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When lies have been accepted for some time, the truth always astounds with an air of novelty.

St. Clement of Alexandria
Introduction

This is Robert Sungenis, executive producer of the feature film, *The Principle*, and director of CAI Publishing, Inc. which publishes the *Galileo Was Wrong* series of books.

I went through Karl Keating’s new book, *The New Geocentrists*. Truth be told, I don’t think I’ve seen such a spurious assortment of exaggerations, innuendos, half truths and downright misinformation in all my years of reading, especially from someone who purports to be a Catholic. As I was going through the book, I sensed that Mr. Keating is a very desperate man, pulling out all the stops and engaging in a kind of slash and burn polemics with which I sensed even he was uncomfortable at times; hoping against hope that he can somehow stem the tide of the new Catholic apologetics he sees replacing his old and worn out apologetics that, in a word, did more capitulating to the world than it did defending against it.

I was so appalled at Keating’s treatment of some very honorable and dedicated Catholics, in addition to his spurious scientific arguments, that I resolved to answer as many of them as possible in order to show everyone exactly how he distorts the reality to his own advantage. Almost every page contains some kind of error, some of them quite deliberate, even when Mr. Keating knew the truth. I managed to pull out 111 of them in his 355 pages, but I could have done more. In addition to the science and the personal attacks, Keating makes my credibility his #1 target, dealing with topics that I have long since put on the shelf. Since he has decided to use them in an attempt to discredit me, I had no choice but to address them to protect my credibility.

Lastly, before you dive into this book, I want you to know that, after he published his book, Keating was challenged to a formal debate by two people of his own caliber, me and Christopher Ferrara. Keating declined to debate both of us. We can only conclude, then, that Keating is the kind of man who believes he can cast reputation-destroying aspersions against his opponents, but feels no responsibility to respond under cross examination from those very people who can best expose the weaknesses in his arguments. As such, I have little respect for the man and I have no problem calling him both a coward and dishonest; and this is the first time I have ever made such an accusation of anyone in all the thirty books I have written over the last two decades. No one but Karl Keating deserves that dishonor. Consequently, this book will have to suffice for a debate.
1) Karl Keating: On the Wrong Track, Thanks to Curtis Wilson

Keating: page 10: “In gratitude, I dedicate this book to the memory of Curtis Wilton.” From a radio interview, Keating adds: “We had to take certain elective courses, and I took one on the History of Science, taught by Professor Curtis Wilson. He is the top American expert in Johannes Kepler. Kepler was a scientist in the 17th century who formulate the three laws of planetary motion on which all of modern astrophysics is based….The class was actually on geocentrism. And what we did was to take Ptolemy’s ancient writings…and he was the first to come up with a consolidated theory of how the planets and the sun and the stars interacted. And it’s his theory that the Earth is at the center. The planets that could be as far as Saturn…and the sun, rotated in circles around, revolved in circles around the Earth. He had to elaborate this with many accoutrements in order to make his theory seem to accommodate the observations he had at the time….In this course, while I was in school Professor Wilson took us through Ptolemy’s work; through his much later successor Tycho Brahe who died in 1601, who had an alternative theory but with Earth still in the center, and took us through the actual calculations and observations. We did the math. We did the arithmetic and the geometry and worked this through. And we were able to see over the course of the class that as time went on and observations became ever more precise, that the Ptolemaic theory and later the Tychonian theory did not accommodate the appearances. And as time went on they were less and less able to explain why the planets and the stars and the sun were doing what they seemed to be doing…Now I see that decades later, this notion of geocentrism has made a comeback.”¹

¹ Catholic Answers radio program of February 13, 2015, an interview between Keating and Patrick Coffin, recorded beginning at 13:50 when Coffin asked Keating how he got into the present subject matter.
R. Sungenis: The key sentence in his description is:

And we were able to see over the course of the class that as time when on and observations became ever more precise, that the Ptolemaic theory and later the Tychonian theory did not accommodate the appearances.

If that is what Professor Curtis Wilson taught Karl Keating, then Prof. Wilson was wrong. If Prof. Wilson was only dealing with kinematics and not dynamics, then it would be true to say that Ptolemy’s model can be shown to be inadequate, but Tycho Brahe’s model matches both the Copernican and the Keplerian models, orbit for orbit, equation for equation. My suspicion is that Keating probably misunderstood Prof. Wilson, but unfortunately, this means Keating has carried the same fallacious idea with him for the last forty years, namely, that the Tychonic model is inadequate, when it is only the Ptolemaic that has proven to be so. I suggest that Mr. Keating go back and check the notes that Prof. Wilson gave him. I know of no professor in astrophysical kinematics that would ever claim that Tycho Brahe’s model was inadequate to explain the motions in the heavens, and I dare say that I don’t think Prof. Wilson would dare to do so either.

Moreover, if Prof. Wilson taught Keating that only the Keplerian model could explain stellar parallax, he is wrong there also. Although accusing Tycho’s model of being unable to explain parallax was popular a few years ago, it has been discredited, for the simple reason that we now know that if the stars are aligned with the sun instead of the Earth, then both parallax and aberration are produced. As one professor from the University of Illinois put it in his 2004 lecture 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.\(^2\)

Another possibility for the miscue is that Keating, without telling us, believes that Tycho’s model is inadequate because Tycho’s original model did not include elliptical orbits of the planets. Since the elliptical orbits of Kepler’s model made the heliocentric version more accurate, Tycho’s geocentric model would not be able to match it. If this is Keating’s reason, then he is playing a shell game. Every professor of astrophysical kinematics, including the late Christopher Wilson, knows that if elliptical orbits of the planets are included in Tycho’s model, it is just as accurate as Kepler’s model. This was already known in the time of Galileo. In 1665, Giovanni Riccioli, in his book, *Astronomia Reformata*, added elliptical orbits to Tycho’s model for this very reason, and afterward he remained a devoted geocentrist.

I also want to make an interesting observation of Kepler’s system. It is not as accurate as Mr. Keating has been led to believe. Professor of celestial mechanics at Columbia University, Charles Lane Poor, shows us why:

> From the time of Newton, it has been known that Kepler’s laws are mere approximations, computer’s fictions, handy mathematical devices for finding the approximate place of a planet in the heavens. They apply with greater accuracy to some planets than to others. Jupiter and Saturn show the greatest deviations from strictly elliptical motion. The latter body is often nearly a degree away from the place it would have been had its motion about the sun been strictly in accord with Kepler’s laws. This is such a large discrepancy that it can be detected by the unaided eye. The moon is approximately half a degree in diameter, so that the discrepancy in the motion of Saturn is about twice the apparent diameter of the moon. In a single year, during the course of one revolution about the sun, the Earth may depart from the theoretical ellipse by an amount sufficient to appreciably change the apparent place of the sun in the heavens.³

So, the upshot of this bit of history is that Keating is either unaware of the truth or is trying to keep it from the audience. His forty-year objection to geocentrism is based on nothing more than a misconception of the

³ Charles Lane Poor, *Gravitation versus Relativity*, p. 129.
Tychonic model. How sad to know that Keating’s vociferous campaign against geocentrism for the past decade has been based on his own ignorance of the subject matter. It is my hope that Mr. Keating will correct his misconceptions and apologize to his audience for leading them down this blind alley.

By the way, one more historical note of import is that Ptolemy was aware that his model might not be correct since he did not know the distances of the planets from the sun, especially Mercury and Venus. But to compensate for this lack he included six variables in his theory so that when the correct distances and placement could be made, they would be added to his model to correct it. In fact, the Tychonic geocentric model made those six corrections and thus allowed the Tychonic model to be either as accurate as Copernicus’ model without elliptical orbits of the planets, or as accurate as Kepler’s model with elliptical orbits. Additionally, Ptolemy had another device, the Equant, which served as the forerunner of Kepler’s elliptical orbits. The Equant allowed the planets to revolve around the sun in non-uniform orbits very similar to Kepler’s elliptical orbits. But since Copernicus wanted to do away with non-uniform orbits and have the planets revolve in perfect circles around the sun, thus Copernicus’ model could not even come close to the accuracy of either the Ptolemaic or Keplerian models for the outer planets.

2) Bruno Burned Beyond Recognition

Keating: page 29: “Just as the 2014 motion picture The Principle completely misstates why Giordano Bruno went to the stake…”

R. Sungenis: Neither The Principle nor its producers took any stand on the case of Bruno. Only Michio Kaku and Max Tegmark voiced opinions about Bruno. The addition of Bruno to the film was done for effect, since later in the movie the image of Bruno appears again, only this time it is in reference to geocentrists and galactocentrists being persecuted by the main stream of modern cosmology for merely suggesting that the data shows Earth to be in the center of the universe. Mr. Keating saw The Principle and therefore has no excuse for his misrepresentation.
3) “Tantamount to Infallible,” is Fallible

**Keating:** page 33: “The role of Bellarmine in the controversy is stressed by modern proponents of geocentrism, and the Catholic proponents in particular argue that early Christian writers unanimously endorsed geocentrism and that this was tantamount to an infallible teaching on the subject.”

**R. Sungenis:** We never used the phrase “tantamount to an infallible teaching.” Keating also made a similar remark on page 7, saying, “They go so far as to say that the Church in the past infallibly taught geocentrism…” Whether geocentrism is an infallible teaching is for the Church to decide. We only bring the information to the Church from science, scripture and history, for that is the job we are called to do.

4) Nicolaus Schoenberg: The Odd Man Out

**Keating:** page 33: “Copernicus….even had his work praised by a cardinal, Nicolaus Schoenberg of Capua.”

**R. Sungenis:** Keating leaves out the fact that Schoenberg was the only cardinal to give favor to Copernicus. Everyone else condemned Copernicus’ model, including Bartolomeo Spina, the Master of the Sacred Palace from 1542 until his death in 1547, who sought to have Copernicus’ book banned as soon as it was published in 1543, which was eventually carried out in 1547 by his Dominican colleague Giovanimaria Tolosani, who died two years later in 1549. After this, both Rheticus’ and Copernicus’ books were put on the Index of Forbidden Books in the 1560s and not taken off until 1835 due to the malfeasance of Cardinal Olivieri.

5) Copernicus Had an “In” with the Inquisition?

**Keating:** page 36: “…after all, Copernicus himself did the same [as Galileo] and was not brought up on charges before the Inquisition – but he presumed to say how Scripture should be interpreted.”

**R. Sungenis:** Copernicus died the year his book was published (1543), so obviously he couldn’t be “brought up on charges before the Inquisition.”
6) Let’s Use the Papal Infallibility Card

**Keating:** page 42: “the ruling issued by the Holy Office and approved *in forma communi* by Urban VIII in 1633 is not considered by theologians or Church historians to have been an exercise of papal infallibility.”

**R. Sungenis:** First, according to Vatican II’s Lumen Gentium 12 and 25, a decree from a pope doesn’t have to be “infallible” in order to be authoritative and demand obedience from Catholic parishioners. Second, “theologians and historians” do not officially decide what is or is not “infallible.” Third, the Church has not given us a list of what is retroactively infallible prior to 1870. Fourth, more recent “theologians and historians” have taken an opposite view. For example, Fr. Coyne, a member of the Galileo commission organized by John Paul II in 1981, has argued:

So far as we can conclude from the circumstances of the condemnation, Pope Urban VIII and the cardinals of the Holy Office certainly did not themselves think it to be reformable. Furthermore, if it was reformable, why has the condemnation of 1633 or, for that matter, the Decree of the Congregation of the Index in 1616 never explicitly been “reformed?”

Likewise, Galileo historian Ernan McMullin has argued:

And let there be no mistake, the judgment of the qualifiers in 1616 and the language of the decree supported by it were couched in definitive terms; it was not proposed as something ‘reformable,’ to use a term favored by some recent theologians. The decree did not say that in the absence of a demonstration, maintaining the Copernican theses would be risky (‘temerarious’). It described the theses as ‘contrary to Scripture,’ period, just as the qualifiers had “qualified” the heliocentric claim as “formally heretical.”

---

4 *The Church and Galileo*, p. 354.
5 *The Church and Galileo*, p. 159.
Coyne adds:

“In the Galileo case the historical facts are that further research into the Copernican system was forbidden by the decree of 1616 and then condemned in 1633 by official organs of the Church with the approbation of the reigning pontiffs” (ibid).

