

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

As we have dealt with the subject of geocentrism for the past twelve years, we have had our share of critics, as you can imagine. I understand. Whereas some people regard it as a breath of fresh air, others find it upsetting to be told that the world in which they have been living is, well, a dream world, a mere invention of scientists bent on undoing the Catholic Church's condemnation of Galileo and the heliocentric system.

But it's one thing to disagree with us. It's quite another for those going by the label "Christian" to lie, cheat, and slander against those who try to present a traditional and scientifically supported geocentric system. David Palm, who claims to be a Christian, uses these very tactics against geocentrists, and he continues even when admonished.

About a year ago I offered Mr. Palm a chance to air his objections in a public and oral debate in which both our views could be cross-examined by each other and the public audience. Mr. Palm declined. He instead wanted to continue to write his objections in the privacy of his home, thereby allowing himself to continue the distortions and sarcasm, unchecked.

Recently, Stephen Hand, who is not a geocentrist but is searching for the truth, and who has been a well respected journalist and theological commentator for many years, approached Mr. Palm on his blog with an honest, short, but pointed question. Since the news has shown that there are many people, both famous and non-famous, who have interpreted the current cosmological data as suggesting or even favoring a geocentric system (in which the Earth is at or near the center of the universe), Mr. Hand wondered whether Mr. Palm would give any credence to the possibility that his heliocentric system could be wrong and that the geocentric system could be right, especially since scientific positions often depend on the philosophical disposition of the person interpreting the data.

In his usual manner, Mr. Palm danced around the question several times, which then prompted Mr. Hand to give up getting a straight answer; and finally said to Mr. Palm: "You are being non-responsive, David. So we'll let it rest." Nevertheless, I thought the intervening dialogue would provide a good example why Mr. Palm was being evasive; why he won't debate the issue in public; and why he blocked me on his blog from responding to him.

Here is the conversation between Palm and Hand. I'll add my commentary in order to show you what is really behind Mr. Palm's answers:

Stephen Hand: David, I'd like to ask this one question and not rhetorically. It's what I would ask you in a courtroom, hand on the Bible, with other "experts" for the Sungenis side waiting in the hall. In your opinion, given the new technological observations, is it possible to look at the same data and come to different conclusions as you and Robert have? Popper said it depends on where one stands how data is to be perceived on route to possible (or even probable, tho not certain) models of interpretation? Even if you personally stand with the consensus and think it foolish to embrace geocentrism, is it a possible interpretation of the data? What say you objectively in response in this instance, my brother, and why? You are under oath.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

David Palm: Hey, Stephen, if you want to pursue that answer, I think it's most fruitful to ask if you would consider theories like a spherical earth, the germ theory of disease, and an atomistic theory of matter to be settled science, versus more ancient views?

[**R. Sungenis**]: So instead of answering Mr. Hand's question concerning whether heliocentrism is as certain as Mr. Palm believes, Palm tries to manipulate the direction of the discussion by making it appear that heliocentrism is no more to be questioned than a spherical earth or the germ theory, and that if Mr. Hand dare question any of them, he shows himself to be a fool. The attempt here is to intimidate Mr. Hand and prohibit him from examining scientific claims on a case-by-case basis.

David Palm: You stated, "Popper said it depends on where one stands how data is to be perceived on route to possible (or even probable, tho not certain) models of interpretation?" I'd be interested to know if you are Popperian on the patristic and medieval view on the four elements? Consider that the four elements have in their favor a unanimous testimony of the Fathers and Doctors, along with two ecumenical councils in their favor: see <http://www.geocentrismdebunked.org/its-elementary-my.../> . Certainly what we observe does not appear to be made up of the infinitesimally small particles that modern scientists assure us exist, but which we can never actually observe directly. Is it possible that we've been bamboozled and deceived by the scientific establishment?

[**R. Sungenis**] Here we see Mr. Palm using the same canards he has used in the past. He was told previously that his attempt to use the "four elements" or the "four humors" was a simple case of taking things out of context, but he refuses to acknowledge his error. This is precisely why Mr. Palm doesn't want to face a public audience in an open and oral debate – he doesn't want his canards exposed.

Briefly, neither the "four elements" nor the "four humors" are not taught in Scripture, nor are they part of the doctrinal teachings of Apostolic Tradition; nor are they either addressed or declared as official teaching of the Catholic Church. Regardless, Mr. Palm tries to use them to make an argument against geocentrism. Here's how:

On his blog, Palm notes that two ecumenical councils regard the "four elements" and "four humors" as doctrine to be accepted by every Catholic. As such, Mr. Palm's argument is: if the Church of the past considered the "four elements" and the "four humors" as doctrine (as verified by not one, but two ecumenical councils), yet we now know from modern science that neither are considered factual, then obviously we have a case in which the Church of the past *thought* something in nature was factual but found out later it was wrong. Mr. Palm then claims that geocentrism dies the same death, namely, it was *thought* to be a fact of nature but modern science has now confirmed otherwise.

The two councils Mr. Palm cites are:

Second Council of Nicea (ecumenical): "For, indeed, God alone is incorporeal and uncircumscribable, but intellectual creatures are not altogether incorporeal or invisible, as is the Deity; wherefore, as they are in particular places, they must also be

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

circumscribable. Whenever, therefore, you find that Angels or devils or souls are styled incorporeal, understand it as meant to signify that they are not compounded of any of the four material elements...”

Fourth Lateran Council (ecumenical): “The number four agrees well with the prohibition concerning bodily union about which the Apostle says, that the husband does not rule over his body, but the wife does; and the wife does not rule over her body, but the husband does; for there are four humors in the body, which is composed of the four elements.”

Before I analyze Mr. Palm’s treatment of these two councils, allow me to inform the audience that Mr. Palm previously took his hand at interpreting ecclesiastical documents and didn’t fare so well. One can see his attempt at our website, www.debunkingdavidpalm.com under the title, “DDP 3 - The Canard of Strict Canonical Interpretation.”

In regards to the Council of Nicea and the Council of Fourth Lateran, what Mr. Palm doesn’t realize is that just because a council refers to some common belief held at the time does not mean the council is dogmatizing that belief for all Catholics to accept as doctrine. A Catholic is required to accept as doctrine only the subject that the Council is specifically addressing at the time. Neither council is teaching, as doctrine, the four elements or the four humors. And since they are not teaching directly on these two subjects, then any statements made about them are not to be construed as official Catholic doctrine.

In the paragraph Palm cites from the Second Council of Nicea, it is teaching that God, the angels and the devil are incorporeal, that is, they have no material substance, and that is true whether we understand material substance as “four elements” (earth, wind, air, fire) or as atoms and molecules.

