in direct contrast to "relative rotation").

The same impeding of electromagnetic waves occurs in the GPS. In fact, the GPS is little more than a giant Sagnac experiment. The electromagnetic waves that travel back and forth from one GPS satellite to the other do so at different speeds. Waves going

west to east travel 50 nanoseconds slower than those going east to west, all the time, every time. This shows that the speed of light is not constant, and thus disproves the Special Theory of Relativity.

Relativists try to answer the Sagnac experiment by using General Relativity and do so my imposing an infinite amount of mathematical "frames" into a Sagnac experiment, and then claim that the GPS uses General Relativity! But this kind of mathematical fudging is just a classic case of *petitio principii*.

By the way, we discovered that the GPS is pre-programmed with the Sagnac effect from a physicist who works for the John Deere tractor company. In order to allow a tractor to plow fields by being guided by the GPS, he had to go into the computer program of the GPS and examine it line by line. That's where he found that the GPS is pre-programmed with the Sagnac effect. This fact is not advertised at all by either NASA or JPL, thus hiding the fact that the GPS actually disproves Special Relativity, not confirm it.

Let's deal with Mr. Plait's assertion that particle accelerators prove relativity. Mr. Plait is referring to the fact that the Special Theory of Relativity theorizes that when an object moves its inertial mass increases. This is part and parcel with Einstein's belief that when an object moves its length decreases and its time dilates and therefore its mass must increase to keep everything in proportion. To do so, relativists use the Lorentz transform equation, wherein length is multiplied by $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$, which will always produce a shorter length. For time dilation, time is divided by $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ and for mass increase, mass is divided by $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$.

What's important to know here is that when Lorentz first proposed this equation to answer the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment, Lorentz believed that ether caused the shortening of the length of a moving object by putting pressure on the object's electrons. Lorentz said the shortening of the length followed the formula $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$. But Einstein didn't like the ether as the cause for the shortening and thus arbitrarily dispensed with it. Einstein replaced the ether with "relativity," but he used the same equation as Lorentz did for the ether, namely, $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$. As you can imagine, Einstein was accused of defying the laws of causation (e.g., by Max Abraham), but since Einstein had provided mankind with the only plausible answer to the fact that Michelson and Morley could not detect the Earth revolving around the sun, Einstein's theory had saved the world from having to go back to the Middle Age view of a non-moving Earth in the center of the universe.

Back to the issue. When an electron or a proton moving close to the speed of light in a particle accelerator appears to gain mass, is it doing do by virtue of the Special Relativity theory? That is hardly provable. If, for example, the ether that Lorentz believed in is present in the chamber and the electron or proton is moving against it, the electron or proton is going to have the same "mass increase" as when Einstein claims the electron or proton gains mass by the virtue of "relativity," but it won't be because

the object is actually increasing in mass but because of the resistance the ether is putting on the electron. Since it takes an enormous amount of energy for the electron to move against ether at high speed, this energy increase, according to Einstein's E = mc^2, can also be understood as a "mass increase." Hence, particle accelerators don't prove Special Relativity. They just show that fast-moving objects will appear to gain mass. Moreover, as Herbert Dingle pointed out many years ago, in experiments that involve elementary particles moving at very high speeds, the speeds of the particles are not measured directly but are merely inferred from certain observations by a process that involves the use of Maxwell's electromagnetic theory. Ironically enough, Maxwell's equations are based on the presence of ether!

Now, let's deal with the article you link above by Richard W. Pogge (http://www.astronomy.ohio-state.edu/~pogge/Ast162/Unit5/gps.html). He writes:

> **Pogge:** To achieve this level of precision, the clock ticks from the GPS satellites must be known to an accuracy of 20-30 nanoseconds. However, because the satellites are constantly moving relative to observers on the Earth, effects predicted by the Special and General theories of Relativity must be taken into account to achieve the desired 20-30 nanosecond accuracy. Because an observer on the ground sees the satellites in motion relative to them, Special Relativity predicts that we should see their clocks ticking more slowly (see the Special Relativity lecture). Special Relativity predicts that the on-board atomic clocks on the satellites should fall behind clocks on the ground by about 7 microseconds per day because of the slower ticking rate due to the time dilation effect of their relative motion.