7) Bellarmine Wrong: The Church Fathers Silent, says Keating

Keating: page 47: “It is not easy to demonstrate that many of the Fathers ever wrote about cosmology at all; it is not easy to show a ‘unanimous consent’ when most of the apparently had nothing to say on the topic.”

R. Sungenis: Most of the Fathers had nothing to say on a variety of topics, including some of our most important doctrines. But the fact remains that many Fathers wrote on cosmology and all of them were the prominent and important Fathers that the Church has come to recognize and honor. They include: Ambrose, Aphrahat, Archeleus, Aristedes, Arnobius, Athanasius, Athenagoras, Augustine, Basil, John Cassian, Chrysostom, Clement of Rome, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephraim, Eusebius, Gregory Nanzianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Thurmaturgos, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Jerome, John Damascene, Justin Martyr, Mathetes, Methodius, Menucius Felix, Tertullian; as well as Thomas Aquinas and many other medievals.

I continue to be amazed at how brazen Keating is against the cardinals and popes of the 17th century who all agreed and declared that the Fathers of the Church held to a consensus on geocentrism and that we are required to follow that consensus. His rebellious attitude and disdain for past teachings is typical of the modern Catholic.

Second, let’s assume Mr. Keating’s premise for the sake of argument. In that case, “it is not easy to demonstrate that many of the Fathers ever wrote about” the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption of Mary, Purgatory, Indulgences, Extreme Unction, Confirmation, the two natures and two wills of Christ, abortion, contraception, and many other topics if Mr. Keating wants to use the frequency of the Fathers’ discussion on geocentrism as the benchmark. Yet all the foregoing have resulted in doctrines in the Catholic Church.
8) You Appear to Appear that you Side with Appearances

Keating: page 47: “Like everyone else in ancient times, when they wrote about the heavens, they wrote in terms of appearances (the Sun rises and sets; the stars move through the sky), without any attempt to formulate astronomical theories”

R. Sungenis: A half-truth. Sometimes the Fathers wrote from appearance. At other times they wrote from a more technical position, stating that the Earth is in the middle or center of the universe and the sun goes around it as if on a wheel. Here are some examples:

Athanasius: For the Sun is carried round along with, and is contained in, the whole heaven, and can never go beyond his own orbit, while the moon and other stars testify to the assistance given them by the Sun...But the earth is not supported upon itself, but is set upon the realm of the waters, while this again is kept in its place, being bound fast at the center of the universe.6

Athenagoras: To Him is for us to know who stretched out and vaulted the heavens, and fixed the earth in its place like a center.7

Augustine: ...while the whole earth is suspended on nothing. For perhaps the world keeps its central place by the same law that attracts to its center all heavy bodies.8

Basil: Do not then be surprised that the world never falls: it occupies the center of the universe, its natural place. By necessity it is obliged to remain in its place, unless a movement contrary to nature should displace it.9

Chrysostom: “Because they are unsteady and giddy, they think that the Earth turns round with them, which yet turns not, but

---

6 Against the Heathen, Part 1, No. 27.
7 Why the Christians do not Offer Sacrifices, Ch XIII.
8 City of God, Bk XIII, Ch 18.
9 Nine Homilies on the Hexameron, 10.
stands firm. The derangement is of their own state, not from any affection of the element.”

**Clement of Rome:** the Creator…who has fixed the great world as a centre in space, who has spread out the heavens and solidified the earth.

**Cyril of Jerusalem:** The earth, which bears the same proportion to the heaven as the center to the whole circumference of a wheel…”

**Gregory of Nyssa:** “…the earth and the water, holding each other in, took the middle place of the universe….for neither is the earth shifted from its own base, nor does the heaven ever relax in its vehemence, or slacken its motion.

**Gregory Thaumaturgos:** “…that the earth itself continues stable; that the sun accomplishes its circuit about it perfectly, and rolls round to the same mark again…

9) **My Presidency Has Been Greatly Exaggerated**

**Keating:** page 75: “Wyatt…is listed as president of Sungenis’s Catholic Apologetics International, but in public Sungenis assigns that title to himself.”

**R. Sungenis:** False. I have only assigned the title of “Director” to myself, and I no longer refer to myself as the president.

10) **Let Me Talk Only of the Guy Who Disagrees with You**

**Keating:** page 76: “About one hundred people attended the [geocentrism] conference….One of those in attendance was Todd Charles Wood.”

---

10 *Homily on Titus*, III.

11 *Homily II, Ch XLV*.

12 *Catechetical Lectures*, VI, 3.

13 *On the Making of Man*, 30, 1, 1.

14 *On Ecclesiastes*, Ch 1, 2.
R. Sungenis: I reproduce this comment from Keating only for the purpose of showing that Todd Charles Wood was the only person at the conference from whom Keating collected any comments, and all Wood’s comments were negative. This is typical of how Keating gathers evidence. There was at least 100 other people at the conference whom Mr. Keating could have contacted for a more balanced reporting of what transpired. Mr. Keating’s tactics wouldn’t be so bad except that Mr. Wood continually gets his facts and figures mixed up, as we shall see. For the record, I responded to Mr. Wood already, and it may be the source for what Keating is extracting.

11) That Darned Aether. I Know I Left it Here Somewhere

Keating: page 78: “If aether does not exist (and in fact it does not),

R. Sungenis: False. Aether has been shown to exist in dozens of experiments. But here is why Keating thinks it doesn’t exist. He first assumes that the Earth is revolving around the sun. He then knows that there were many experiments done in the 1800s and 1900s that tested for the Earth’s movement by measuring aether resistance against the Earth. Since none of the experiments found negligible aether resistance (that is, not enough for an Earth moving at 30km/sec around the sun), Keating concludes that aether doesn’t exist rather than concluding that the Earth isn’t moving around the sun.

We can easily prove Keating wrong. The experiments that measure whether there is a rotation between Earth and space always produce a 100% result (e.g., the 1925 Michelson-Gale experiment). To do so, they use the same aether-based experimental apparatus that was used when testing for the Earth’s revolution around the sun (the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment).

Why, you ask, would the experiments detect a rotation and not a revolution? Heliocentrists are stuck for an answer, since they need both a revolution and a rotation for their system to work. Geocentrists have the perfect answer, namely, the Earth isn’t revolving around the sun, but space is daily rotating around a fixed Earth.
12) Nah, Nah, Now you Can’t Explain Rotation

Keating: page 78: “If aether does not exist…geocentrism collapses because there is no way to explain how the star field can circle the Earth every twenty four hours, and there is no way to explain what keeps the Earth at the center of the universe.”

R. Sungenis: False. Both Ernst Mach and Albert Einstein allowed for the possibility of a geocentric universe in which the stars revolve around a fixed Earth, based on the fact of relative motion, but neither incorporated an aether for that purpose. The geocentrist incorporates aether because that’s what the experiments demonstrate. As such, aether helps in understanding how a geocentric universe would best operate.

13) Galileo Only Broke the Rules Later than Sooner

Keating: page 79: Quoting Wood: “Sungenis made it sound like Galileo just marched right out defiantly against the Church and began writing his next argument for heliocentrism, but that not what happened at all.”

R. Sungenis: I never used those words nor did I seek to give that impression. I simply stated the facts from what the historians have written, and they all agree that only seven years after Galileo was told not to research, write or speak on heliocentrism, he began writing his book, the Dialogo, in 1623. Here are some additional statements I made in December 2010 regarding Mr. Wood’s take on things:

Mr. Wood: After describing the Church's 1616 formal condemnation of copernicanism, Sungenis said, "Galileo ignored the injunction against copernicanism" and began writing his Dialogue, giving the distinct impression that Galileo went out immediately and began writing his next book advocating heliocentrism.

R. Sungenis: So Mr. Wood, without knowing my real intention, is making a grandiose conclusion based only on “impressions” he received? All he needed to do was ask me, since I made myself available the entire 10 hours
of the conference. But Mr. Wood failed to introduce himself, much less ask for any clarifications.

Mr. Wood: The truth is that he had already written a draft of what became the Dialogue prior to the condemnation of copernicanism and that he didn't start revising it for publication until September of 1624. Basically, he let the manuscript sit for nine years, and when he began to revise it, he made it a Dialogue discussing both copernicanism and the geocentric perspective.

R. Sungenis: So, then, Mr. Wood admits that Galileo picked up his draft of the *Dialogo* and began working on it again when he was specifically told by Pope Paul V never to write, speak or teach on the subject again. Apparently Mr. Wood believes that disobeying the injunction nine years later is better than disobeying it only one year later.

Additionally, Mr. Wood’s choice of 1624 is not precise. If he had bothered to read Galileo Was Wrong on this very subject he would have come across these two paragraphs on page 212 of the second volume.

Sentence: Therefore by our order you were cited before this Holy Office, where, being examined upon your oath, you acknowledged the book to be written and published by you. You confessed that you began to write the said book about ten or twelve years ago [1621-1623], after the command had been imposed upon you as above; that you requested license to print it without, however, intimating to those who granted you this license that you had been commanded not to hold, defend, or teach the doctrine in question in any way whatever.

Analysis: This means that Galileo, in his typical temerity, began writing the Dialogo just five to seven years after the injunction had been given to him in 1616. In fact, parts of the Dialogo were written as far back as 1610.

Be that as it may, here is a description of the injunction from the official document:
His Holiness ordered the Most Illustrious Cardinal Bellarmine to call Galileo before himself and warn him to abandon these opinions; and if he should refuse to obey, the Father Commissary, in the presence of notary and witnesses, is to issue him an injunction to abstain completely from teaching or defending that doctrine and opinion or from discussing it; and further, if he should not acquiesce, he is to be imprisoned. (Le Opere di Galileo Galilei, vol. 19, p. 321, translated by Fantoli).

And despite this clear wording, Mr. Wood claims that it was permissible for Galileo to revise his Dialogo since Galileo was “discussing both Copernicanism and the geocentric perspective.” But that’s not what the injunction said. The injunction didn’t care what Galileo’s intentions were. It simply stated that he was to stay away from the subject altogether. Mr. Wood doesn’t like that particular fact of history and thus he bends the story to suit his tastes and then tries to give the impression that I was bending it.

Mr. Wood: This was ostensibly permissible under the injunction against copernicanism,

R. Sungenis: “Ostensibly permissible”? Is Mr. Wood now the judge and jury of what the injunction meant? Seems so. If so, his judgment contradicts what Pope Paul V actually required, which, as noted above, was for Galileo “to abstain completely from teaching or defending that doctrine and opinion or from discussing it; and further, if he should not acquiesce, he is to be imprisoned.”

Mr. Wood: but the problem was that the text made it quite clear that Galileo's sympathies were with the Copernican system.

R. Sungenis: That was the second reason, not the first. The first was that Galileo entered into the topic of cosmology when he was told not to do so. Mr. Wood needs to read the injunction for what it actually says and not give us his biased opinion.
**Mr. Wood:** Sungenis made it sound like Galileo just marched right out defiantly against the Church and began writing his next argument for heliocentrism, but that's not what happened at all.

**R. Sungenis:** This, unfortunately, is what Mr. Wood extracts from a quick Power Point presentation and an “impression.” Be that as it may, in actuality, it doesn’t matter how soon Galileo decided to defy the Church. The point is, he defied her and he knew what he was doing. In fact, he waited until 1621-1623 to do his revising since he thought that Cardinal Barberini who had befriended him by that time would support his *Dialogo*. Apparently, enough time had passed to tempt Galileo to think that no one would remember or make a big deal about the injunction that Paul V gave him in 1616. Barberini supported Galileo for a while, but when Barberini became Pope Urban VIII and found out that Galileo was not only presenting Copernicanism as a thesis but also obtained an imprimatur for the *Dialogo* through a bit of subterfuge by getting the best of Cardinal Riccardi through the help of Cosimo Medici, well, that’s when Galileo’s house of cards fell. And when confronted by Urban VIII’s inquisition, Galileo feigned a memory loss that he had received the injunction in 1616, at least until the Commissar helped him remember by showing Galileo’s signature on the injunction. Galileo was devious from start to finish. It only took him five to seven years to put together his wily plan to circumvent the Church. I suggest Mr. Wood read the history before he comments on it. It’s all in my book, all 1100 pages.

14) The Fallible Use of the Infallible Magisterium

**Keating:** page 79: Quoting Wood: “For most of his lecture Sungenis talked about ‘what happened after Galileo, in which he emphasized that it was the infallible Magisterium of the Church that condemned Galileo and therefore the condemnation could not be rescinded without admitting that the Magisterium had made a mistake.’”