Likewise, in the above paragraph that Mr. Palm cites from the Fourth Lateran Council (<http://pages.uoregon.edu/dluebke/Religions407/FourthLateran1215.html>)¹ the council is not

¹ §50. **On the Restriction of Prohibitions to Matrimony**

It should not be judged reprehensible if human decrees are sometimes changed according to changing circumstances, especially when urgent necessity or evident advantage demands it, since God himself changed in the new Testament some of the things which he had commanded in the old Testament. Since the prohibitions against contracting marriage in the second and third degree of affinity, and against uniting the offspring of a second marriage with the kindred of the first husband, often lead to difficulty and sometimes endanger souls, we therefore, in order that when the prohibition ceases the effect may also cease, revoke with the approval of this sacred council the constitutions published on this subject and we decree, by this present constitution, that henceforth contracting parties connected in these ways may freely be joined together. Moreover the prohibition against marriage shall not in future go beyond the **fourth degree of consanguinity and of affinity**, since the prohibition cannot now generally be observed to further degrees without grave harm. The number four agrees well with the prohibition concerning bodily union about which the Apostle says, that the husband does not rule over his body, but the wife does; and the wife does not rule over her body, but the husband does; for there are **four humors in the body, which is composed of the four elements**.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

teaching doctrine on the four humors or the four elements and is not requiring any Catholic to accept them as doctrine. The council is merely using the number four that is commonly associated with the common belief of the four humors and the four elements as an analogy to the doctrinal teaching the council wishes to present, namely, that “the prohibition against marriage shall not in future go beyond the fourth degree of consanguinity and of affinity.” In other words, this section of the Fourth Lateran Council is teaching doctrine about marriage, and marriage only.

So, contrary to Mr. Palm’s skewed analysis, there are no “ecumenical councils” that teach, as doctrine, either the four humors or the four elements. But be it known, these are the kinds of elementary mistakes Mr. Palm continually makes when he is searching the Catholic record to support his case against geocentrism.

Mr. Palm also cites a number of Church Fathers that believed in the four elements or the four humors. His argument is that: if we make appeal to the Church Fathers as an authoritative source for geocentrism, then we should also believe in the four elements or the four humors since there were a number of Church Fathers who believed in them. Here again, Mr. Palm’s understanding of the Church is skewed. The Church does not hold that every single idea that the Church Fathers believed in unison is to be held as doctrine. Rather, it is only those issues which are contained in Scripture or oral revelation upon which the Fathers give a united interpretation that we are required to believe as doctrine. This is precisely why Pope Leo XIII in *Providentissimus Deus* said: “...it is permitted to no one to *interpret Holy Scripture* against such sense or also against the unanimous agreement of the Fathers.” Notice, it is the Fathers’ “interpretation of Holy Scripture,” not their personal beliefs (e.g., the four humors) that we cannot go against.

Conversely, the Catholic record DOES show that, with regard to the single concept of geocentrism, not only were the Fathers in absolute consensus regarding Scripture’s teaching on the fixity of the Earth in the center of the universe; the Church later declared specific decrees against any system that made the Earth move. In fact, the Church stated that any contrary teaching is “formally heretical.” We never find any such language from the Church when it is speaking about the four elements or four humors. Unfortunately, Mr. Palm seems inept at making these crucial distinction, but that is usually what happens when one approaches this subject with ulterior motives.

David Palm: So just to get a better feel for where you're coming from, would you consider the view that the material universe is comprised of four and only four elements (air, fire, water, earth) to be just as viable as the modern theory of atoms with its (at least) 118 elements (some of them man-made no less)? Why or why not?

Although the prohibition of marriage is now restricted to the fourth degree, we wish the prohibition to be perpetual, notwithstanding earlier decrees on this subject issued either by others or by us. If any persons dare to marry contrary to this prohibition, they shall not be protected by length of years, since the passage of time does not diminish sin but increases it, and the longer that faults hold the unfortunate soul in bondage the graver they are.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

[R. Sungenis]: We can easily see what is happening here. Since Mr. Hand has not yet studied these issues in depth and perhaps doesn't realize that the Catholic Church has never taught the four humors or four elements as doctrine, Mr. Palm thinks he has him over a barrel, and thus poses his irrelevant question: will Mr. Hand accept the four elements or the 118 elements of modern science? Not only is Mr. Palm's question irrelevant (since the Church never made doctrine out of the four elements), his own comparison is askew. The four elements of earlier days were not elements in the same sense that we view the elements of the Periodic Table today. The four elements were the four basic constituents of the material world: air, water, earth and fire, which, incidentally, is the same way we break down how the 118 elements of the Periodic Table, that is air is a gas, water is a liquid, earth is solid, and fire is plasma, the fourth state of matter. Or we can understand the four elements as representative of all the 118 elements, since some of the 118 elements are in air, some are in water, some are in the earth, and some are in fire. Either way, Mr. Palm has climbed up the wrong tree, and that is because he is unskilled and biased when reading Church documents and understanding science.

David Palm: I'll try to answer your question above to the best of my ability. But I'm trying first to understand your own standards for evaluating evidence and how you determine what is and is not a reasonable and solid conclusion from the physical evidence. God bless

Stephen Hand: David, for the sake of argument and time. Just assume that I probably would answer your preliminary questions as you would expect Robert would. Work with that. I would very much appreciate your simply and directly answering the question I put. Speak to me as simply as my question is. And as succinctly. Thanks VERY much.

David Palm: Hey, Stephen, I don't think the two views are equally viable or equally reasonable. Neither has any working astronomer or physicist (Catholic, Protestant, Jew, etc.) for centuries. And it's not a plot against the Faith. Here's why. Let's forget the CMB for a moment and focus on what we can observe most directly and measure most accurately. One of the common critiques of evolutionary theories is that they are not sufficiently grounded in direct observation. But this is just the opposite with geocentrism. Geocentrism was abandoned centuries ago precisely on the basis of what we can observe going on right now, all the time. Everywhere we look, especially on the scales that we can measure most accurately and observe most closely, we see less massive bodies orbiting more massive bodies. Everywhere we look we see asteroids, moons, planets, and stars rotating on their axes. These observations are replicated consistently throughout the universe.

[R. Sungenis]: So we see that Mr. Palm wants to use the same argument that Galileo tried to use against the Church and which the Church rejected as "no proof," namely, that the moons of Jupiter go around Jupiter. I'm confident Mr. Hand will not fall for this kind of specious argument, but Mr. Palm should know better, since he has been told that both Machian physics and Einsteinian physics (the very physics that he and his tutor, Alec MacAndrew, believe as correct) allow the whole universe to rotate around a fixed Earth. But please notice that Mr. Palm fails to mention either of these two sciences to Mr. Hand. Rather, Palm tries to work off of Mr. Hand's ignorance (perhaps just as Galileo tried to do with the Church).

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

The only question remaining is, would Newtonian physics disagree with Machian and Einsteinian physics that the whole universe could rotate around a fixed Earth? The answer to that is no! Although Newton would agree that the moons of Jupiter revolve around Jupiter, the reason is because the center of mass is closer to Jupiter than Jupiter's moons. In other words, objects don't revolve around each other, *per se*, they revolve around their mutual center of mass. Likewise, if the universe is rotating every day, it will rotate around its center of mass. Hence, although Newton did not envision the universe rotating, if the universe did so, Newton could have no objections. The only question left is: can the Earth share a center of mass with the rest of the universe? The answer to that is yes. Newton could not disagree with any of this. The problem with Newton, however, was that he had a visceral hatred of the Catholic Church and thus wanted to promote only the heliocentric system; and in order to do so, he isolated the sun and Earth from the rest of the universe. This error wasn't exposed until the days of Ernst Mach, over 200 years later.

David Palm: From the reasonable view that Earth revolves around its star just like any other planet we predict and then observe phenomena such as aberration of starlight and stellar parallax. And we find that the Earth's orbital period is just what we would expect for a planet of its mass and distance from the sun obeying the laws of gravity (what a strange coincidence, huh?)