**Robert Sungenis**: That the clocks on the earth's surface may tick differently than clocks up in space is a common occurrence, but to say that this difference is caused by "relativity" and that it is proof of Special Relativity, is specious. The only thing it proves is that Special Relativity's math can be massaged to calculate the physical phenomenon of clock disparities, but it doesn't prove that the cause is "relativistic" time dilation.

Since we already know that the 1887 and 1925 Michelson experiments, as well as the 1913 Sagnac experiment, discovered absolute motion, and did so by measuring ether drift, then the clock disparities cannot be proven to be due to "relativistic" time dilation. In accord with the empirical evidence from the Michelson and Sagan experiments, we would be required to say that the clocks at different heights differ in their time calibration simply because the mechanisms of clocks at high elevations have a slightly different ether drag on them than clocks at the surface. In other words it is purely a physical phenomenon, not a "relativistic" one.

Mr. Pogge continues:

> **Pogge:** Further, the satellites are in orbits high above the Earth, where the curvature of spacetime due to the Earth's mass is less than it is at the Earth's

> surface. A prediction of General Relativity is that clocks closer to a massive object will seem to tick more slowly than those located further away (see the Black Holes lecture). As such, when viewed from the surface of the Earth, the clocks on the satellites appear to be ticking faster than identical clocks on the ground. A calculation using General Relativity predicts that the clocks in each GPS satellite should get ahead of ground-based clocks by 45 microseconds per day.
>
> The combination of these two relativitic effects means that the clocks on-board each satellite should tick faster than identical clocks on the ground by about 38 microseconds per day (45-7=38)! This sounds small, but the high-precision required of the GPS system requires nanosecond accuracy, and 38 microseconds is 38,000 nanoseconds. If these effects were not properly taken into account, a navigational fix based on the GPS constellation would be false after only 2 minutes, and errors in global positions would continue to accumulate at a rate of about 10 kilometers each day! The whole system would be utterly worthless for navigation in a very short time. This kind of accumulated error is akin to measuring my location while standing on my front porch in Columbus, Ohio one day, and then making the same measurement a week later and having my GPS receiver tell me that my porch and I are currently about 5000 meters in the air somewhere over Detroit.

**Robert Sungenis**: Now, isn't this interesting. Special Relativity and General Relativity contradict each other. One makes the ground-based clock go faster and the other makes the ground-based clock go slower. This is a common occurrence in Einstein's world, since Special Relativity is hampered by the fact that it can only deal with uniform motion and does not include gravity. Since General Relativity deals with accelerated motion and includes gravity, it is inevitable that General Relativity and Special Relativity are going to reach different answers for the same phenomenon. It is the same reason that Special Relativity says a light beam can only go 300,000 kilometers per second, but General Relativity says a light beam can go at any speed. Whatever will work, is used. Yet Pogge just passes over this contradiction as if it is standard fare that we should all accept without question.

Now, let's look more closely at Pogge's use of General Relativity. He says that the clock in the GPS will tick faster than the clock on the surface because at higher elevations "the curvature of spacetime due to the Earth's mass is less than it is at the Earth's surface," and, since General Relativity "predicts that clocks closer to a massive object will seem to tick more slowly than those located further away," then General Relativity is proven by the GPS. No, it doesn't prove General Relativity at all. It only proves that there is some effect on clocks at higher altitudes that is different than clocks at lower altitudes. As to what causes that effect, no one has proven. General Relativists think that just because they can manipulate the math of General Relativity to describe the amount of time the clock on the surface is running slower, that this somehow proves General Relativity. No, it only proves that he can manipulate the math to match the

phenomenon. As to the actual physical cause of why the clock at the surface is running slower, Pogge doesn't really know.