**R. Sungenis:** Check the lecture. I never said that it was the “infallible Magisterium…that condemned Galileo,” nor did I ever say that it “could not be rescinded.” I have repeatedly said that it “has not been rescinded,” not that it *could not* be rescinded. If Keating has been paying the least bit
of attention to what I’ve said over the years, he knows this to be the case but fails to correct Mr. Wood. Here are additional words I stated in December 2010:

**R. Sungenis:** Apparently Mr. Wood wasn’t listening very well, or perhaps he is once again relying on “impressions” instead of facts. I said nothing about an “infallible Magisterium…condemned Galileo.” I specifically stated that since the condemnation wasn’t issued in a formally infallible venue, it then depended on the Ordinary Magisterium. I then said that because the condemnation of Galileo came under the auspices of a canonical trial from a tribunal of the Church, it then became a legal matter, and since legal matters can only be overturned by the pope or another tribunal, then the legal decision against Galileo and heliocentrism continues since no one has ever legally rescinded it. I then said that, if the Church were to rescind the canonical decision against Galileo and heliocentrism, it would only be putting itself in jeopardy, since in saying an Ordinary Magisterium of the past made a mistake then forces us to ask whether an Ordinary Magisterium from the present can also make a mistake, but, of course, that specific issue is hypothetical.

15) I’m Dubious, I’m Delightful, I’m Delovely

**Keating:** page 79: Quoting Wood: “I found this section interesting but, given Sungenis’s mistreatment of Galileo, I have to say I’m dubious about some of his claims here.”

**R. Sungenis:** In other words, Mr. Wood could find no worthy objections to what I said, but because he misunderstood what I said about Galileo, he concludes that he is skeptical about what I said about the Church’s role. Keating apparently likes this kind of presumption since Mr. Wood’s “dubious” state of mind would tend to make Keating’s reader likewise as dubious – all without proving a single assertion. Here are additional comments from December 2010:

**Mr. Wood:** For example, he described the Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina as ”Galileo goes on and on about why heliocentrism does not contradict the Scripture.” That's not exactly correct. Galileo was proposing a hermeneutic in the
Letter, a way of interpreting scripture that made it possible to be a heliocentrist. His argument was far bigger than just "why heliocentrism does not contradict the Scripture."

R. Sungenis: Besides the fact that Mr. Wood is attempting to make a grand conclusion of my views of Galileo from some cursory remark I made in a Power Point display, in actuality, Mr. Wood is making a distinction without a difference, and then using this phantom to make it appear as if I don’t know what I’m talking about. This psychological ploy is typical of my opponents, but I won’t get into that issue right now. Suffice it to say, there is no significant difference between: (a) “Galileo was proposing a hermeneutic… a way of interpreting scripture that made it possible to be a heliocentrist” and (b) the reasons “why heliocentrism does not contradict the Scripture.” In order to accomplish (a) you must first accomplish (b).

I suggest Mr. Wood go back and read Bellarmine’s critique of Galileo’s letter to Christina, as well as his critique of the letter to Castelli. It’s all about Galileo trying to tell Bellarmine that he was not contradicting Scripture, mainly because, as Galileo insisted, Scripture was to be taken figuratively when it spoke about cosmology (except, of course, when Galileo came to Joshua 10:10-14, which he tried to interpret literally by saying that the earth stopped rotating instead of the sun stopped moving, and got himself into quicksand from which he never recovered).

16) You’re All Just a Bunch of Conspiracy Kooks

Keating: page 80: Quoting Wood: “Characterizing scientist as arrogant, deceptive, or purely driven by philosophical bias doesn’t help your case at all. It makes you sound like conspiracy kooks.”

R. Sungenis: We don’t characterize scientists in that way, except when they clearly reveal they are that way. Let me give you two examples. One regarding a philosophical bias against creationism and one regarding a philosophical bias toward geocentrism, *in spite of what the evidence shows*. Here is evolutionist, Richard Lewontin:
We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a-priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that *materialism* is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.\(^{15}\)

Here is physicist Stephen Hawking:

...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.\(^{16}\) 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.\(^{17}\)

17) Almost Gotcha with Those Meteors

**Keating:** pages 83, 85: “Robert C Newman….received his Ph.D. in astrophysics from Cornell University. He has written at least two essays against geocentrism….Newman says that, for

\(^{16}\)*A Brief History of Time*, 1988, p. 42.
\(^{17}\)*A Brief History of Time*, p. 42.
geocentrists who hold to a rotating Earth, the ‘easiest-to-understand problem’ concerns meteors.”

R. Sungenis: I don’t know any modern geocentrists who hold to a rotating Earth model, so Keating has created a strawman.

18) Newman Needs a New Take on Einstein

Keating: pages 85-86: “Newman turns briefly to Einstein’s theory of relativity, saying that geocentrists sometimes argue that the theory indicates that ‘any reference frame is as good as any other, since all are equivalent. Therefore, their Earth-centered reference frame is just as good as a Sun-centered one, and science cannot distinguish between them. Unfortunately, otherwise competent scientists have sometimes said the same thing. But this is not true.’ Newman says that ‘Einstein’s principle of relativity refers to frames of reference which are moving at a constant velocity in a straight line relative to one another. This is not the case with the Sun and Earth, where the relative motion is approximately circular.’ (This is the extent of Newman’s remarks on relativity.)”

R. Sungenis: It’s hard to believe that a Ph.D. in astrophysics from Cornell is making such a facile argument. Einstein has two theories, the Special and the General. That Newman hasn’t made this crucial distinction; and Keating hasn’t caught it, means that neither one is competent to handle the issue.

The Special theory makes the ‘principle of relativity’ refer to “frames of reference which are moving at a constant velocity in a straight line relative to one another,” otherwise known as “inertial frames.” But non-inertial frames are covered by the General theory (e.g., things that move in a circle instead of a straight line), and it is that theory that says, with respect to dynamics, an Earth rotating in a fixed universe is just as valid as a rotating universe around a fixed Earth. Let’s prove this by quoting from both Einstein and one of his colleagues, Max Born:

We need not necessarily trace the existence of these centrifugal forces back to an absolute movement of K' [Earth]; we can
instead just as well trace them back to the rotational movement 
of the distant ponderable masses [stars] in relation to K' whereby 
we treat K' as ‘at rest.’…On the other hand, the following 
important argument speaks for the relativistic perspective. The 
centrifugal force that works on a body under given conditions is 
determined by precisely the same natural constants as the action 
of a gravitational field on the same body (i.e., its mass), in such a 
way that we have no means to differentiate a ‘centrifugal field’ 
from a gravitational field….This quite substantiates the view that 
we may regard the rotating system K' as at rest and the 
centrifugal field as a gravitational field….The kinematic 
equivalence of two coordinate systems, namely, is not restricted 
to the case in which the two systems, K [the universe] and K' 
[the Earth] are in uniform relative translational motion. The 
equivalence exists just as well from the kinematic standpoint 
when for example the two systems rotate relative to one 
another.18

...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.19

19) Come on, Newman. Get With It

Keating: page 86: “Just as police officers can determine 
motorists’ speeds through radar, so speeds of relatively close

18 Einstein’s October 1914 paper titled: “Die formale Grundlage der allgemeinen 
Relativitätstheorie,” trans. by Carl Hoefer, in Mach’s Principle: From Newton’s 
Bucket to Quantum Gravity, eds. Julian Barbour and Herbert Pfister, pp. 69, 71. 
objects such as asteroids and planets can be determined with radar, but the stars are too far away. Nevertheless, says Newman, ‘we can tell something about their motion relative to us by two means…For closer stars we can detect their sideways motion against the background of more distant starts [sic].

**R. Sungenis:** In other words, Newman is claiming that stellar parallax proves the Earth is revolving around the sun. That is categorically false. Newman is apparently unaware that stellar parallax also occurs in the geocentric system, but most astrophysicists today are not aware of the Neo-tychonic model (which has the stars aligned with the sun, and the sun going around the Earth) as opposed to the Tychonic or Ptolemaic models which did not account for parallax.

**20) Doppler is Not So Popular**

**Keating:** page 86: Quoting Newman: “For stars close or far, we can detect their motion towards or away from us by a shift in their frequency of the light they emit, the so-called Doppler shift. We find in each of these motions two components, one due to the motion of the Earth around the Sun (which varies with a year-long period) and another due to the relative motion of the Sun and the particular star (which has no such periodicity). Again, clear evidence that the Earth is moving around the sun.”

**R. Sungenis:** False. The Doppler Effect (or Doppler Shift) was discovered by Christian Doppler in 1842. This effect occurs when the source of wave emission moves closer or farther away from the observer. The waves are compressed when the source moves closer and stretched when the source moves farther away. This phenomenon does not occur, however, when the receiver moves closer or farther away from a stationary source since the waves coming to the receiver are the same in both cases. Light acts in a similar manner. If the source of light is moving closer to the observer, the light waves are compressed or “blue-shifted”; while if the source of light is moving farther away from the observer, the light waves are stretched or “red-shifted.” Heliocentrists have claimed that since the Earth revolves around the sun at about 19 mps, this movement causes the Doppler shift of stars. As one author puts it, “Classical physics, but not Special Relativity,
predicts different Doppler shifts for the source moving versus the observer moving, allowing one to ‘determine’ whether the earth moves or a ‘fixed star’ moves….To conclude, Mach did not consider the difference between the Copernican and Ptolemaic/Brahean systems and the observations falsifying the latter.”

The truth is, however, that the Neo-Tychon geocentric system can easily explain Doppler shift. The Neo-Tychon system has the star field rotating around the Earth on a 1 AU radial hub. As such, on one hemisphere of the star-field the stars will be receding away from the Earth and on the opposite hemisphere the stars will be advancing toward the Earth. Those advancing toward the Earth will create a Doppler blue shift and those receding will create a Doppler red shift.

21) God Forgot to Tell Israel?

Keating: page 87: “Newman concludes his short essay by saying ‘These evidences indicate that there is no validity to the idea that the Earth is the physical center of the universe. We as Christians have a good reason to believe that the Earth has a central place in God’s redemptive plan, but it does not follow from this that our location is central. God warned the nation of Israel not to think that because he had chosen them they were particularly great in themselves. The situation here is similar.’ This is a good point. The ancient nation of Israel was central to God’s plan, but Israel was not centrally located in terms of geography….If the earth is central to God’s plan (and it is), it is because of what the Earth is, not where it is.”

R. Sungenis: Of course God didn’t tell Israel they were centered geographically, since spherical surfaces don’t have centers. But God did say that the Earth doesn’t move and thus everything else in the universe must be revolving around it, and thus the Earth is at or near the geographic center, just as the Fathers of the Church said (as noted above). Keating thinks he is being spiritually mature in not depending on the center for significance (and he might be, IF the Earth were not in the center) but what

---

he doesn’t realize is how spiritually destitute he is when he makes God out to be a liar, for God stated in Scripture that the Earth doesn’t move. This was confirmed by the Fathers, the medievals and the two popes who condemned Galileo, and that truth has never been rescinded by any future pope or council.

22) Betcha Can’t Answer This One

Keating: page 89: “Anyone thinking the cosmos was created thousands of years ago rather than billions of years ago must grapple with the question of how starlight could have reached the Earth in an astronomical twinkling of the eye. Perhaps, ages ago, light move much faster than it does today, and perhaps modern notions of light’s fixed speed are wrong. Newman responds this way: ‘….Einstein’s famous equation E = mc² relates the conversion of matter to energy, where c is the speed of light. If we keep the masses of objects constant but let c be larger by a thousand back in patriarchal times, then the heat output of the sun and of radioactive elements would be a million times….what it is now, frying everything in sight.

NB: Keating has a similar argument about the speed of light and aether on pages 251-252.

R. Sungenis: This is a bogus argument. First, notice that E = mc² is composed of c². Does this mean that light can travel c²? No. So why does the equation use c² if light cannot go that fast? For the same reason Einstein’s General Relativity field equation uses c⁴ in the equation G = 8piGT/c⁴. They do so because they are only showing a relationship between mass and energy, but it has nothing to do with how fast light itself can travel.