[**R. Sungenis**]: We can again see Mr. Palm's agenda. He knows that aberration of starlight and stellar parallax do not prove the Earth goes around the sun, for he has been shown the animations in which both aberration and parallax can be demonstrated in the geocentric system, and that even colleges and universities have acknowledged this fact. For example, from a physics class at the University of Illinois it was stated in the class notes: "It is often said that Tycho's model implies the absence of parallax, and that Copernicus' requires parallax. However, it would not be a major conceptual change to have the stars orbit the sun (like the planets) for Tycho, which would give the same yearly shifts in their apparent positions as parallax gives."² As for aberration, Mr. Palm has been shown the same, but he refuses to accept it. For example, the famous physicist in Einstein's era, Henri Poincaré, wrote: "The observation of the aberration show us, therefore, not the movement of the earth, but the variation of this movement; they cannot, therefore, give us information about the absolute motion of the earth."³ So either David Palm is ignorant of the science regarding aberration and parallax, or he is deliberately hiding the truth from Mr. Hand. The David Palm I have come to know is leaning toward the latter possibility.

² University of Illinois, Physics 319, Spring 2004, Lecture 03, p. 8. Entire quote is: "Thus if parallax were observed, a flexible Tychonean could adjust the theory to account for it, without undue complexity. What if parallax were not observed? For Copernicus, one only requires that the stars be far enough away for the parallax to be unmeasurable. Therefore the presence or absence of parallax doesn't force the choice of one type of model over the other. If different stars were to show different amounts of parallax, that would rule out the possibility of them all being on one sphere, but still not really decide between Tycho and Copernicus. In fact, if we don't worry about the distant stars, these two models describe identical relative motions of all the objects in the solar system. So the role of observation is not as direct as you might have guessed. There is no bare observation that can distinguish whether Tycho (taken broadly) or Copernicus (taken broadly) is right."

³ *The Monist*, The Principle of Mathematical Physics, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1905, p. 20.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

David Palm: We extrapolate from axial rotation to predict things like equatorial bulges and lo and behold, planets have them (including the Earth), with planets that rotate faster having larger bulges, medium rates of rotation yielding smaller bulges, slow rotation (like Venus) almost no bulge at all.

[**R. Sungenis**]: Once again, Mr. Palm has been shown the geocentric models of this phenomenon (equatorial bulges) but he refuses to accept them as a viable scientific alternative, even though the geocentric models are sanctioned by his mentors, such as Albert Einstein. Einstein himself said that a rotating universe will create the centrifugal forces necessary to cause a bulge at the Earth's equator, but Mr. Palm ignores Einstein when he is not to his advantage. Here is a statement from one of Einstein's colleagues, Arthur Eddington: "The bulge of the Earth's equator may be attributed indifferently to the Earth's rotation or to the outward pull of the centrifugal force introduced when the Earth is regarded as non-rotating."⁴ It is obvious that Mr. Palm deliberately rejects anything that disagrees with his preferred universe.

Allow me to mention one more thing. Mr. Palm makes reference to Venus' rotation. Interestingly enough, Venus' rotation has slowed down by 6 minutes in the last few years. That's quite a lot. If that large decrease happened on Earth, it would kill most or all of life, due to heat buildup. Venus need not worry, since it has no life and it is already at 800 degrees. But while the planets slow down in their rotations, why does Earth always have an exact rate of 23 hours, 56 minutes and 4.009 seconds, every day, every year? That is because it is not rotating, but the universe is, and the universe, because of its tremendous mass has tremendous inertia and angular momentum. It is like a giant flywheel that can't be slowed or sped up.

David Palm: We predict that we should observe nutation (the Earth wobbling on its axis) and we observe that too.

[**R. Sungenis**]: Again, the same thing can be shown in the geocentric system, but Mr. Palm is not about to admit that to Mr. Hand.

David Palm: We measure the rotation of the Earth every day using multiple methods – ring lasers in subterranean caverns, lasers bounced off of retro-reflectors on the moon, and VLBI arrays locked onto ultra-distant quasars. Lo and behold they all correlate to each other, even to the point of showing variations in that rotation due to tidal influences.

[**R. Sungenis**]: None of these have shown any variations in the sidereal rate. The only variations are in the solar rate. Besides, none of them could calculate a difference, since there is no standard or anchor by which to measure them. For example, VLBI (Very Long Baseline Interferometry) are based on one quasar, but it would take two to make an accurate measurement. But if quasar moves against quasar, then even the two-quasar method won't work. As for lasers bounced off the moon, this would show nothing, since Mr. Palm believes both the Earth and moon are in relative movement; besides the fact that the moon is known to increase its radius from Earth. Ring lasers won't help anymore than the GPS system will help, since both show

⁴ *Space, Time and Gravitation: An Outline of the General Relativity Theory*, 1923, pp. 24, 41.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

that EM waves traveling ETW are faster than those traveling WTE. Thanks to the ring laser, we know that Special Relativity is wrong.

David Palm: These orbital and rotational motions proceed according to physical laws. Scientists and flight engineers calculate orbital trajectories, the future position of planets years hence, the location of Lagrange points, and launch spacecraft that maneuver with astounding precision with absolutely no reference to any mythical aether. They conduct their work as if the aether doesn't even exist. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to guess how they can do that.

[R. Sungenis]: This is just another red herring. It wouldn't make any difference whether they believed in aether or not. The calculations and the results would be the same. What Mr. Palm isn't telling Mr. Hand is that the reason "Scientists and flight engineers can calculate orbital trajectories" even though electromagnetic waves travel 50 nanoseconds faster ETW is because the technicians adjust the satellites to absorb the 50 nanosecond difference in order to make the speed of light the same for both ETW and WTE. But they don't tell the public that they make these adjustments. Instead, they make it appear that Special Relativity is supported by the GPS.

Laying aside the outright lying that the science establishment does with regard to the GPS, why would electromagnetic waves travel faster ETW than WTE? The reason is that there is a relative rotation between Earth and space, as we noted earlier. Since the universe is rotating against a fixed Earth, space is going ETW. So, any signal sent WTE in space is going to run into space traveling ETW. Conversely, if the signal is sent ETW, it will travel with space that is already traveling ETW and thus move faster.

One thing more of note. Although the difference between ETW and WTE was discovered in the 1925 Michelson-Gale experiment, it was discovered earlier in an experiment performed by Georges Sagnac in 1913. He used the same principle of the interference of light waves as Michelson did in 1887, but oriented his interferometer in a different way. He noticed that light waves traveling ETW always went faster than those traveling WTE. The same phenomenon occurs in many applications today, and it is a common occurrence in physics. It is called the Sagnac Effect. Relativity has no explanation for why it occurs, but they do admit that it occurs. In fact, when the technicians adjust the GPS computers to compensate for the 50 nanosecond difference of signals from ETW to WTE, they call it "the Sagnac Correction."

In other words, modern science has already shown that the universe works on the geocentric system, but in order to keep this from the public, they adjust the computers to hide the difference.