A good educated guess as to why the clock at the surface runs slower is because of the force of gravity, which can be measured to be greater at the Earth's surface than at the heights in which the GPS travel. But if you will notice, that is precisely what Mr. Pogge is trying to say in his "relativistic" terminology without really coming right out and saying it. When Mr. Pogge says "the curvature of spacetime due to the Earth's mass is less than it is at the Earth's surface," what he is referring to is simply gravity. But since he wants to promote General Relativity, he is only going to give General Relativity's understanding of gravity, namely, "the curvature of spacetime." But he doesn't really know for certain that "spacetime" (whatever that is) is being curved (and curved relative to what?). All he really knows is that gravity is affecting the clocks.

We don't need General Relativity to show that gravity will affect the internal mechanism of clocks so that they run slower. We could also use Newton's F = Gm1m2/r^2 to show that there is more gravitational force at the surface of the Earth than 10,000 miles up in the Earth's atmosphere. We could also say that the ether at the Earth's surface is denser, and therefore it will slow down the mechanism of a clock more than when the clock is at 10,000 miles above the surface. All kinds of answers can be given to the phenomenon. The reason why is because no one, including Newton and Einstein, has ever figured out how gravity works. They can only tell you how fast gravity makes an object fall toward Earth, but they can't tell you how it does so. Presently, all of science is hampered by this embarrassing fact, that is, no one knows how gravity works. And since that is the case, it is specious for Mr. Pogge to tell us that the clock at the surface runs slower because of "spacetime curvature" or because General Relativity "predicts that clocks closer to the surface of the Earth will tick slower."

Moreover, notice what Mr. Pogge really wants us to swallow. He wants us to believe that both Special Relativity and General Relativity actually demonstrate that time itself changes! Just as he wants us to believe that the length of an object shortens when it moves and its mass increases, he wants us to believe that its existence in time (whatever that is) also changes. According to Pogge, the time changes such that we cannot view the object in the same time envelope that the moving object itself is in; rather, we are merely looking at the object before or after our particular time.

Note, Pogge is not saying that Einstein's theories affect the mechanism of a clock. In other words, he is not saying that some physical force actually physically slows down the counting mechanism of the clock the same as if you put your finger on the second hand of a clock and slowed it down. Rather, he wants us to believe that time itself, in its abstract form, is either increased or decreased when an object moves! That is what he means by a "relativistic" effect.

But not only is this unprovable, it is hardly the case. It is a fantasy world created by Einstein. The truth is, gravity or inertial forces slow down a clock but not because

abstract time is being slowed down but because gravity and inertial forces will impede the moving parts of a clock, and they will also impede the decay of a cesium clock. It is all physical, not "relativistic."

Mr. Pogge continues:

> **Pogge:** The engineers who designed the GPS system included these relativistic effects when they designed and deployed the system. For example, to counteract the General Relativistic effect once on orbit, they slowed down the ticking frequency of the atomic clocks before they were launched so that once they were in their proper orbit stations their clocks would appear to tick at the correct rate as compared to the reference atomic clocks at the GPS ground stations. Further, each GPS receiver has built into it a microcomputer that (among other things) performs the necessary relativistic calculations when determining the user's location.

**Robert Sungenis**: No, it is not the "General Relativistic effect" that is being compensated for since Mr. Pogge has not proven that the GPS is operating by General Relativity. The only thing Mr. Pogge knows is that clocks at higher altitudes tick differently than clocks at lower altitudes. So, whether someone believes in General Relativity or not, he must adjust the clock of a GPS satellite so that it can coincide with a surface clock. One can believe that the cause for the diverse ticking is General Relativity, or Newtonian dynamics, or Machian physics, or String Theory, or Quantum Loop Gravity, or because demons are putting a spell on the clock. It doesn't matter. No one can prove that any one theory is the actual cause of the clock diversity.

The real truth is that Mr. Pogge wants to promote General Relativity because it stems from Special Relativity, and Special Relativity was invented so that modern science could have at least some plausible answer for why the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment showed the Earth was not revolving around the sun. The means by which Einstein hid this truth from the world is by turning physics upside down and claiming that because of the magic of "relativity" (whatever that is), lengths must shorten, time itself must dilate or contract, and mass must increase.