Second, according to Einstein’s General Relativity, light can travel at any speed. It is only in the Special theory that light cannot exceed c. To prove this, we will quote from a recognized authority on General Relativity, G.V. Rosser. He writes:

…the restriction u < c = 3 x 10⁸ m/sec is restricted to the theory of Special Relativity. According to the General theory, it is
possible to choose local reference frames in which, over a limited volume of space, there is no gravitational field, and relative to such a reference frame the velocity of light is equal to \( c \). If gravitational fields are present the velocities of either material bodies or of light can assume \textit{any numerical value} depending on the strength of the gravitational field. If one considers the rotating roundabout as being at rest, the centrifugal gravitational field assumes enormous values at large distances, and it is consistent with the theory of General Relativity for the velocities of distant bodies to exceed \( 3 \times 10^8 \text{ m/sec} \) under these conditions.\(^{21}\)

Interestingly enough, in the geocentric universe there are tremendous inertial forces created by a rotating universe. The farther away from Earth, the greater the inertial forces are. The greater the inertial forces, the faster the speed of light can be. Hence, it is no stretch of the imagination to understand that all the stars created on the Fourth Day of Genesis could have their light reach Earth at the same time, since the light of the farther stars would travel faster to Earth than the light of nearer stars, all due to the centrifugal force created by a rotating universe, a universe that started rotating on the Second Day.

23) Stupid Geocentrist Don’t Have Equations

\textbf{Keating:} page 96: “This raises the question why no geocentrist has taken the time to work out the equations for his system.”

\textbf{R. Sungenis:} Equations have been worked out, but Keating doesn’t pay any attention to them. The geocentrist equations are in Chapter 2 of \textit{Galileo Was Wrong}; and the heliocentrists who have worked out geocentric equations are in Chapter 9.

24) Here’s a New One: Aether

\textbf{Keating:} page 97: “For example, all along there has been an easy way to explain the unexpected result of the Michelson-

\footnote{\textit{An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity}, William Geraint Vaughn Rosser, 1964, p. 460. Rosser was the senior lecturer in Physics at Exeter University.}
Morley experiment. That solution is to realize that aether simply does not exist.”

R. Sungenis: If so, then Keating wants us to believe that all the scores of experiments that measured the aether as existing, many with thousands of trials, were simply wrong. That conclusion is hardly likely and Mr. Keating gives no explanation for all the positive results. In reality, the simplest explanation to the Michelson-Morley experiment is that the Earth isn’t moving in space. Let me quote from just two physicists to demonstrate this:

….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.22

….The easiest explanation [of Michelson-Morley] 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.23

But, of course, that would mean Keating would have to admit that that Catholic traditionalists whom he dislikes were right, and his mentor, Albert Einstein, was wrong.

25) What in Carnation Holds up those Pesky Satellites?

Keating: page 105 (also on pages 135-136): “Here is it enough to note that if it is the gravitational force of the stars that holds a motionless satellite in place (whether that force derives from the stars’ mass or from their rotation), there are equally many stars on the other side of the Earth, adding their pull to its tremendous

---

gravitational force. The stars on the one side would seem to cancel out the stars on the other, leaving only the Earth’s gravity to work on the satellite and leaving geocentrists with a difficult to explain manifestation of levitation.”

**R. Sungenis:** Keating fails to realize that since the satellite is closer by at least 22,236 miles to the stars right above it than the stars on the other side of the Earth; and as such, there will be a greater gravitational pull on the satellite by the stars right above. Since in the Newtonian equation \( F = GMm/r^2 \) means that the gravitational force is proportional to the distance, this means that the extra 22,236 miles must be incorporated into the calculation. As such, the pull from one side will be greater than the other side. Surprisingly, on page 137, Keating calls his satellite argument “perhaps the strongest argument against the notion of a motionless Earth,” when, in fact, it is probably his weakest.

26) **Head I Win, Tails You Lose**

**Keating:** page 109: “Geocentrist commonly allege that evidence in favor of heliocentrism equally can be used to prove geocentrism, if only the equations are inverted. Evidence for one cancels out evidence for the other. This isn’t true, but this claim is proof that they believe scientific evidence exists—for both sides. Based on the science alone, they say, either side could be right. To determine which in fact is right, we must turn to Scripture.”

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Keating says “it’s not true.” So why did Einstein, Born, and the whole modern science establishment say it is true? Let’s repeat Einstein’s and Born’s words once again:

We need not necessarily trace the existence of these centrifugal forces back to an absolute movement of K’ [Earth]; we can instead just as well trace them back to the rotational movement of the distant ponderable masses [stars] in relation to K' whereby we treat K' as ‘at rest.’…On the other hand, the following important argument speaks for the relativistic perspective. The centrifugal force that works on a body under given conditions is determined by precisely the same natural constants as the action
of a gravitational field on the same body \(i.e.,\) its mass), in such a way that we have no means to differentiate a ‘centrifugal field’ from a gravitational field….This quite substantiates the view that we may regard the rotating system \(K'\) as at rest and the centrifugal field as a gravitational field….The kinematic equivalence of two coordinate systems, namely, is not restricted to the case in which the two systems, \(K\) [the universe] and \(K'\) [the Earth] are in uniform relative translational motion. The equivalence exists just as well from the kinematic standpoint when for example the two systems rotate relative to one another.\(^{24}\)

...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.\(^{25}\)

27) It’s a Miracle Karl Didn’t Muck This Up Even Worse

**Keating:** pages 114-115: “To sum up: there is good evidence, even if not conclusive to an anti-miraculist, for the Miracle of the Sun at Fatima. The people present in that field thought they saw the Sun moving erratically through the sky, but the event was local. It did not involve the actual displacement of the Sun, though observers imagined it did. Likewise, the event involving Joshua could have been local; the Sun in that instance also would have had an apparent but not actual displacement. If understood


this way, ‘Joshua’s long day’ tells us nothing whatsoever about the relative motion of the Earth and Sun.”

**R. Sungenis:** What we gather from this hypothetical description is that Keating has a penchant for minimizing the miraculous, which is common among most liberals. It started in Europe in the late 1700s in “The Quest for the Historical Jesus,” and was later imbibed by liberal Catholics in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and has spread today in most Catholic academic institutions. Suffice it to say, neither the Fathers nor the tradition of the Catholic Church has ever described the events in Joshua 10 as Keating attempts to do above. They understood it precisely as the text says, namely, the sun and moon stopped moving for a whole day. Of course, Keating’s objective is not merely to minimize the miraculous, but minimize the possibility that the sun goes around a fixed Earth. In any case, what was seen of the sun at Fatima’s Cova da Iria was real and seen by many thousands of witnesses, but the rest of the world was blinded to it, just as the witnesses were blinded to Our Lady’s appearance. What was seen in Joshua 10 was also real. Either the rest of the world was blinded to it, or it may have been seen in various foreign countries since there are various reports from many parts of the world of a similar phenomenon.

28) **Okay, One More Time: Does Aether Exist or Not?**

**Keating:** page 117: “The problem for Bouw is that there is no evidence that this plenum aether, which he identifies with the firmament of Genesis, exists...It is special pleading and nothing more.”

**R. Sungenis:** Keating apparently doesn’t know quantum mechanics, for it holds that nature requires a substance, a plenum, that is far smaller than atomic particles. Quantum mechanics holds that those particles are in the

---

26 Avelino de Almeida, writing for O Século, Portugal's most widely circulated and influential newspaper that was pro-government and anti-clerical at the time, and from which Almeida's previous articles had been to satirize Fátima, stated:"Before the astonished eyes of the crowd, whose aspect was biblical as they stood bare-headed, eagerly searching the sky, the sun trembled, made sudden incredible movements outside all cosmic laws — the sun 'danced' according to the typical expression of the people." (source: Wikipedia).
Planck dimensions. Even Einstein, Keating’s mentor, believed in aether. Here is a quote from his 1920 book:

Recapitulating, we may say that according to the general theory of relativity, space is endowed with physical qualities; in this sense, therefore, there exists an ether. According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense. But this ether may not be thought of as endowed with the quality characteristic of ponderable media, as consisting of parts which may be tracked through time. The idea of motion may not be applied to it.\(^{27}\)

Interestingly enough, a “non-ponderable media” is precisely what Bouw is presenting with his “plenum aether.” Keating is oblivious to it because he’s never studied it.

In the late 1920s, Paul R. Heyl posed a different yet related question to Einstein:

…Einstein pointed out that there might be no such thing as gravitational force any more than there is a centrifugal force; that both may be considered as manifestations of inertia aided in the case of gravitation by curved space acting much like a mechanical surface of constraint. For this reason it is sometimes said that the theory of relativity has done away with the ether. I hardly think that is a fair statement…[I]f relativity ignores the ether, does it not introduce what is to all intents and purposes its equivalent? The ether was supposed to be a medium filling all space that otherwise would be empty. Einstein supposes space itself to be enough of an entity to have a curvature, and to be “empty” only where and when it is flat. But if space can be bent

http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ether_and_the_Theory_of_Relativity
and can straighten out again, why can it not repeat this process with sufficient rapidity to be called a vibration? And what difference does it make whether it is space itself that vibrates, or something that fills space? Back in every one of our heads is the idea that there is something which philosophers call a “thing-in-itself” which is responsible for our sensations of light and electricity; and whether we spell it ETHER or SPACE, what does it matter?²⁸

As 1993 Nobel Prize winner, Robert Laughlin, puts it:

It is ironic that Einstein’s most creative work, the general theory of relativity, should boil down to conceptualizing space as a medium when his original premise was that no such medium existed…. Einstein…utterly rejected the idea of ether and inferred from its nonexistence that the equations of electromagnetism had to be relative. But this same thought process led in the end to the very ether he had first rejected, albeit one with some special properties that ordinary elastic matter does not have. The word “ether” has extremely negative connotations in theoretical physics because of its past association with opposition to relativity. This is unfortunate because, stripped of these connotations, it rather nicely captures the way most physicists actually think about the vacuum.

And he concludes with this important paragraph:

It turns out that such matter exists. About the time relativity was becoming accepted, studies of radioactivity began showing that the empty vacuum of space had spectroscopic structure similar to that of ordinary quantum solids and fluids. Subsequent studies with large particle accelerators have now led us to understand that space is more like a piece of window glass than ideal Newtonian emptiness. It is filled with “stuff” that is normally transparent but can be made visible by hitting it sufficiently hard.

to knock out a part. The modern concept of the vacuum of space, confirmed every day by experiment, is a relativistic ether. But we do not call it this because it is taboo.²⁹

Here is an article from the famous physicist Paul C. W. Davies. In a 2001 article for *New Scientist* titled “Liquid Space.” It speaks about the same thing Dr. Bouw speaks of.

See print version for photo on this page

IS SPACE just space? Or is it filled with some sort of mysterious, intangible substance? The ancient Greeks believed so, and so did scientists in the 19th century. Yet by the early part of the 20th century, the idea had been discredited and seemed to have gone for good.

Now, however, quantum physics is casting new light on this murky subject. Some of the ideas that fell from favour are creeping back into modern thought, giving rise to the notion of a quantum ether. This surprising revival is affording new insights into the nature of motion through space, the deep interconnectedness of the Universe, and the possibility of time travel. Ingenious new experiments may even allow us to detect the quantum ether in the lab, or harness it for technological purposes.

If so, we'll have answered a question that has troubled philosophers and scientists for millennia. In the 5th century BC, Leucippus and Democritus concluded that the physical universe was made of tiny particles, atoms, moving in a void. Impossible, countered the followers of Parmenides. A void implies nothingness, and if two atoms were separated

²⁹ Robert B. Laughlin, *A Different Universe: Reinventing Physics from the Bottom Down*, 2005, pp. 120-121. The two chapters of Laughlin’s book that deal with these issues are: “The Nuclear Family,” (pp. 99-116 and “The Fabric of Space-Time” (pp. 117-126). Laughlin can speak so boldly about ether and not be afraid of suffering chastisement because, as one author notes: “…the impression of suggesting an ether theory is carefully avoided, because such can still be career suicide. Only physicists who were established beyond reproach could discuss ether-like aspects openly, like George Chapline, Gerd ’t Hooft, Robert Laughlin, or Frank Wilczek, just to alphabetically list a few who did. Today, we finally witness the dams breaking and ever more people dare to ‘come out.’” Sascha Vongehr, “Supporting Abstract Relational Space-Time as Fundamental without Doctrinism Against Emergence,” Nanjing University, China, Dec. 2009, p. 2.
by nothing, then they would not be separated at all, they would be touching. So space cannot exist unless it is filled with something, a substance they called the plenum.