David Palm: So there are excellent reasons why astronomers and physicists – Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and yes even atheists – had universally abandoned geocentrism long before Big Bang cosmology came on the scene and why they will continue to reject it even if the standard model is replaced by something else. And what about the alternative view? The alternative view is a massive exercise in special pleading, gummed together with conspiracy theories. Just because one can come up with an alternative "explanation" doesn't make it reasonable. So instead of the simple, obvious, reasonable explanation that the Earth rotates on its axis and revolves around its star like any other planet, we are told that what's "really"

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

happening is that the entire universe be-bops and hip-hops and shilly-shallies and shakes, rattles and rolls in just the way necessary to create the illusion of nutation, stellar parallax, and whatever else the geocentrists need. I stress the word illusion because the level of special pleading necessary to uphold this alternative view turns our good God into a Great Deceiver.

[R. Sungenis]: The only “deceiver” here is David Palm. Let’s prove this by seeing whether the science community agrees with Mr. Palm’s caricature of a universe that has to “be-bops and hip-hops and shilly-shallies and shakes, rattles and rolls” in order to be geocentric. Let see if even they, who prefer heliocentrism for philosophical reasons, use the same biased description that Mr. Palm uses when they acknowledge the possibility of geocentrism. We will see that the only one who is “shilly-shallying” is David Palm:

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. Albert Einstein⁵

“We can’t feel our motion through space, nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the Earth actually is in motion.” Historian, Lincoln Barnett, foreword by Albert Einstein⁶

“Since the time of Copernicus we have known that the Earth rotates on its axis and moves around the sun. Even this simple idea, so clear to everyone, was not left untouched by the advance of science.” Albert Einstein⁷

“Fred Hoyle has argued that a subtler understanding of Einstein’s theories reveals they may actually slightly favor an Earth-centered model. Had Galileo had Hoyle at his elbow, he might have produced the book that would have pleased the pope and not have been tried for heresy!...There is another criterion by which theories are judged, and, for better or worse, it shows that modern scientists do have a certain kinship with those recalcitrant seventeenth-century scholars they so disdain. When new theories and the implications of new discoveries disagree with the way a scientist personally feels the universe ought to run, he or she is reluctant to accept them.” Kitty Ferguson, Science writer⁸

“Thus, even now, three and a half centuries after Galileo’s condemnation by the Inquisition, it is still remarkably difficult to say categorically whether the earth moves...” Physicist, Julian Barbour.⁹

“Briefly, everything occurs as if the Earth were at rest...” Physicist, Henrick Lorentz¹⁰

⁵ *The Evolution of Physics: From Early Concepts to Relativity and Quanta*, Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, 1938, 1966, p. 212.

⁶ Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, 2nd rev. edition, 1957, p. 73.

⁷ Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, *The Evolution of Physics*, 1938, 1966, pp. 154-155.

⁸ Kitty Ferguson, *Measuring the Universe*, 1999, p. 106, 107.

⁹ Julian Barbour, *Absolute or Relative Motion*, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 226.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

“The failure of the many attempts to measure terrestrially any effects of the earth’s motion...” Physicist, Wolfgang Pauli¹¹

“We do not have and cannot have any means of discovering whether or not we are carried along in a uniform motion of translation.” Physicist, Henri Poincaré¹²

“A great deal of research has been carried out concerning the influence of the Earth’s movement. The results were always negative.” Physicist, Henri Poincaré¹³

“There is no planetary observation by which we on Earth can prove that the Earth is moving in an orbit around the sun.” Physicist, I. Bernard Cohen¹⁴

“So which is real, the Ptolemaic or Copernican system? Although it is not uncommon for people to say that Copernicus proved Ptolemy wrong, that is not true....one can use either picture as a model of the universe, for our observations of the heavens can be explained by assuming either the earth or the sun to be at rest.” Physicist, Stephen Hawking¹⁵

“Let it be understood at the outset that it makes no difference, from the point of view of describing planetary motion, whether we take the Earth or the Sun as the center of the solar system. Since the issue is one of relative motion only, there are infinitely many exactly equivalent descriptions referred to different centers – in principle any point will do, the Moon, Jupiter....So the passions loosed on the world by the publication of Copernicus’ book, *De revolutionibus orbium caelestium libri VI*, were logically irrelevant...” Astronomer, Fred Hoyle¹⁶

“...we can take either the Earth or the Sun, or any other point for that matter, as the center of the solar system. This is certainly so for the purely kinematical problem of describing the planetary motions. It is also possible to take any point as the center even in dynamics, although recognition of this freedom of choice had to await the present century.” Astronomer, Fred Hoyle¹⁷

¹⁰ Lorentz’s 1886 paper, “On the Influence of the Earth’s Motion of Luminiferous Phenomena,” in A. Miller’s *Albert Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity*, p. 20.

¹¹ Wolfgang Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, 1958, p. 4.

¹² From Poincaré’s lecture titled: “L’état actuel et l’avenir de la physique mathématique,” St. Louis, Sept. 24, 1904, *Scientific Monthly*, April, 1956.

¹³ From Poincaré’s report *La science et l’hypothèse* (“Science and Hypothesis”)1901, 1968, p. 182. L. Kostro’s, *Einstein and the Ether*, 2000, p. 30.

¹⁴ I. Bernard Cohen, *Birth of a New Physics*, revised and updated, 1985, p. 78.

¹⁵ *The Grand Design*, Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, NY, Bantam, 2010, p. 41.

¹⁶ Fred Hoyle, *Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on his Life and Work*, p. 1. Two years later he wrote: “We know that the difference between a heliocentric theory and a geocentric theory is one of relative motion only, and that such a difference has no physical significance. But such an understanding had to await Einstein’s theory of gravitation in order to be fully clarified” (*Astronomy and Cosmology*, 1975, p. 416).

¹⁷ Fred Hoyle, *Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on his Life and Work*, p. 82. Also from the same book: “Today we cannot say that the Copernican theory is “right” and the Ptolemaic theory is “wrong” in any meaningful sense. The two theories are...physically equivalent to one another” (*ibid*, p. 88).

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

“...Thus we may return to Ptolemy’s point of view of a ‘motionless Earth.’ This would mean that we use a system of reference rigidly fixed to the Earth in which all stars are performing a rotational motion with the same angular velocity around the Earth’s axis...one has to show that the transformed metric can be regarded as produced according to Einstein’s field equations, by distant rotating masses. This has been done by Thirring. He calculated a field due to a rotating, hollow, thick-walled sphere and proved that inside the cavity it behaved as though there were centrifugal and other inertial forces usually attributed to absolute space. Thus from Einstein’s point of view, Ptolemy and Copernicus are equally right. What point of view is chosen is a matter of expediency.” Physicist, Max Born¹⁸

“The ancient argument over whether the Earth rotates or the heavens revolve around it (as Aristotle taught) is seen to be no more than an argument over the simplest choice of a frame of reference. Obviously, the most convenient choice is the universe.... Nothing except inconvenience prevents us from choosing the Earth as a fixed frame of reference...If we choose to make the Earth our fixed frame of reference, we do not even do violence to everyday speech. We say that the sun rises in the morning, sets in the evening; the Big Dipper revolves around the North Star. Which point of view is “correct”? Do the heavens revolve or does the Earth rotate. The question is meaningless.” Science historian, Martin Gardner¹⁹

“...the Earth-centered system...is in reality absolutely identical with the system of Copernicus and all computation of the places of the planets are the same for the two systems.” Astronomer, J. L. E. Dreyer²⁰

“...it is very important to acknowledge that the Copernican theory offers a very exact calculation of the apparent movements of the planets...even though it must be conceded that, from the modern standpoint practically identical results could be obtained by means of a somewhat revised Ptolemaic system....It makes no sense, accordingly, to speak of a difference in truth between Copernicus and Ptolemy: both conceptions are equally permissible descriptions. What has been considered as the greatest discovery of occidental wisdom, as opposed to that of antiquity, is questioned as to its truth value.” Physicist, Hans Reichenbach²¹

“...I tell my classes that had Galileo confronted the Church in Einstein’s day, he would have lost the argument for better reasons. You may use my name if you wish.” Mathematician, Carl E. Wulfman²²

¹⁸ Max Born, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, 1962, 1965, pp. 344-345.