But we don't need any of this haunted house of mirrors in geocentrism. Length, time and mass are what they are and they do not change. The only thing that may change is that a clock in strong gravity has a harder time ticking normally because the gravity is pulling on its internal parts. For example, a clock on Jupiter will run slower than a clock on Earth, because the gravity on Jupiter is so much stronger. By the same token, a weight scale will show that you weigh about 1000 pounds on Jupiter, but on Earth it will show that you weigh 100 pounds (NB: these figures are estimated). Why? Because the stronger gravity on Jupiter pulls harder on the springs in the weight scale. Very simple.

As for Mr. Plait's assertion: "Relativity is one of the most well-tested and thoroughly solid ideas in all of science for all time," that is the myth, and the reality is quite

different. Special Relativity was disproven by both the 1913 Sagnac experiment, and also by the 1925 Michelson-Gale experiment. The 1925 experiment was similar to the 1913 Sagnac experiment, but in this case Michelson tested for the relative rotation between the universe and the Earth, and he did so by basing it on the presence of ether in space, which presence his interferometer measured. The astounding results of his 1925 experiment showed 97.6% of a sidereal rotation (a sidereal rotation is 23 hours, 56 minutes and 4.7 seconds, which occurs every day between the Earth and the stars).

But when Michelson had tested for the revolution of the Earth around the sun in his 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment, he didn't find anything close to the 30km/sec that the Earth was believed to be moving. Instead, he found about 1/20 of that result (but using squares, he could also say he found about 1/6 of that result, but that is not important here). What is important is that Michelson did not find a revolution of the Earth around the sun in 1887, but he did find a rotation in 1925.

And here is the dilemma for heliocentrists, such as Mr. Plait. They need both a revolution of the Earth and a rotation of the Earth in order to make heliocentrism work. They cannot have one without the other, since they must explain both the four seasons and the day/night sequence. But geocentrism does not need a revolution, only a rotation, and Michelson's 1925 experiment proved a rotation and his 1887 experiment showed no revolution.

In his 1925 experiment, Michelson thought he proved that the Earth rotated, but what he actually proved is a relative rotation between the stars and Earth. In other words, the stars could just as easily be revolving around a fixed Earth insofar as Michelson's 1925 experiment was capable of showing, and that is precisely what geocentrism says – that the universe is revolving around a fixed Earth.

So, the empirical evidence (i.e., Michelson's 1887 and 1925 experiments) shows a geocentric universe. Conversely, it is only a THEORY, namely, Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, that tries to explain away this empirical evidence by telling us that lengths shorten, time dilates and mass increases when objects move.

As for the General Theory of Relativity, it also has not been proven. The three instances used as proof, namely, (a) Einstein's explanation of the perihelion of Mercury, (b) the bending of star light near the sun, and (c) the Hefele-Keating experiment of 1971, don't prove General Relativity at all. We cover these issues in depth in the book *Galileo Was Wrong*, but I will give a short synopsis here. As for the perihelion of Mercury, Einstein started with the figure he needed and then worked backwards with his relativistic math to arrive at the answer he needed. For the bending of star light, first, the evidence from the 1919 eclipses that was used to provide proof only showed one star that was actually obeying Einstein's theory, and the rest of the dozen or so stars disproved it. Moreover, Einstein's theory says that there should be a gradient of light bending near the sun, but in actuality, when star light passes near the sun there is no gradient. Only starlight very near the sun's surface is affected, and beams farther away from the sun are not affected

at all. As for the Hefele-Keating experiment, they also fudged their numbers to make it look like Einstein's theory was true.

As for Mr. Plait's assertion that a geocentrist cannot use General Relativity to support geocentrism, he is correct. But we don't use General Relativity to do so. We only show that heliocentrists such as Mr. Plait can have no argument against geocentrism since his own science – the science of relativity that he says has been proven over and over again – confirms the geocentric universe.