If the plenum exists, it must be quite unlike normal matter. For example, Isaac Newton's laws of motion state that a body moving through empty space with no forces acting on it will go on moving in the same way. So the plenum cannot exert a frictional drag, indeed, if it did, the Earth would slow down in its orbit and spiral in towards the Sun.

Nevertheless, Newton himself was convinced that space was some kind of substance. He noted that any body rotating in a vacuum, a planet spinning in space, for example, experiences a centrifugal force. The Earth bulges slightly at the equator as a result. But truly empty space has no landmarks against which to gauge rotation. So, thought Newton, there must be something invisible lurking there to provide a frame of reference. This something, reacting back on the rotating body, creates the centrifugal force.

The 17th century German philosopher Gottfried Leibniz disagreed. He believed that all motion is relative, so rotation can only be gauged by reference to distant matter in the Universe. We know the Earth is spinning because we see the stars go round. Take away the rest of the Universe, Leibniz said, and there would be no way to tell if the Earth was rotating, and hence no centrifugal force.

The belief that space is filled with some strange, tenuous stuff was bolstered in the 19th century. Michael Faraday and James Clerk Maxwell considered electric and magnetic fields to be stresses in some invisible material medium, which became known as the luminiferous ether. Maxwell believed electromagnetic waves such as light to be vibrations in the ether. And the idea that we are surrounded and interpenetrated by a sort of ghostly jelly appealed to the spiritualists of the day, who concocted the notion that we each have an etheric body as well as a material one.

But when Albert Michelson and Edward Morley tried to measure how fast the Earth is moving through the ether, by comparing the speed of light signals going in different directions, the answer they got was zero.

An explanation came from Albert Einstein: the ether simply doesn't exist, and Earth's motion can be considered only relative to other material bodies, not to space itself. In fact, no experiment can determine a body's speed through space, since uniform motion is purely relative, he said.

Sounds OK so far, but there was one complication: acceleration. If you are in an aeroplane flying steadily, you can't tell that you're moving relative to the ground unless you look out of the window, just as Einstein asserted. You can pour a drink and sip it as comfortably as if you were at rest in your living room. But if the plane surges ahead or slows suddenly,
you notice at once because your drink slops about. So although uniform motion is relative, acceleration appears to be absolute: you can detect it without reference to other bodies.

Einstein wanted to explain this inertial effect what we might commonly call g-forces using the ideas of the Austrian philosopher Ernst Mach. Like Leibniz, Mach believed that all motion is relative, including acceleration. According to Mach, the slopping of your drink in the lurching aeroplane is attributable to the influence of all the matter in the Universe an idea that became known as Mach's principle. Einstein warmed to the idea that the gravitational field of the rest of the Universe might explain centrifugal and other inertial forces resulting from acceleration.

However, when in 1915 Einstein finished formulating his general theory of relativity —a theory of space, time and gravitation he was disappointed to find that it did not incorporate Mach's principle. Indeed, mathematician Kurt Gödel showed in 1948 that one solution to Einstein's equations describes a universe in a state of absolute rotation, something that is impossible if rotation can only be relative to distant matter. So if acceleration is not defined as relative to distant matter, what is it relative to? Some new version of the ether?

In 1976 I began investigating what quantum mechanics might have to say. According to quantum field theory, the vacuum has some strange properties. Heisenberg's uncertainty principle implies that even in empty space, subatomic particles such as electrons and photons are constantly popping into being from nowhere, then fading away almost immediately. This means that the quantum vacuum is a seething frolic of evanescent "virtual particles".

Although these particles lack the permanence of normal matter, they can still have a physical influence. For example, a pair of mirrors arranged facing one another extremely close together will feel a tiny force of attraction, even in a perfect vacuum, because of the way the set-up affects the behaviour of the virtual photons. This has been confirmed in many experiments.

So clearly the quantum vacuum resembles the ether, in the sense that there's more there than just nothing. But what exactly is the new version of the ether like? You might think that a real particle such as an electron moving in this sea of virtual particles would have to batter its way through, losing energy and slowing down as it goes. Not so. Like the ether of old, the quantum vacuum exerts no frictional drag on a particle with constant velocity.

But it's a different story with acceleration. The quantum vacuum does affect accelerating particles. For example, an electron circling an atom is
jostled by virtual photons from the vacuum, leading to a slight but measurable shift in its energy.

And according to my 1976 calculations, an observer accelerating through empty space should see themselves surrounded by electromagnetic radiation, like that from a hot object. The stronger the acceleration, the hotter the radiation.

Later that year, William Unruh at the University of British Columbia reached a similar conclusion by considering how the quantum vacuum might affect an accelerating particle detector. Unruh's method was readily adaptable to rotational acceleration, and calculations revealed that a rotating detector in a vacuum would also see radiation. Could this heat radiation be the ether glowing?

To find out for sure, we would have to actually observe the radiation. However, the effect is tiny: to register a temperature of just 1 kelvin requires an acceleration of about 1021 g. Accelerating a physicist so severely is hardly a practical proposition. But maybe we could subject a subatomic particle to such violence. Last month, Daniel Vanzella and George Matsas of the State University in São Paulo, caused a stir by pointing out that if the radiation effect exists, it could cause a proton to do something that would never happen otherwise. A rapidly accelerated proton would absorb energy from the surrounding radiation and turn into a neutron, creating a positron neutrino in the process. But achieving such enormous accelerations is extremely difficult, even with a proton.

So is there a gentler way? In the 1970s, Stephen Fulling and I, then working at King's College London, investigated how the quantum vacuum would be disturbed by a moving mirror. We found that, as with a moving particle, there was no effect if the mirror moves at a constant velocity. Somewhat to our puzzlement, the same turned out to be true for a uniformly accelerating mirror. However, a mirror that changes its acceleration, by wiggling back and forth, say, excites the quantum vacuum and creates real photons. It might be possible to amplify this moving-mirror radiation by using a resonant cavity with vibrating walls. Marc-Thierry Jaekel, Astrid Lambrecht and Serge Reynaud of the University of Paris, Jussieu, described such an experiment earlier this year. They showed that the resonant oscillations not only amplify the radiation, they mean that it is emitted in sharply peaked bursts, helping to make it distinctive. The unsolved problem is how to shake the cavity violently enough while keeping it very cold, so that heat radiation doesn't swamp the still faint signal.

There could be a way to feel the ether more directly. Theory predicts that the quantum vacuum behaves in some ways like a viscous fluid. According to general relativity, a gravitational field is just a distortion of
the geometry of space-time. And it turns out that bending space puts a strain on the quantum ether. If this strain changes with time, you get friction. Leonard Parker discovered in the late 1960s that an expanding or contracting Universe would create particles out of a pure vacuum. In effect, the stretching of space jiggles up some of the virtual particles and turns them into real particles.

At about the same time, Unruh and Alexei Starobinskii of Moscow University predicted a similar effect near black holes. They showed that if a black hole (which is actually just highly warped empty space) rotates, it emits quantum particles and glows. The quantum ether provides a neat way to explain this. As the hole rotates, it drags the ether around with it. The dragging effect is fiercer closer to the hole, so the ether is sheared, which heats it and makes it glow. Unfortunately the glow is so faint that no readily foreseeable telescope will be able to capture it.

Luckily, you don't need a black hole to observe ether friction. In 1997, John Pendry of Imperial College, London, showed that a mirror sliding sideways parallel to another mirror facing it should experience friction even in a vacuum, because the virtual photons sandwiched between the parallel plates would heat up the mirror surfaces. This heat energy can come only from the kinetic energy of the plates, which would therefore be slowed down.

The same would apply to a single atom moving near a metal surface. So in theory, an atom dropped down the exact centre of a vertical metal pipe should reach a terminal velocity as it ploughs through the viscous quantum vacuum, just like a ball bearing dropped into oil. With advances in cold-atom optics, such an experiment might be feasible in the near future.

Yet even if we could detect the quantum ether as dramatically as this, all the effects I have described so far are weak. None of them has a powerful influence on the Universe, so you might think the quantum ether is just a minor curiosity. But some physicists think the very opposite is true.

Bernard Haisch of the California Institute for Physics and Astrophysics in Palo Alto and his colleagues have calculated the effect of the quantum vacuum on an accelerating charged particle, and claim that it mimics the effect of mass (New Scientist, 3 February, p 22). This, says Haisch, is the true origin of inertia, and solves the old conundrum about acceleration and relative motion. Put bluntly, your drink slops when an aircraft lurches because the quantum vacuum pushes against the accelerating atoms. Although few scientists have so far accepted this claim, the possibility is tantalising.
And there is a curious pointer to something deeper. Quantum physics is famed for its "non-locality": the fact that it is not possible to characterise the physical situation at a point in space without reference to the state of the system in the wider surroundings. The quantum vacuum is no exception, since its state is defined across all of space. This enables it to "feel" the structure of the entire Universe, and thereby to link the global and the local in precisely the manner that Mach had in mind. This nonlocality hints at a possible connection between local physics and distant matter in the Universe—a connection that could be mediated by the quantum ether. Among other things, it could explain why we share an absolute frame of acceleration with the distant stars.

This is not the ether of Maxwell. Rather than being the medium that transmits light, it is made of light, virtual photons and other virtual particles. Nor is it the plenum. The Greek philosophers' original argument against the void has lost much of its force, because physicists today have little difficulty imagining the concept of empty space. But now they question whether space itself is truly fundamental. Perhaps space as we know it is a special configuration of a deeper quantum entity, the properties of which we can only guess at. Far from abhorring a vacuum, nature may have worked very hard to create one.30

29) Keating Should Bow Before Bouw

Keating: page 117: “There are two points that Bouw does not address. He thinks the Earth is motionless, with the entire universe revolving around it each day. He fails to note that this is equivalent to the universe being motionless with the Earth rotating on its axis each day. There is no way to distinguish one situation from the other. This alternative understanding with the Earth rotating and the universe not, removes any need to consider what happens if a body exceeds the speed of light.”

R. Sungenis: This paragraph shows that Keating does not know his own or his opponent’s position. Dr. Bouw certainly knows that both systems are equivalent. He has consistently used this fact to show that no one can discredit geocentrism. Keating is apparently oblivious to the fact that the limit of the speed of light is only applicable to Special Relativity, where there are no gravitational or inertial forces. In General Relativity, light and material objects (including the stars going around a fixed Earth) can go

any speed, due to the presence of gravity and inertial forces. We already saw this fact above from G. V. Rosser’s book on General Relativity.

30) Does the Plenum Drag Stuff?

Keating, pages 117-118: “The other point that Bouw does not address is that if, as he says, the plenum drags along the distant stars, it also should drag along planets, comets, and other objects relatively near to us, but in his telling these bodies travel through the plenum without interference. This suggests that the distant plenum has one set of properties while the near plenum has another. How could that be, if the plenum is uniform throughout space? The discrepancy cannot be accounted for by the size of the object. Bouw would not say that small objects—planet-sized and below—can travel unimpeded through the plenum while massive objects such as stars are pulled along it. If that were so, star would find themselves stripped of their planets.”

R. Sungenis: Keating totally misconstrues what Bouw is saying. The plenum is the same throughout the universe. In fact, the plenum is the universe, and the stars and planets are just pin-pricks, as it were, in the plenum. As such, as the plenum rotates each day around the Earth, it will carry all the stars, and their planets, with it. The plenum permeates all things and thus will carry all things when it moves. It’s the same with leaves moving in a river. When the river moves, the leaves move with it. Perhaps a better example is an airliner that carries passengers. Wherever the plane goes, the passengers go. They have no choice. Likewise, two boys can have a catch with a baseball on a passenger plane that is taking them from LA to NY. However, just as passengers may get up from their seat and walk in the fuselage, so stars and planets can have independent movement in the plenum. This is why planets can revolve around their stars due to gravity and inertial forces between the star and planet.

31) My Income is Better than Your Income

Keating: page 145: “In recent years, Robert Sungenis has been listed on IRS Form 990 only as an independent contractor, not as an employee. On the return for 2010, for example, his ‘type of
service’ is given as ‘consulting, writing, managing,’ with his compensation as $168,560.”

R. Sungenis: Keating has played this game concerning incomes for many years. A few years ago I initiated an email exchange about it since Keating was obviously misrepresenting my income and failing to divulge the true nature of his own. Although my income is listed as $168,550 on the 2010 Form 990, that is before business expenses. After business expenses, my income is around $100,000 – the same Keating paid Tim Staples and Jimmy Akin. With that income I had to support eleven children, some of them in college. At the present time, I still support eight of my eleven children.