¹⁹ *The Relativity Explosion*, 1976, pp. 86-87. The previous edition was published in 1962 under the title: *Relativity for the Million*.

²⁰ J. L. E. Dreyer, *A History of Astronomy from Thales to Kepler*, New York, Dover Publications reprint, 1953, p. 363. See also his 1890 work *Tycho Brahe*, (New York, Dover Publications reprint, 1963).

²¹ *From Copernicus to Einstein*, 1970, pp. 18, 82.

²² Letter from Carl E. Wufman (University of the Pacific) to Mr. Roush, Nov. 2, 1975, cited in “Galileo to Darwin,” P. Wilders, *Christian Order*, Apr.1993, p. 225.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

“Whether the Earth rotates once a day from west to east, as Copernicus taught, or the heavens revolve once a day from east to west, as his predecessors believed, the observable phenomena will be exactly the same. This shows a defect in Newtonian dynamics, since an empirical science ought not to contain a metaphysical assumption, which can never be proved or disproved by observation.” Physicist, Dennis Sciama²³

“Before Copernicus, people thought that the Earth stood still and that the heavens revolved about it once a day. Copernicus taught that ‘really’ the Earth revolves once a day, and the daily rotation of sun and stars is only ‘apparent.’ Galileo and Newton endorsed this view, and many things were thought to prove it – for example, the flattening of the Earth at the poles, and the fact that bodies are heavier there than at the equator. But in the modern theory the question between Copernicus and his predecessors is merely one of convenience; all motion is relative, and there is no difference between the two statements: ‘the earth rotates once a day’ and ‘the heavens revolve about the Earth once a day.’ The two mean exactly the same thing, just as it means the same thing if I say that a certain length is six feet or two yards. Astronomy is easier if we take the sun as fixed than if we take the Earth, just as accounts are easier in decimal coinage. But to say more for Copernicus is to assume absolute motion, which is a fiction. All motion is relative, and it is a mere convention to take one body as at rest. All such conventions are equally legitimate, though not all are equally convenient.” Philosopher, Bertrand Russell²⁴

“There is no planetary observation by which we on Earth can prove that the Earth is moving in an orbit around the sun. Thus all Galileo’s discoveries with the telescope can be accommodated to the system invented by Tycho Brahe just before Galileo began his observations of the heavens. In this Tychonic system, the planets...move in orbits around the sun, while the sun moves in an orbit around the Earth in a year. Furthermore, the daily rotation of the heavens is communicated to the sun and planets, so that the Earth itself neither rotates nor revolves in an orbit.” Physicist, I Bernard Cohen²⁵

“Descartes is, however, doubly interesting to us in the discussion of Relativity, for at one time when the Inquisition was becoming uneasy about his scientific researches, he gave them a reply that satisfied them, or perhaps he merely gained time, which was long, while they were trying to understand its meaning. He declared that the sun went around the Earth, and that when he said that the Earth revolved round the sun that was merely another manner of expressing the same occurrence. I met with this saying first from Henri Poincaré, and I thought then that it was a witty, epigrammatic way of compelling thought to the question; but on reflection I saw that it was a statement of actual fact. The movements of the two bodies are relative one to the other, and it is a

²³ Quoted from Dennis W. Sciama’s, *The Unity of the Universe*, 1961, pp. 102-103.

²⁴ Bertrand Russell, *The ABC of Relativity*, London, revised edition, editor Felix Pirani, 1958, pp. 13-14.

²⁵ I. Bernard Cohen, *Birth of a New Physics*, revised and updated, 1985, p. 78.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

matter of choice as to which we take as our place of observation.” Physicist, Arthur Lynch²⁶

“Tycho Brahe proposed a dualistic scheme, with the Sun going around the Earth but with all other planets going around the Sun, and in making this proposal he thought he was offering something radically different from Copernicus. And in rejecting Tycho’s scheme, Kepler obviously thought so too. Yet in principle there is no difference.” Astronomer, Fred Hoyle²⁷

“We know now that the difference between a heliocentric and a geocentric theory is one of motions only, and that such a difference has no physical significance,” [the Ptolemaic and Copernican views], “when improved by adding terms involving the square and higher powers of the eccentricities of the planetary orbits, are physically equivalent to one another.” Fred Hoyle²⁸

“What happened when the experiment was done in 1887? There was never, never, in any orientation at any time of year, any shift in the interference pattern; none; no shift; no fringe shift; nothing. What’s the implication? Here was an experiment that was done to measure the speed of the earth’s motion through the ether. This was an experiment that was ten times more sensitive than it needed to be. It could have detected speeds as low as two miles a second instead of the known 20mps that the earth has in its orbital motion around the sun. It didn’t detect it. What’s the conclusion from the Michelson-Morley experiment? The implication is that the earth is not moving...” Physicist, Richard Wolfson²⁹

“Michelson and Morley found shifts in the interference fringes, but they were very much smaller than the size of the effect expected from the known orbital motion of the Earth” Physicist, John D. Norton³⁰

“This ‘null’ result was one of the great puzzles of physics at the end of the nineteenth century. One possibility was that...v would be zero and no fringe shift would be expected. But this implies that the earth is somehow a preferred object; only with respect to the earth would the speed of light be c as predicted by Maxwell’s equations. This is tantamount to assuming that the earth is the central body of the universe.” Physicist, Douglas C. Giancoli³¹

“If [earth] it isn’t moving relative to the ether, then earth alone among the cosmos is at rest relative to the ether. Now that may be an absurd possibility but maybe it’s true. I think you can see that this is not going to be very philosophically satisfying, and it

²⁶ Arthur Lynch, *The Case Against Einstein*, p. 22.

²⁷ Fred Hoyle, *Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on His Life and Work*, p. 3.

²⁸ The first quote taken from Fred Hoyle’s *Astronomy and Cosmology*, 1975, p. 416; the second, from Hoyle’s *Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on His Life and Work*, p. 88.

²⁹ *The Teaching Company*, episode taught by Professor Richard Wolfson of Middlebury College.

³⁰ “The Origins of Special Relativity,” www.pitt.edu/~jdnorton/teaching/HPS_0410/chapters/origins/index.html, p. 14.