For that matter, Newtonian physics also supports geocentrism, even though it has its flaws (e.g., it believes in absolute space and must add the inertial forces in by hand). Newtonian physics, on a much grander scale than even Newton envisioned, can be used to verify geocentrism since Newton believed that a rotating body has a center of mass or center of gravity. Since that is the case, we can then consider that the universe is rotating instead of the Earth rotating. In other words, we can envision the universe rotating daily around a non-moving Earth. Is this possible in Newton's physics? Yes, since the Earth can be considered as the center of mass around which the universe rotates.

So the question Mr. Plait is faced with is this: since his "relativistic" science allows both a heliocentric and geocentric universe, how does he know which one is correct? He doesn't, and therefore he should not be touting heliocentrism as the correct system, that is, if he wants to be faithful to his own scientific theories.

We are here to tell Mr. Plait to stop the theorizing and start paying attention to the empirical evidence, which we already covered above. Michelson's 1887 experiment showed no revolution of the Earth around the sun. Michelson's 1925 experiment showed a sidereal rotation, and both experiments were based on ether drag. The only logical conclusion is that the Earth does not revolve or rotate and that the universe rotates around a fixed Earth.

Additionally, Michelson, as well as Sagnac, showed that ether does, indeed, exist, and is the very reason that GPS beams traveling west to east go 50 nanoseconds slower than beams going east to west, since they must travel against the ether space of the universe, which is rotating east to west, every day, all day.

We would also suggest that Mr. Plait pay attention to the new evidence from the 2009 Planck probe which verified the 2001 Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy probe and the 1990 COBE probe, which all found that the whole universe, as divided by the all-pervasive cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB), is centered on the ecliptic and equator of the Sun-Earth system, otherwise known in contemporary science literature as the "Axis of Evil," since this "evil" alignment destroys the Copernican Principle that claims the Earth is not in any special place in the universe. It has been shown that both the dipole and quadrupole of the CMB cannot be attributed to solar motion, but must be intrinsic to the makeup of the universe itself. The dipole shows that the whole universe is divided in half by the Earth's equator, and the quadrupole shows

that the sun's 47 degree vertical movement to create the four seasons, otherwise known as the ecliptic, is aligned with the CMB quadrupole. In other words, the CMB shows that the whole universe is centered on the Earth.

It has also been shown by the 2005 Sloan Digital Sky Survey that the galaxies are all arranged in concentric shells around the Earth. It has also been shown that quasars and gamma ray bursts are also centered around the Earth in concentric shells. In other words, all the celestial objects we can find in the universe are centered around us. Since such is the case, the days of the Copernican Principle are over, and it is just a matter of time before the funeral dirge is played.

While that dirge is played, it will also sing the story of the Big Bang exploding. It has exploded because it can no longer be supported against the sheer weight of ad hoc theories that have been added to it over the last 50 years to keep it patched up for the public eye.

For example, in the early 1980s, Inflation was invented for the Big Bang in order to allow it to become homogeneous from a heterogeneous start, since homogeneity was one of Edwin Hubble's requirements to keep the Earth out of the center of the universe. It was also invented so that light could break the *c* barrier set by Einstein's Special Relativity, since without a superluminal value for light speed, one side of the Big Bang couldn't instantaneously communicate with the other side as required.

But it wasn't over for Big Bang inventions. In the last 1970s they found that spiral galaxies were disobeying Newton's and Einstein's laws of motion. They were spinning ten times as fast as they should. So in the 1990s, the Big Bangers invented Dark Matter to add to the galaxies to allow Newton's F=ma and Einstein's G=8piTau to work.

Next, in the late 1990s it was found that if the Big Bangers wanted their expanding universe, it had to expand much faster than previously thought, but there simply wasn't enough energy or matter in the universe to propel this accelerated expansion. So they invented the energy they needed, and called it Dark Energy. But no one has found empirical evidence for either Inflation, Dark Matter or Dark Energy, but they are the backbone of modern Big Bang and Copernican cosmology.