Mr. Keating, on the other hand, has taken over $250,000 from Catholic Answers for many years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income on 990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$256,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$266,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$235,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$266,532³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$252,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$236,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average over these six years is $252,000. Not too shabby for a man with no small children at home to support and no personal business expenses listed. In other words, if we include business expenses, Mr. Keating makes 2.5 times the income I make, and I have a wife, eight children and two dogs to support!

32) Gee, Only a $1,000 Geocentric Challenge?

Keating: pages 148-149: “….This is reminiscent of a challenge made in 2002 by Robert Sungenis. ‘[CAI] will write a check for $1,000 to the first person who can prove that the Earth revolves around the Sun….What is a bit surprising is why Sungenis failed

³¹ Why his income for 2010 is identical to the income of 2012 is certainly a mystery.
to increased [sic] the size of the prize….A more generous prize may have induced more people to participate and thus made for a more interesting contest. Sungenis need not have worried about having to mortgage his home because he, as the sole judge, knew a priori that any submitted argument would be declared insufficient because his theory of the Earth’s immobility was, in his mind, itself immovable.”

R. Sungenis: Throughout his book Keating makes it appear as if he knows what his opponent is thinking and what his motivations are. He then creates innuendos and insinuations from those speculations in an attempt to assassinate the character of his opponent. He is wrong every time, and this time is no exception. The very reason I made the challenge for $1,000 and not $10,000 is that, if I lost, I knew I could not afford to pay $10,000, but could easily pay $1,000. Hence, I had to balance out the desire to “induce more people to participate” against what I could afford to pay if I lost. This necessarily means that it was not the case that I “knew a priori that any submitted argument would be declared insufficient because his theory of the Earth’s immobility was, in his mind, itself immovable.” As such, Keating just defeated his own argument, yet he is numb enough to his own mistakes that he probably doesn’t recognize it.

33) My Scripture is Better Than Your Scripture

Keating: page 159: “This is a danger that Gerhardus Bouw and, like him, Gordon Bane see not at all. They cobble together every scriptural passage that might be construed in any way, poetic or otherwise, as having a reference to the cosmos. They don’t allow poetry to be poetry or everyday expressions, such as ‘the Sun sets,’ to be anything other than oracles of science, though even those who fervently hold to heliocentrism speak in terms of the Sun and the Moon rising and setting.”

R. Sungenis: This is a mischaracterization of Bouw’s treatment of Scripture. All geocentrists know that phrases such as “the sun sets” have a metaphorical or phenomenological dimension to them for the mere fact that the sun doesn’t actually “set” in either the geocentric or heliocentric systems. In both systems the sun only appears to set, since it is seen by the
Earthly observer against the background of the Earth’s horizon. As such, when Bouw or any other geocentrist appeals to “sun setting” passages as scriptural evidence for geocentrism, it is only because, of the two ways to make a sunset, that is, the heliocentrist or geocentrist way, only one can be right. Either the Earth rotates and makes it appear as if the sun is setting (as in the heliocentric system), or the sun is actually moving around a fixed Earth (as in the geocentric system). Since the phrase “the sun sets” implies that the sun is moving rather than the Earth rotating, geocentrists use the phrase for that purpose.

As regards “poetry,” contrary to the impression Keating wants to portray, geocentrists appreciate very much the poetical and metaphorical language of Scripture. For example, when Psalm 19:4-5 speaks of the sun as “bridegroom coming out of his chamber,” this is certainly metaphorical or poetical language. But one must also see that this metaphorical language is being used to enhance the reality of the sun’s movement around the Earth, not dilute or deny it.

In short, just because the language is put in poetical form doesn’t make it any less true than if it were put in prose form. In fact, putting it in poetical form may be for the express purpose to emphasize the reality in a way that prose does not have the capability. If the fact that the sun revolves around the Earth has already been established by the historical narratives of Scripture (e.g., Joshua 10:10-14), then the poetical passages of Scripture that speak of the sun moving around the Earth must be taken as factual statements albeit with an enhanced description for literary effect (e.g., “as a man running a race”). This is certainly true of the Psalms where most of the geocentric passages occur. In fact, Psalms is the most quoted book in the New Testament for verification of historical and doctrinal truth, even though every Psalm is a Hebrew poem.

34) Danny Dances Around Psalm 93

Keating: page 161: “More to the point, Faulkner faults Bouw’s argument that verses such as Psalm 93:1 indicate that the world does not move. ‘These passages declare that the world is not to be moved’ by ‘an external or causative agent to bring about change in position,’ such as moving the Earth out of its orbit.
The phrasing ‘does not exclude the possibility of motion apart from an external agent.’ In other words, Psalm 93:1 and like passages does not exclude Earth’s orbiting the Sun or its diurnal rotation.”

**R. Sungenis:** But why would there be a need to “exclude” an orbiting or turning Earth if no biblical passage has ever included it? What Keating just did above was very clever. He plants in the reader’s mind that an orbiting Earth is a possibility as far as Scripture is concerned. But it is not, since Scripture, in all of its 73 books written over 1500 years by dozens of different authors, never says that the Earth moves around the sun or rotates on an axis. Not even a hint.

Although the comparison between the strength of God and the stability of the world is quite evident in Psalm 93, there are very few options available regarding the meaning of the “establishment of the world” if one seeks to make a legitimate comparison to God. The world cannot refer to the political machinations of the nations, for they shift quite frequently. It could not refer to the whole universe, since if the universe were moved, to where would it move? The best way the Psalmist’s analogy can have its intended effect is if an object exists that is unmoved in the midst of all other objects that are moving. For example, if the Psalmist were referring to an unmoving Earth, then the image displayed by Ps 93:1 would be most accurate, for the Earth would be the only body at rest in the midst of a sea of moving bodies in the heavens. The Earth would be the only foundation point; the only immovable object, and thus the best example to picture of the immutability of God himself. More to the point is that Ps 93:2 adds that God’s throne is also “established.” Logically, if his throne does not move then the world cannot move. The intended imagery would be

---

32 Ps 93:1 and 93:2 use the same Hebrew word for “established,” the word יֹס ה (kun), which appears over a hundred times in the Old Testament in most of the Hebrew tenses. In vr. 1 it is utilized in the Niphal imperfect and in vr. 2 in the Niphal participle, which is the simplest of the passive tenses. Although kun includes the concept of an original founding date (e.g., “the building was established in 1955”), it also includes the concept of stability and longevity (e.g., “the rock of Gibraltar was established”). Kun also refers to rest or immobility (Jg 16:26: “and Samson said to the lad who held him by the hand, ‘Let me feel the pillars on which the house rests’”; 16:29: “And Samson grasped the two middle pillars upon which the house rested”; Er 3:3: “They set the altar in its place”).
identical to passages that call the Earth the “Lord’s footstool,” since footstools are understood to be at rest, not moving.\textsuperscript{33}

Some might object that the phrase “shall never be moved” could also be translated as “shall never be shaken.” If that is the case, then one could argue that a “shaking of the world” could have some political overtones. This might be true, except for the fact that the political systems of the world are inherently unstable, and thus they would not make a good comparison in displaying the strength and throne of God almighty. Conversely, the physical world, marked as it is by times and seasons that have been repeating themselves in exact precision for eons, is the only possible “world” that could be compared to the infinite stability of God.

In actuality, if the proper translation were “shaken” rather than “moved,” this would only enhance the imagery of an immobile Earth, for this interpretation would require that the Earth be so firm in its position that it would not only be prohibited from rotating or revolving, but it would also be prohibited from shaking. As we learned in the science portion of this work, the Earth is held in space by the combined torque of the whole universe. To move the Earth would require that it overcome the combined torque of the universe. Consequently, we can see why this particular Hebrew word (\textit{mōht}) for “move” or “shaken” was chosen, since it includes the Earth’s resistance to even the slightest outside movement.\textsuperscript{34} If vibration

\textsuperscript{33} Is 66:1; Mt 5:35. In all of these passages the notion of “rest” for the Lord’s footstool is emphasized: Is 66:1: “Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool; what is the house which you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest?”; 1Ch 28:2: “I had it in my heart to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and for the footstool of our God”; Ps 132:7-8: “Let us go to his dwelling place; let us worship at his footstool! Arise, O Lord, and go to thy resting place, thou and the ark of thy might” (see also Ac 7:49). “Rest,” of course, refers to motionlessness, which is appropriate in the Earth’s case only if it is not moving through space.

\textsuperscript{34} Hebrew: מָה (\textit{mōht}) appears 39 times in the Old Testament, 20 in the Psalms. The Qal form appears 13 times, 23 times in the Niphal, and one each in the Hiphil and Hithpael. It can refer to things as simple as slipping with the foot (Dt 32:35; Ps 17:5; 38:16-17) to moving the earth (Ps 82:5; Is 24:19). \textit{Mōht}, in the physical sense, refers to the transition from a state of rest to a state of movement; in the figurative sense, from a state of stability to a state of instability. Of all the words in Hebrew referring to movement (\textit{e.g., rōf, šañ, nōš, rōbō, tōp, et al}) מָה, מָה, מָה, מָה, מָה, מָה, מָה,
occurs, it will occur within the internal structure of the Earth but not with respect to the Earth’s position in space. In fact, the reason earthquakes occur is that the internal movements within the Earth are rubbing against the external forces that are keeping the Earth immobile in space.

The only other detail of Ps 93:1-2 regards the meaning and usage of the word “world.” As it stands, the Hebrew consistently uses the term in reference to the earth, not the universe at large. Hence, it is the Earth alone that is kept immobile, not the universe.

35) Danny Does Parallax

Keating: pages 163-165: “Faulkner than turns to two key scientific matter, parallax and star streaming…Faulkner admits that Bouw is correct in noting ‘that the failure to detect stellar parallax was an argument against the heliocentric model.’ Like geocentrists of the seventeenth century, Bouw says this is at least an indirect argument in favor of geocentrism. True, but the later discovery of stellar parallax, says Faulkner, equally should be regarded as substantiation of heliocentrism. That later discovery did not occur until 1838….Faulkner says Bouw tries to get around this by modifying his version of the Tychonian model ‘so that the Sun in its annul motion drags along the distant stars.’ It is not clear how the Sun, which is not a large star, manages to move stars that are incredibly distant and, many of them, immensely larger than itself.”

R. Sungenis: Since this is all Keating has to say about stellar parallax, I will deal with it as it is. As such, it is one of the most horrendous

(mōht) is used when any, even the slightest movement, is in view. Hence, it can refer to a shaking or vibration as well as a change of location.

Hebrew: הַבָּלָה (tebel) appears 38 times in the Old Testament. It is often a poetic synonym of עָרֶץ (erets) referring to the “earth” (e.g., 1Sm 2:8; Ps 33:8; 77:18; 90:2; Is 34:1; Lm 4:12), but in non-poetic contexts it sometimes has a larger focus than the physical world and may include the more abstract notions associated with existence, such as the totality of human consciousness (e.g., Is 24:4; 26:9). In the non-poetic passages that tebel is used without erets, tebel always refers to the earth or that which is inhabited by mankind (e.g., 2Sm 22:16; Is 13:11; 14:17, 21; 18:3), not to the universe at large.
treatments of stellar parallax I’ve ever seen. No geocentrist believes that the “sun drags the distant stars.” The sun has no more power to “drag” the stars than a flea has of dragging an elephant. That is a pure misrepresentation by both Faulkner and Keating. Neo-Tychonic geocentrism holds that the sun is aligned with the stars, that is, they both move in the same direction at the same time, the sun acting as the geometric center to the stars. The sun, in turn, moves around the fixed Earth. As such, the same parallax seen in the heliocentric system is seen in the geocentric. As noted by notes from the Univ. of Illinois:

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. 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.36

36) Danny Does Star Streaming

Keating: page 165: “Faulkner then turns to star streaming…. ‘When the proper motion of many stars are considered, we find that stars seem to stream out of a region called the solar apex,

---

presumably in the direction in which the Sun is moving. Conversely, stars appear to stream toward a convergent point, called the solar antepex, diametrically opposed from the solar apex and presumed to be the direction from which the Sun is moving. This would appear to be strong evidence that neither the Sun nor the Earth is the center of the universe, but Bouw baldly asserts that stars could be moving past the Sun rather than the other way around.’