³¹ Douglas C. Giancoli, *Physics: Principles with Applications*, 1985, pp. 613-614 and 1980, p. 625.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

isn't satisfying physically either, but it violates the Copernican Principle that the earth isn't special. It is particularly absurd in light of what we know from modern cosmology namely that there are places in the universe, distant galaxies in particular, that are moving away from us at speeds very close to the speed of light. It's absurd to imagine that everything in the universe is pinned to earth when there are such a wide range of speeds relative to earth throughout the universe, but it suffices to rule it out on this philosophical ground." Physicist, Richard Wolfson³²

"So if Earth is at rest relative to the ether, then it alone is at rest. That makes us pretty special....Do you really want to return to parochial, pre-Copernican ideas? Do you really think you and your planet are so special that, in all the rich vastness of the Universe, you alone can claim to be 'at rest.'" Richard Wolfson³³

"Thus, failure [of Michelson-Morley] to observe different speeds of light at different times of the year suggested that the Earth must be 'at rest'...It was therefore the 'preferred' frame for measuring absolute motion in space. Yet we have known since Galileo that the Earth is not the center of the universe. Why should it be at rest in space?" Physicist, Adolph Baker³⁴

"...The easiest explanation was that the earth was fixed in the ether and that everything else in the universe moved with respect to the earth and the ether....Such an idea was not considered seriously, since it would mean in effect that our earth occupied the omnipotent position in the universe, with all the other heavenly bodies paying homage by moving around it." Physicist, James Coleman³⁵

"In the effort to explain the Michelson-Morley experiment...the thought was advanced that the Earth might be stationary....Such an idea was not considered seriously, since it would mean in effect that our Earth occupied the omnipotent position in the universe, with all the other heavenly bodies paying homage by revolving around it." Physicist, Arthur S. Otis³⁶

"The Michelson-Morley experiment confronted scientists with an embarrassing alternative. On the one hand they could scrap the ether theory which had explained so many things about electricity, magnetism, and light. Or if they insisted on retaining the ether they had to abandon the still more venerable Copernican theory that the earth is in motion. To many physicists it seemed almost easier to believe that the earth stood still than that waves – light waves, electromagnetic waves – could exist without a medium to sustain them. It was a serious dilemma and one that split scientific thought for a quarter century. Many new hypotheses were advanced and rejected. The

³² "Einstein's Relativity and the Quantum Revolution," Richard Wolfson, *The Teaching Company*, 2000, Lecture 5: "Speed c Relative to What?"

³³ Richard Wolfson, *Simply Einstein: Relativity Demystified*, New York, W. W. Norton Co. 2003, pp. 63-64.

³⁴ Adolph Baker, *Modern Physics & Antiphysics*, pp. 53-54.

³⁵ James A. Coleman, *Relativity for the Layman*, p. 37.

³⁶ Arthur S. Otis, *Light Velocity and Relativity*, p. 58.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

experiment was tried again by Morley and by others, with the same conclusion; the apparent velocity of the earth through the ether was zero.” Historian, Lincoln Barnett, foreword by Albert Einstein³⁷

“There was just one alternative; the earth’s true velocity through space might happen to have been nil.” Physicist, Arthur Eddington³⁸

“This conclusion directly contradicts the explanation...which presupposes that the Earth moves.” Physicist, Albert Michelson³⁹

“In the United States Albert Michelson and Edward Morley had performed an experiment which confronted scientists with an appalling choice. Designed to show the existence of the ether...it had yielded a null result, leaving science with the alternatives of tossing aside the key which had helped to explain the phenomena of electricity, magnetism, and light *or of deciding that the earth was not in fact moving at all.*”⁴⁰

“The data [of Michelson-Morley] were almost unbelievable... There was only one other possible conclusion to draw — that the Earth was at rest.” Physicist, Bernard Jaffe⁴¹

“...all this evidence that the universe looks the same whichever direction we look in might seem to suggest there is something special about our place in the universe. In particular, it might seem that if we observe all other galaxies to be moving away from us, then we must be at the center of the universe...⁴² There is, however, an alternate explanation: the universe might look the same in every direction as seen from any other galaxy, too. This, as we have seen, was Friedmann’s second assumption. We have no scientific evidence for, or against, this assumption. We believe it only on grounds of modesty: it would be most remarkable if the universe looked the same in every direction around us, but not around other points in the universe.” Physicist, Stephen Hawking⁴³

“It is both amusing and instructive to speculate on what might have happened if such an experiment could have been performed in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries when men were debating the rival merits of the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems. The result would surely have been interpreted as conclusive evidence for the immobility of the Earth, and therefore as a triumphant vindication of the Ptolemaic system and irrefutable falsification of the Copernican hypothesis. The moral of this historical fantasy is that it is often dangerous to believe in the absolute verification or falsification of a scientific hypothesis. All judgments of this type are necessarily made

³⁷ Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, p. 44.

³⁸ Arthur Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, 1929, pp. 11, 8.

³⁹ Albert A. Michelson, “The Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether,” *American Journal of Science*, Vol. 22, August 1881, p. 125.

⁴⁰ *Einstein: The Life and Times*, 1971, p. 35; 1984, p. 57.

⁴¹ Bernard Jaffe, *Michelson and the Speed of Light*, 1960, p. 76.

⁴² *A Brief History of Time*, 1988, p. 42. Hawking says the same on page 47: “This could mean that we are at the center of a great region in the universe...”

⁴³ *A Brief History of Time*, p. 42.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

in some historical context which may be drastically modified by the changing perspective of human knowledge.” Physicist, G. J. Whitrow⁴⁴

Schoolchildren learn that we live on a planet that revolves on its axis and orbits the Sun, that Nicolaus Copernicus introduced this controversial idea in the sixteenth century, and that some men were persecuted for believing it. But in the end...“all settled”...case closed...Certainly no scientific knowledge has a better claim to being “Truth” than the knowledge that the Sun is the center of our planetary system, and that the Earth, like the other planets, orbits it. Yet our own contemporary science backs away and tells us that when it comes to proving what moves and what doesn’t, and whether or not there is an unmoving “center,” no one can make an airtight case that any answer is right or wrong. Pick what you will, the Moon, Mars, the Sun, the Earth, your great aunt’s dining table – the options are infinite – and it’s possible to come up with that as the unmoving center. In fact you are being parochial if you limit the exercise to our planetary system. It is possible to describe the entire universe using any chosen point as the unmoving center – the Earth will do very well – and no one can prove that choice is wrong....Scientists today prefer to picture everything in motion and nothing as being the center. If you haven’t given much thought to the implications of twentieth century science, you may be chagrined as Mr. Elmendorf to realize that because of the concept of relative motion, no one can prove that the Earth moves. Kitty Ferguson, Science writer⁴⁵

“...to the question whether or not the motion of the Earth in space can be made perceptible in terrestrial experiments. We have already remarked...that all attempts of this nature led to a negative result. Before the theory of relativity was put forward, it was difficult to become reconciled to this negative result.” Physicist, Albert Einstein⁴⁶

“I have come to believe that the motion of the Earth cannot be detected by any optical experiment, though the Earth is revolving around the Sun.” Albert Einstein⁴⁷

David Palm: No reasonable person would seriously advance such special pleading, when such a simple and reasonable explanation was available, unless he was already convinced that he must do so on other grounds. And that’s what’s really happening here. The geocentrists are mistakenly convinced that they must hold this view as a matter of faith. And so they are driven to engage in all this special pleading and conspiracy mongering.

⁴⁴ G. J. Whitrow, *The Structure and Evolution of the Universe*, 1949, 1959, p. 79.