That's not all. Then, the Big Bangers found that the accelerated expansion was going much faster than the speed of light allowed by Einstein's Special Relativity, so they then tweaked Einstein's postulate and claimed that it wasn't anything material that was expanding, but that "space" itself was expanding, but they never defined what the "space" is.

So, as you see, modern Copernican cosmology is always breaking its own rules in order to keep the Big Bang propped up. But it will eventually fall, and I believe its replacement will be geocentric cosmology, since geocentrism doesn't need any of these ad hoc theories to make the universe work, and work well.

**Interviewer:** 3. Do you think Geocentrism will ever be considered as a viable cosmology in our school system within our life time? If not, why not, and if so, how can average students around the world like me help bring that about?

**Robert Sungenis**: I am not much for predicting the future but I would say this: all indications show that the Big Bang will eventually fall. It is just a matter of time. When it does, I think it is a good likelihood that it will be replaced by some form of geocentric cosmology. The scientific literature has already hinted to such a transition, and I document it in my book Galileo Was Wrong.

The evidence for geocentrism (e.g., Michelson-Morley, Michelson-Gale, Sagnac, the CMB alignment with the Earth, galaxy/quasar/GRB concentric alignment with Earth, the allowance for geocentrism from either a Newtonian, Machian or Einstein mathematical framework, the fact that all celestial phenomena such as parallax, aberration, retrograde motion and the Foucault Pendulum can all be explained from the geometry and dynamics of geocentrism, that geocentrism needs no Inflation, Dark Matter or Dark Energy, and does not have a limit to the speed of light, etc.) will be irresistible for a lot of scientists who are sick and tired of the Big Bang circus, which has now led them to believe in the Multiverse (that our universe is just the baby born from a previous universe, and all without the slightest empirical evidence to support it); and that "something can come from nothing" (the belief that quantum particles can pop in and out of existence and if they pop in and don't pop out, they can produce other universes, and, of course, all this is conjectured without the slightest empirical evidence to support it).

I believe God is allowing this shakeup to happen because it is one of His last efforts to wake up mankind to the fact that He exists and Judgment Day is coming. If the Earth is motionless in the center of the universe, then obviously, Someone with a capital S had to put it there (i.e., God), since being in the center it is not going to happen by chance. An Earth in the center of the universe will be the quintessential evidence to prove St. Paul's point in Romans 1:20 that the creation itself displays the power of God, and as such men will be without excuse.

As for what you and your friends can do to help materialize this vision, I would suggest first that you take physics and astronomy courses in high school and college so that you can find out what the other side is saying. You need to know their position better than they do.

Second, you need to study the Church documents on this issue so that you can know where the Church stood and stands on geocentrism, and you need to know it better than those in our Church who are supporting the Big Bang, Relativity and Copernicanism.

Third, you need to know both the Scriptural arguments and the patristic testimony for geocentrism. All of these things will be needful when you get into discussions with people about geocentrism.

Fourth, please help promote the three volumes of *Galileo Was Wrong*. We now also have an easy-to-read book that condenses the three volumes of *Galileo Was Wrong* into 200 pages. Its title is *Geocentrism 101*. It comes with a CD-ROM that has 66 animations of the geocentric system so even the least educated person can understand what we are saying. The cost is only $19.95 for the book and the CD-ROM. This will be the best way to educate your friends, relatives and family to this important topic. The book is available on Amazon.com, www.galileowaswrong.com and catholicintl.com.

**Interviewer:** Dr. Sungenis, thank you for all of the tireless effort you have put into defending Gods word and His Church. It really impacts lives.

**Robert Sungenis**: It is my pleasure to serve both God and offer this material to you. Please pray that God will preserve me and my work so that it can reach the rest of the world, for our purpose here is to lead people to God, and I can't think of a better way to do it in this modern age than to show the people of the world that the cosmos does, indeed, as the Psalmist said, show the glory and handiwork of God. God has placed the Earth in the very center and thus the Earth is not some remote speck of dust that came into being by mere time and chance, but is, indeed, very special, not only for us, but for His dear Son who came to Earth to bring us to heaven someday.

Interview conducted November 18, 2013

By Wesley T. Hunt