**R. Sungenis:** This is all either Faulkner or Keating says on star streaming, so I will deal with it as it is. Keating gives no affirmation or negation of Faulkner’s view, probably because he doesn’t understand it. If Bouw is wrong, neither Keating nor Faulkner tell us why he is wrong, since “baldly asserts” is not a critique. Star streaming is dealt with in my book, *Galileo Was Wrong*, but Keating decided not to address it. Be that as it may, star-streaming is the optical phenomenon occurring when stars seem either to spread apart from each other or come closer together. It is analogous to a person riding in a car that is parallel to a forest and noticing that as the car moves, the trees seem to spread apart from each other, while other trees seem to come closer together. It is an optical illusion that is caused by the relative movement between the objects and the observer. In 1783 William Herschel discovered that the sun appears to move through the stars. He isolated thirteen such stars and found that as the sun moved through them they were spreading apart from a point in the constellation Hercules. He then isolated thirty-six stars and found similar results. Friedrich Argelander, an assistant to Friedrich Bessel, found similar results with 390 stars in 1830. In 1842 Otto Struve confirmed the results. As in the case of parallax discovered in 1838, these star-streaming results were invariably touted as proof of the heliocentric system. In reality it provides no proof at all. The reason is simple. The optical illusion of the separation of the stars can be caused either by the Earth moving past the stars or the stars moving past a fixed Earth. Both will produce the phenomenon of star-streaming.

37) The Dullness of Occam’s Razor

**Keating:** page 166: “In his conclusion, Faulkner writes that the adoption of the heliocentric theory was a result of the application of Occam’s razor….The principle holds that, among competing
hypotheses, the one requiring the fewest assumption should be preferred, all else being equal. ‘The Sun-centered system was far simpler than the primary geocentric model, the Ptolemaic system…Copernicus and Galileo believed that a simpler model glorified God, who is ‘simple’….But, says Faulkner, later phenomena, ‘such as aberration of starlight and trigonometric parallax are better explained in the heliocentric model rather than [in] any geocentric theory.’”

R. Sungenis: First, the whole premise of Occam’s razor is a shaky one. Sometimes a simple system is the best one; sometimes a simple system is not able to account for all the variables. It is presumptuous, then, to make a rule that the simplest system is the true system. If that were the case, then Copernicus’ first model of heliocentrism should have been the reality, since it was very simple – planets going around the sun in perfect circles. But Copernicus found out to his dismay that planetary orbits were not simple, and he ended up having to put in 48 epicycles to even come close to the 40-epicycle system of Ptolemy.

Second, since neither Faulkner nor Keating present the geocentric understanding of stellar aberration, how can they make a convincing argument that it is more complicated than the heliocentric version? We are apparently supposed to take their subjective judgment that it is. But in reality, it is not complicated, and I doubt very much that Keating even knows what it is. Stellar aberration has the same cause as stellar parallax in the geocentric system. That is, both aberration and parallax are created due to the fact that the sun is the center of the star field and is going around a fixed Earth. We present animations of both on our CDROM available for purchase.

38) Danny Does Ductile on Hard Issues

Keating: p. 170: “…Bouw says of Faulkner’s article that ‘it is very shallow and often misrepresents geocentrists, the history of the Copernican Revolution, its evidences, and the authority of Scripture. It fails to deal with any of the hard issues.’ Any of the hard issues? It deals with parallax and star streaming, among
others. If these are not consider [sic] among the ‘hard issues,’
Bouw fails to indicate which topics qualify for that label.”

R. Sungenis: I can testify to Bouw’s critique of Faulkner’s article. For
having a Ph.D. in astronomy, Faulkner’s is one of the poorest attempts at
trying to discredit geocentrism I have ever seen. If that is the best that
Creation Research Institute has to offer, geocentrism has a long life ahead
of it. We already saw one case in which Bouw’s criticism of Faulkner was
evident, namely, when Faulkner claimed that Bouw believes the sun
“drags the stars.” The irony of Keating’s remarks is that he regards
parallax and star streaming as “hard issues,” which can only mean that
either Keating doesn’t know what the hard issues are or is afraid to deal
with them, and that is noted by the way he has cherry-picked both Bouw’s
book and my book. Be that as it may, parallax and star streaming are not
“hard issues.” I explained them very easily from the geocentric side.

39) Danny and Karl Dance in the Moon Light

Keating: p. 170: “Bouw says that Faulkner and others ‘are not
above erecting straw men and knocking them down.’ As an
example, he points to Faulkner’s ‘claim that the astronauts on the
Moon saw the Earth rotating therefore they’ve proven the Earth
rotates is a straw man. If you believe that is a proof, then you
also have to believe that while riding on the horse of a carousel
and you see the central support rotating; it proves that the central
support rotates and that you’re not turning about it.’ Ignore
Bouw’s awkward phrasing. He believes he has here a conclusive
argument, the conclusiveness of which demonstrates that
Faulkner brought up a straw man….Bouw rightly infers that the
rider circles the pillar and that the pillar is motionless. He makes
a parallel to the astronauts’ case: the Moon circles the Erath,
while the Earth remains motionless. But he forgets something
important. If the Moon circled the Earth every twenty-four
hours, and if the astronauts patiently observed that motion, they
would see that the Moon’s backdrop would change hour by hour.
In the course of a day the whole of the star field would pass
behind the Moon. What they observed in fact is that the
backdrop remains fixed, which only could mean that the Earth rotates on its axis with respect to the star field.”

R. Sungenis: This alone should show that Keating is incompetent to deal with these subjects. He somehow got the notion that the Moon moves independently from the star field every 24 hours. No, the Moon moves with the star field, since the stars, the Moon, and the sun are all carried by the universe that is rotating daily around a fixed Earth. The only independent movement that the Moon and sun have is that the sun lags behind the star field by about 1 degree per day, and the Moon lags behind the sun by a few degrees per day. So, in direct opposition to what Keating asserted: If the Moon circled the Earth every twenty-four hours, and if the astronauts patiently observed that motion, they would NOT see that the Moon’s backdrop would change hour by hour. In the course of a day the whole of the star field would NOT pass behind the Moon. What they observed in fact is that the backdrop DOES remain fixed, which only could mean that the Earth DOES NOT rotate on its axis with respect to the star field. The star field revolves around the Earth and carries the Moon with it.

40) I am the Door. You are a Dip

Keating: p. 175: “The Bible is replete with imagery and symbolism. Jesus says, ‘I am the door’ (John 10:9). Not a single Fundamentalist Protestant thinks that he is a slab of wood with hinges on one side and a latch on the other. Would Bouw claim that Jesus ‘knew it not to be true’ when he said he was a door? Was it a matter of it being ‘inconvenient for [Jesus] to tell the truth’? If Bouw’s exegesis of Joshua 10:13 is the best he can muster, then his biblical argument will fail to impress anyone who is not already both a geocentrist and a Fundamentalist.”

R. Sungenis: First, notice how brazen Keating is. He knows his own Catholic Church Fathers interpreted Joshua 10:13 in the same way that Dr. Bouw interprets it, but Keating wants to give the impression that such a literal interpretation is the disease of “Fundamentalist Protestants,” rather than from the core of Keating’s own Catholic patrimony. This is the kind of double-dealing for which Keating is well known. He then adds insult to
injury by making it appear that Dr. Bouw doesn’t have the right or capability to see the “door” of John 10:9 as a metaphor while at the same time understanding Joshua 10:13 as teaching the sun and moon literally stopped instead of the Earth. Bouw, unlike Faulkner and Keating, is smart enough to realize that if Joshua meant “the Earth stopped rotating,” then Joshua would be a liar, since if the Earth stopped rotating the Moon would keep on moving whereas Joshua said it stopped. As such, Bouw is much more faithful to Scripture than Faulkner or Keating.

41) The Phenomenon of Phenomenal Language

Keating, p. 175: “Bouw gives a similar argument regarding Ecclesiastes 1:5, ‘Again, God could just as well have spoken the “geokinetic truth” by simply adding the sense “seemeth to” before each of the three actions. That is, to say instead “the Sun also seemeth to arise, and the Sun seemeth to do down, and seemeth to haste to his place where he arose.” Why did God persist in his geocentric “error”? This argument highlights a basic misunderstanding on Bouw’s part regarding the composition of Scripture. He apparently assumes that inspiration implies dictation….In truth, in only a few places in Scripture do we have evidence of dictation by God.”

R. Sungenis: Actually, in this instance, I think Bouw and Keating are both wrong. Bouw does not need to make the argument that God could have used “geokinetic” language, since whether heliocentrism or geocentrism is true, God could have used phenomenal or “as it appears” language and still be telling the truth. Keating is wrong for bringing up the issue of how Scripture is inspired.

42) I Privately Judge You Guilty of Private Interpretation

Keating: page 177: “A few paragraphs later Bouw returns to his second key verse, saying…. ‘The central issue is not the motion of the Earth, nor is it the creation of the Earth. The issue is final authority; is it to be the words of God or the words of men?’ The words of God—as interpreted by whom? Bouw holds to a
position of private interpretation believing the Bible to be clear and unambiguous to those who have real faith.”

**R. Sungenis:** Although Dr. Bouw believes in private interpretation, for all intents and purposes, so does Karl Keating. As noted earlier, Keating is well aware that the Catholic Fathers and medievals interpreted Scripture’s cosmological passages in the exact opposite way he does. He knows that St. Bellarmine’s argument to Galileo in 1616, which was approved by the reigning pope, Paul V, stated that since the Church Fathers were in consensus on geocentrism, we could not deviate from their testimony. He knows that Galileo and heliocentrism were approved as “formally heretical” by Pope Urban VIII in 1633. He knows that there has been no official overturning of these beliefs or decisions in the whole 2000 years of Catholic history. Yet Keating takes it upon himself to issue a “private interpretation” of these biblical passages because he believes that modern science has proven the Church’s interpretation wrong. In this case, Mr. Keating is acting more like a Protestant than Dr. Bouw. If Keating complains that a lot of other Catholics today are doing the same thing, that doesn’t get him off the hook. All it means is that modern Catholics are engaging in “private interpretation” of Scripture. It is the same herd mentality that was prevalent in the Arian heresy when, because of “private interpretation,” 95% of the Church’s bishops sided with Arius.

**43) Damned if They Are. Damned if They Aren’t**

**Keating:** page 179: “Palm says that the ’new geocentrists present themselves as both qualified and competent to overturn the entire world of physics and astrophysics concerning the motion of the Earth.”

**R. Sungenis:** I would hope we feel qualified and confident. Does Mr. Palm expect us to think we are unqualified and incompetent? As for “overturning the entire world of physics,” we are only initiating, according to what Harvard historian Thomas Kuhn taught, what science itself initiates about ever 50-100 years – an overturning of its own ideas, a paradigm shift. As physicist Richard Feynman said, “Science is a culture of doubt,” and today there is more doubt in science than there ever has been. Scientist today, in light of their inventions of Inflation, Dark Matter,
Dark Energy, and faster than $c$ space expansion, all to keep the Big Bang patched-up, literally don’t know if the universe is coming or going.

Actually, however, we are not overturning as much as we are bringing science back to its original conception of the universe – the same conception that was officially endorsed by the Catholic Church when it condemned Galileo’s universe. For some reason, Mr. Palm has an acute aversion to doing so, denying even the possibility of geocentrism despite all the plausible evidence available. When we add to this the simple fact that science itself admits that “we can’t feel our motion through space, nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the Earth actually is in motion,”37 and that science itself can “construct [for] you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its center, and you cannot disprove it based on observations. You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds,” and that science uses “philosophical criteria in choosing our models [and] a lot of cosmology tries to hide that,”38 we are on safe ground in our attempt to bring back geocentrism.

44) Geocentrists are Conspiracy Theorists?? It’s a Conspiracy

Keating: page 187: “Robert Sungenis demonstrates this dark conspiratorial view of the scientific community in the title of his talk at a 2010 geocentrism conference, ‘Geocentrism: They Know It But They’re Hiding It.’”