⁴⁵ Kitty Ferguson, *Measuring the Universe*, pp. 34-35. Even as late as 1941, the president of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Agostino Gemelli, gave a speech to the members stating: “...although Galileo did not provide a decisive demonstration of Copernicanism, neither did Newton, Bradley, or Foucault” (cited by Finocchiaro in *Retrying Galileo*, p. 278).

⁴⁶ “Relativity – The Special and General Theory,” cited in Stephen Hawking’s, *A Stubbornly Persistent Illusion*, 2007, p. 169.

⁴⁷ Speech titled: “How I Created the Theory of Relativity,” delivered at Kyoto University, Japan, Dec. 14, 1922, as cited in *Physics Today*, August, 1982.

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

[R. Sungenis]: First of all, it is not “special pleading.” The Geocentric system has been in play and the dominant system for millennia longer than the heliocentric. Second, contrary to Mr. Palm’s belief that his system, the heliocentric, is “a simple and reasonable explanation,” is simply not the case. The heliocentric system is dependent on an Earth rotating at precisely the same rate every day, every century, but planets that rotate show that rotation is not steady (e.g., Venus, Saturn). The heliocentric system also depends on an Earth that must travel around the sun in 365.25 days with no deterioration of orbit. How is that possible? The simpler system is the geocentric in which all movements are governed by the rotation of the massive universe whose angular momentum doesn’t allow anything, including planetary rotations and orbits, to slow down. Moreover, the geocentric system is not dependent on the Big Bang’s so-called “expanding universe” or dark matter or dark energy or anything that troubles modern cosmology today. The simple truth is, the geocentric system is better because it is the simpler and more reliable system. Of course, we can’t leave out the fact that the Fathers of the Church were in absolute consensus on geocentrism, and that the Church of 1616 and 1633 made geocentrism a doctrine of the Church when it condemned Galileo and anyone who taught heliocentrism.

David Palm: Catholics are not bound to hold geocentrism as a matter of faith.

[R. Sungenis]: And Mr. Palm continues to distort what we are saying, no matter how many times he is told that he is misrepresenting us. His purpose is to put fear into Catholics about us. So let’s make this clear, once again. We do not say that Catholics are bound today, and the obvious reason for this exception is that Catholics today are not being taught geocentrism from their Catholic leaders, either in the Church or the universities. Will someone please shake Mr. Palm and get this through his head, once and for all?

Palm: The Magisterium has ruled...

[R. Sungenis]: Mr. Palm continues to confuse the public on this issue. When he refers to the “Magisterium” here he is referring to the incident in 1820 when Pius VII allowed Canon Settele to have an imprimatur for his book on heliocentrism, against the wishes of the Master of the Palace, Fr. Filippo Anfossi, who told the pope that the theory had already been condemned by solemn decrees both in 1616 and 1633. What Mr. Palm deliberately avoids admitting is that what prompted Pius VII to allow the imprimatur were two gargantuan lies told to the pope by Maurizio Olivieri, the Commissioner of the Index, who was promoting heliocentrism. The lies Olivieri told the pope were that the only reason the 1616 and 1633 Magisteriums condemned Galileo was because: (1) he didn’t include the elliptical orbits of Kepler, and (2) that if the Earth moved it would suck the atmosphere into outer space. The records show that the 1616 and 1633 Magisteriums said nothing of the kind, and, in fact, Kepler and his elliptical orbits were already put on the Index as early as 1619. But since Pius VII was very sick and a weak pope and did not want to fight with Olivieri, he allowed the imprimatur. So Mr. Palm’s so-called “Magisterium has ruled” is severely tainted by a breaking of the Eighth Commandment. Mr. Palm’s attempt to sanction heliocentrism based on this kind of ecclesiastical chicanery is just as dubious as when Galileo got an imprimatur from Fr. Riccardi by deceiving him in 1631. When the pope found

out, he rescinded Galileo's imprimatur in 1632 and put him on trial. That Mr. Palm doesn't mention any of these details reflects his bias and dishonesty.

David Palm: and as St. John Paul II has said, the debate is over.

[**R. Sungenis**]: Notice Mr. Palm doesn't give a citation, and that's because John Paul II never said any such thing. In fact, in John Paul II's address to the PAS he said, "It is a duty for theologians to keep themselves regularly informed of scientific advances in order to examine...whether or not there are reasons for taking them into account in their reflection or for introducing changes in their teaching." Hence, if modern heliocentric theologians find from science that geocentrism is a viable model of the universe, then John Paul II orders them to make changes in their teaching. So the debate is far from over. It is just getting started. But it is apparent that Mr. Palm would like it to be over.

David Palm: So the simple answer to your question is that the two systems are not equally viable or reasonable. One is straightforward – the Earth revolves around its star and rotates on its axis just like any other planet and this explains what we observe. That's why no working astronomer or physicist holds strict geocentrism and none of them have for decades, yea centuries.

[**R. Sungenis**]: If they follow Einstein (and all of them do),⁴⁸ then they would be required, categorically, to disagree with Mr. Palm's statement: "the two systems are not equally viable or reasonable." We saw from the dozens of quotes I catalogued above that all of them, without exception, agree that a geocentric system is viable, but many choose to believe in heliocentrism for philosophical, not scientific reasons. They are smart enough to figure out that a scientist can't cry wolf and declare that all motion is relative (per Einstein) and then declare that things are not relative and heliocentrism is an absolute. Apparently, Mr. Palm is not smart enough to figure that out.

David Palm: On the other side we have hand waving and special pleading from guys who have no demonstrated competence and who refuse to do any real science themselves or present their own model in a way that can be evaluated and tested by real scientists.

[**R. Sungenis**]: So if we are so inept, why did Mr. Palm refuse to debate me on these very issues in an open, oral and public forum so that his views could be cross-examined in front of an audience? Why did his cohort, Karl Keating, likewise refuse to debate me, and also refused to debate Christopher Ferrara on these same issues? Why has Mr. Palm blocked me from responding to this very blog he set up to criticize me? Sounds to me like Mr. Palm wants to control the discussion and leave as little room as possible for the opposition to tell the other side of the story.

⁴⁸ "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." Albert Einstein

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

As for presenting our model for testing, we have already done so. The models were presented and peer-reviewed by the *European Journal of Physics* and published in their magazine in 2013. Neither Mr. Palm nor anyone else has refuted them – and that is because the mathematical model of geocentrism it represents is as solid as a rock. Other refutations of Mr. Palm’s scientific explanations have been presented on internet forums dozens of times and every question he has raised has been answered. The problem is not with us. The problem is that Mr. Palm refuses to accept any alternatives to his heliocentric system, as is noted above by his rather blanket admission to Mr. Hand (“So the simple answer to your question is that the two systems are not equally viable or reasonable”) despite the fact that every famous scientist I quoted above rejects Mr. Palm’s absolutism.

David Palm: We have repeated appeal to a scientific theory they strenuously reject – relativity - instead of coherent explanations within their own system.

[**R. Sungenis**]: That is another lie, and Mr. Palm has had this canard exposed many times but he refuses to acknowledge it. We only use Relativity theory in order to show that Mr. Palm’s and Mr. MacAndrew’s OWN SCIENCE refutes their steadfast devotion to heliocentrism! When one’s own science supports the opponent’s position and does not support one’s own position, we would be foolish not to point out this massive contradiction. Instead of acknowledging the contradiction in his methodology, Mr. Palm tries to make it appear that we are using Relativity theory illegitimately! Go figure. This is just another example of how devious Mr. Palm can be.

David Palm: Instead of robust philosophy we get appeals to sentimentalism (oh, don’t you just wish you were in the physical center of the universe so you can be significant?).

[**R. Sungenis**]: We can only laugh at Mr. Palm’s sophistry – trying to pass himself off, on the one hand, as a philosopher, and, on the other hand, trying to turn the idea that we are in the center of the universe into a soap opera instead of scientific fact. Incidentally, at one point Mr. Palm tried to make an argument that to say the Earth was in the center of the universe is akin to making it the anus of the universe, so instead of being significant, Mr. Palm said the ancients made the Earth insignificant. Perhaps they did. But what Mr. Palm didn’t tell his audience was that the Church Fathers rejected Aristotle’s idea that the Earth was an anus, and instead extolled the Earth for being the center of creation that Jesus Christ came to save mankind. To this day, Mr. Palm has not corrected his error.

David Palm: We get basic scientific blunders and math errors.

[**R. Sungenis**]: I don’t know of one scientific error Mr. Palm has uncovered. He doesn’t show any examples to investigate. As for math errors, the only one that occurred was when I put the wrong units into an on-line calculator with which I wasn’t familiar. I finally fixed the error and admitted my mistake. But in order to keep the fires of character assassination burning, Mr. Palm makes it appear as if I always make math blunders and didn’t admit the only one he caught.

David Palm: Plagiarism:

[**R. Sungenis**]: The only plagiarism that Mr. Palm has accused me of has nothing to do with geocentrism. Rather, he continues to bring up a charge of plagiarism against me stemming from

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

a 2002 incident in which I quoted words from some German author against the Jews. But the real reason Mr. Palm likes to harp on this subject is that we point out that his own mentor, Albert Einstein, was a known plagiarist. See <http://www.amazon.com/Albert-Einstein-The-Incorrigible-Plagiarist/dp/0971962987> and http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/esp_einstein.htm. Mr. Palm is incensed that we would point out the flaws of one of his favorite Jews.

David Palm: Conspiracies.

[**R. Sungenis**]: This is another of Mr. Palm's ploys. He tries very hard to make geocentrists appear as if they are merely conspiracy theorists looking for the next big story. It works rather well for stuffed-shirts like him. Recently, his comrade in arms, Karl Keating, tried to use the same malicious methodology in his book *The New Geocentrists*. Mr. Keating tried to make it appear that since I accuse both Jews and Gentiles of the Bush Administration of orchestrating the 911 attacks and that the 19 Muslims were merely patsies, that I'm just a conspiracy theorist and thus no one should listen to me when I speak about geocentrism. So this forced me to write a book against Mr. Keating and include most of the article I wrote for Culture Wars on 911. I'm sure that anyone who reads it will have sincere reservations about calling me a conspiracy theorist, since all I present are facts. In fact, they will begin to revile people like Karl Keating and David Palm for trying to suppress the evidence that the USA has been virtually taken over by a cadre of Neo-cons and Zionists, and that the Muslims have little to do with it. Anytime Mr. Palm would like to debate these issues, I'm here to engage him. But, of course, we all know what Mr. Palm's answer is going to be: no thanks.

David Palm: I have said it many times – if these fellows want to try to make their living peddling pseudo-science and nonsense, it's a free country and I would leave them to carry on with myriad other shysters. But when they claim that this is part and parcel of our holy Catholic Faith, that's where I draw the line and call it out for what it is – a pseudo-scientific scam.

[**R. Sungenis**]: As you can see, Mr. Palm doesn't fail to add to his methodology a good measure of sanctimonious dressing. He tries to make it appear as if he is carrying the banner of the Catholic faith, yet it is that very faith that he denies. He knows the Church Fathers were in consensus and that the Church of 1616 and 1633 relied on that consensus to condemn Galileo. He knows that Catholic Church has never made an official retraction of the 1616 and 1633 decisions. He knows that those decisions were about heresy and not just discipline. He knows that Cardinal Olivieri lied to Pius VII about why Settele should get an imprimatur. He knows that there is now so much scientific evidence that even secular scientists are admitting that they cannot hold heliocentrism as a fact and that the Earth could very well be in the center of the universe, and that Mr. Palm's own Einsteinian science allows these new ideas as viable options, yet he stamps his feet and glibly says it is nothing but a "pseudo-scientific scam."

That being the case, may I then suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the real "conspiracy" culprit here is none other than David Palm? He believes alternative interpretations to the scientific data are a conspiracy. It is obvious that a person who can see all this scientific and ecclesiastical evidence before his eyes and not even be willing to bend to a "well, it may be possible, but I choose to interpret the evidence in a heliocentric way" position, is, may I suggest,

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

not dealing with a full deck. This is what happens when a man is driven by jealousy and hatred, rather than facts.

David Palm: “God bless.”

[R. Sungenis]: I can’t help but notice Mr. Palm’s glib “God bless” as a perfect example of St. James’ warnings against such sanctimonious sophistry. James says: “But no one can tame the tongue...With it we bless our Lord and Father, and with it we curse men who have been made in the image of God.” (3:8-9). Mr. Palm rips me up one side and down the other on his blog and in his papers, and purposely sets up blog questions to make me look like a fool, and in the process blocks me from the blog so that I can’t defend myself, yet gives his sanctimonious “God bless” as his sign off signature. The Pharisaical hypocrisy speaks for itself.

Stephen Hand: David Palm, this is your response? So, to be clear, you are saying a geocentric interpretation is not even possible from the data derived from new observation using this new technology? Not even possible? Do I understand you correctly?

Stephen Hand: I am asking whether the geocentric interpretation is viable, not necessarily "equally" so in your opinion. The same with reasonable. Simply whether it is possible to interpret the data in this way. In that sense viable, reasonable, though I understand not "equally" in your view.

Stephen Hand: David Palm, 2 question/comments here for your clarification.

David Palm: Stephen, so as we started this off, so now the question to you again: do you consider the view that the material universe is comprised the four elements to be viable and reasonable? Why or why not? Your answer will shed light on how you define viable and reasonable.

Stephen Hand: You are being non-responsive, David. So we'll let it rest.

Stephen Hand: Gentlemen, heck, they extend an open invitation to review responses to all of this at the Ask [Robert Sungenis](#) site. Be good sports and feel free to respond there in the interests of clarification of thought.

[See:

https://www.facebook.com/david.palm.560/posts/10204347895993054?comment_id=10204688913358275]

As noted, proof of how Mr. Palm tries to manipulate the situation is that he has blocked Robert Sungenis from responding to his blog. He, however, remains unblocked from Robert’s blog: Ask Robert Sungenis about Geocentrism

(https://www.facebook.com/robert.sungenis.1?hc_location=ufi).

Hence, since Mr. Palm continues to be so self-assured about his position, we are once again going to offer the chance for him to debate the issue in front of an audience in a public and oral

Open Letter to David Palm for a Public Debate on Geocentrism

debate against Robert Sungenis. If Mr. Palm wants to accept he can write to Robert Sungenis at cairoleo@aol.com

Don't hold your breath.

June 19, 2015