R. Sungenis: Since the anti-geocentrists can’t win the battle on the science front (as demonstrated thus far by Keating’s totally inept attempt to discredit geocentrism), our opponents never cease to use the Saul Alinsky tactic of demonizing us. In this instance, we are labeled as “conspiracy theorists.” On the prior page Mr. Palm accuses me of plagiarism from some incident in 2002, and makes the same accusation against my colleagues. This keeps the gossip mill going so that they can try to win the battle by character assassination. As for whether scientists are “hiding” information, we already saw Lewontin and Hawking admit that they simply will not allow scientific creationism and geocentrism to get a foot

in the door, even though they know they have no proof for their own theories. This is because they have an atheistic agenda in their science. Any scientific theory that resorts to God as its ultimate source of power is forthwith eliminated. My book, *Galileo Was Wrong*, has a plethora of evidence from the writings of secular scientist themselves that proves the point. One does not have to look far to find it. David Palm ignores all that evidence and chooses to make the messengers into demons that people love to hate.

45) What the Heck Was Your Major in College?

**Keating:** pages 199-201: “When asked about his knowledge of science, Sungenis wrote, ‘I’ve been studying science all my life. I was a chemistry and physics major in college, studying for pre-med.….Note that he claims to have had two majors at George Washington University: chemistry and physics. The implication is that he received his undergraduate degree in both subjects….In the tenth edition…Sungenis says that he ‘holds advanced degrees in theology and religious studies and was a physics major in college.’ There is no mention of a bachelor’s degree in religion—the implication is that his undergraduate degree was in physics only. The story change later in 2014, when, in reply to a [sic] online post I wrote, Sungenis said: ‘[Keating] knows that I have said many times I was a physics major in college….I was a physics major in college before I switched to religion.’ So here is an admission that his undergraduate degree was solely in religion. It was not in chemistry or physics.”

**R. Sungenis:** As you can see, I’m very popular. My critics go through every nook and cranny of my life hoping to find some flaw, some contradiction, some inconsistency, so that they can quickly broadcast their findings to the whole world in hopes of turning people against me by creating the boogeyman of their choice. They spend hours and hours researching my life, and relish when the find something out of the ordinary. One of Keating’s favorite tactics is setting up straw men that he can beat up, and his above description of my time at GWU is a classic case. He strings together various descriptions I have given over the years of my time at GWU to paint a picture of inconsistency, improbability,
deception or instability, never once contacting me to see if there was a simple explanation to the complicated matrix he presents. The answer is very simple. In the first half of my freshman year I was a chemistry major. In second half I switched to a physics major. In my junior year I switched to religion and then graduated as a religion major. The point of all this is to show that I had sufficient study in physics to know the issues faced in the subject of geocentric cosmology – a point that Keating tries to obscure as much as possible.

46) What are you Doing with that Calamus Degree?

**Keating:** page 201: Sungenis’s claims about his undergraduate studies have been contradictory, but they have not caused him as much grief as have questions about his claimed Ph.D. in religious studies. That degree was granted by Calamus International University, which widely is considered to be a diploma mill.”

**R. Sungenis:** My Ph.D. from Calamus has been a favorite target of my opponents. They are like hyenas to a carcass. But here are the simple un glossed facts. I was in an accredited Ph.D. program at Maryvale Institute in England in 2002 when I suddenly became very interested in the subject of geocentrism. I asked Maryvale if I could switch my dissertation topic to geocentrism but they said no. So, wanting to pursue geocentric studies as soon as possible, and also wanting to continue my Ph.D. curriculum, I sought for an institution that could provide both. Calamus appeared on my radar screen, but it was unaccredited. Not realizing that in the future my enemies would make hay of this deficit, I applied and was accepted into Calamus’ online Ph.D. program, for which I spent 2.5 years writing a 700-page dissertation. I was awarded the Ph.D. in April 2006 by the international faculty of Calamus, my dissertation being judged as “excellent” in nine out of nine categories.

For the record, Calamus is not a “diploma mill,” despite Keating’s attempt to smear me with his derogatory label after my continued attempts to set the record straight for him. A “diploma mill” is issued to someone who pays for a piece of paper that says he has a degree but for which he has done no work and from which the institution has no authority to grant a
degree. For the record, the Ph.D. degree I have from Calamus International University is a LEGAL Ph.D. that is granted under the authority of the government of Vanuatu. The government of Vanuatu, like Denmark, allows academic institutions to grant degrees without the institution having attained accreditation from another country. For the record, I have US accredited Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees.

47) Judge Me, Judge My Friends

Keating: page 213: “Just as a man can be judged by the friends he keeps, so he can be judge by the idea he keeps….We make less allowance for someone with unsavory ideas, because the ideas he holds tend to reflect his character.”

R. Sungenis: Since the title of Keating’s chapter here is “Hiding an Anti-Jewish Past,” let’s cut to the chase and state that Keating’s determined goal is to paint me as an irrational Jew-hater so that he and his cronies can call me an “anti-semite” and hope to deter people from listening to anything I teach, especially geocentrism. Again, it is the Saul Alinsky approach to fighting one’s enemy – just assassinate the tar out of their character and the job of discrediting them will be over very quickly.

Now, to be sure, over the years I have criticized various Jews for various things they have said and done. But here is the key, and don’t miss it (even though people like Karl Keating will always try to stop you from seeing it): I only criticize the Jews who do evil things, just as I criticize Gentiles who do evil things. But I do not criticize or have any animosity against the Jews at large; the majority of Jews who are God-loving and decent human beings. My heart really goes out to them and I hope to God they can survive in this cruel world.

Even St. Paul said something similar about the Jews in Romans 9:6: “For they are not all Israel who are descended from Israel,” or in Romans 2:28: “But he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that which is of the heart.” There are Jews who live well with Gentiles and seek to get along (which is the majority of Jews) and then there are the agitators and the prideful, the Zionists, the Christianity haters. I know a lot of Jews who despise their racial tactics since they make it bad for all Jews.
My philosophy toward the Jews incenses people like Karl Keating and David Palm (and the groupies that follow them on their blogs) who more or less idolize the Jewish race. They think of Jews as “special,” or even “chosen,” above the rest of the world, despite the fact that Jesus Christ and the New Testament condemned this favoritism. Unlike me, they never admit to the Jews doing anything wrong, and won’t let anyone do so without a vociferous backlash. To me that is pure unadulterated racism, both physical and spiritual, and I detest it with every fiber of my being. There are no “special” or “chosen” people in this world. We are all equal in God’s eyes. In fact, we are all damned in God’s eyes, and the only ones who will escape that damnation are the Jews and Gentiles who repent of their sins and throw themselves on the mercy of the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. They are the only “chosen” ones in this world, yet they are not chosen because of their human status or ethnicity but in spite of it. And I can say this for a certainty: if Mr. Keating keeps up his lies and slander, he will not be among the “chosen.”

NB: Mr. Keating was caught stating on his blog early in 2014 that he was going to contact the ADL and enlist its help in destroying our film, The Principle (although he took it down a few minutes later, but not before it was seen by two witnesses). Lo and behold, we were barraged in the press (the third highest trending story on the Internet) with all kinds of accusations about being “anti-semites” and “holocaust deniers” in April 2014. When he was confronted with the fact that he put the statement on his blog, Keating denied it.

48) Dino and Fred Flintstone: So Happy Together

Keating: page 225: “Robert Sungenis subscribes not to one or two conspiracy theories but to many. He believes the sinking of the Titanic was no accident but was a long-range blueprint for 9/11. He asks, ‘Has modern science found irrefutable evidence that dinosaurs co-existed with humans? Yes, the evidence has been found but it is being systematically suppressed.’”

R. Sungenis: Yes, there are guys like me who see a fair-share of conspiracies; but then there are guys like Karl Keating who see none, or, better put, won’t admit to any. But Keating, as are most Americans, is very
aware of proven conspiracies, such as the Gulf of Tonkin, Iran-Contra, MK Ultra, the Lusitania, the USS Liberty, Watergate, and a host of others. In fact, Alex Jones has a list of 33 “conspiracy theories” that later turned out to be true.\(^3\) But it still makes good fodder to marginalize your opponent if you can make people believe he is just a conspiracy theorist; a paranoid or delusional idiot who sees danger around every corner. This is what Keating is trying so hard to do with my image in the public eye. In the end you will have to ask yourself whether you want to trust someone like Keating who continually hides his head in the sand, or someone like me who makes you think long and hard about everything you see and hear in this crazy world.

So let’s see who the conspiracy nut really is. Above Mr. Keating accuses me of falsely claiming that dinosaurs lived with humans, and also accuses me of accusing others of suppressing the evidence. First, let’s note that Mr. Keating believes in evolution, despite what the tradition of the Catholic Church has taught.

Second, let’s look at one piece of evidence out of the dozens I could show you. The December 2010 issue of *Scientific American* contains a documented story about field research Mary Schweitzer who found red blood cells, blood vessels and collagen in the bone of a T-Rex dinosaur. The problem? Modern paleontology says that dinosaurs are 70-million years old, but organic tissue such as blood cells couldn’t last 7000 years, much less 70-million. Dinosaur bones like this have been found all over the world, but you never hear it on the CBS evening news, do you? All we have are the accounts in magazines like *Scientific American*. So let’s take a gander at what it says about this incident, and then you will cease wondering about who the conspiracy theorist really is, me or Karl Keating:

The article is titled, “Blood from Stone.” The story is written by field researcher Mary Schweitzer of North Carolina State University who, after excavating the T-rex, watched the crane accidentally break one of its bones. When Dr. Schweitzer looked inside, to her absolute astonishment she saw not only blood cells but the veins and arteries to carry them, which

\(^3\) http://www.infowars.com/33-conspiracy-theories-that-turned-out-to-be-true-what-every-person-should-know).
vessels she described as very pliable and resilient as if they were still fresh. But because evolution must fit all past events into a pre-arranged timetable, it has always insisted that a T-Rex cannot be less than 68 million years old. Yet modern biological science says, even with the best efforts of preservation, nucleated blood cells couldn’t survive even 7,000 years, much less 10,000 times that age.

Notwithstanding, what I found most intriguing about the article in Scientific American was not the news about blood in a T-Rex but more about the reaction of Dr. Schweitzer and her immediate superior to whom she showed her findings. His name is Dr. Jack Horner, curator of paleontology and one of the world’s foremost dinosaur authorities. As Mary recounts the story,

“He took a look for himself. Brows furrowed, he gazed through the microscope for what seemed like hours without saying a word. Then, looking up at me with a frown, he asked, ‘What do you think they are?’ I replied that I did not know, but they were the right size, shape and color to be blood cells, and they were in the right place, too. He grunted, ‘So prove to me they aren’t.’ It was an irresistible challenge, and one that has helped frame how I ask my research questions, even now.”

Whereas Jack and Mary should have both been beside themselves with astonishment and ready to be moved wherever the empirical evidence led them, instead we have one of the clearest examples of the agenda-driven side of modern science – ignore any evidence that refutes the status quo and seek to turn all evidence into support of it. This is especially surprising
of Mary Schweitzer since she is a member of the American Scientific Association whose website says it believes in “the divine inspiration, trustworthiness and authority of the Bible in matters of faith and conduct…the Triune God affirmed in the Nicene and Apostles’ creeds which we accept as brief, faithful statements of Christian doctrine based upon Scripture...creating and preserving the universe God has endowed it with contingent order and intelligibility, the basis of scientific investigation”\(^{40}\)

Hoping that Dr. Schweitzer would be more forthcoming, our team of scientists wrote to her and asked if we could do a Carbon-14 test on the T-Rex bone. This would have readily shown how old the specimen was. Other times we have done so show dates in the range of 15,000 to 30,000 years, tops. But Mary refused our offer. Perhaps she was afraid of losing her job as Dr. Richard von Sternberg lost his when after he published an article in 2007 for the *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* favorable to Intelligent Design and was subsequently fired by the Smithsonian Institution because his article “does not meet the scientific standards of the Proceedings.” Incidentally, Dr. von Sternberg is a practicing Roman Catholic.

As for 911, Mr. Keating apparently wants to believe that 19 Muslims with box cutters led by a person on the other side of the world on dialysis orchestrated the biggest terror plot in history against the most protected country in the world with only a cell phone and a lap top computer. In my opinion it is Keating who is the nut for believing such absolute malarkey. If he believes this, he will believe anything, and thus he simply cannot be trusted. Here is just one short commentary I can give you on the utter ridiculousness of the official 911 story. Open your eyes. Your country is falling apart at the seams, and this is only one small indication of it. (Later in this critique of Keating I will give much more detail on 911).\(^{41}\)

\(^{40}\)www.asa3.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=76&Itemid=62

\(^{41}\)https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=eWDHYh-gceY
49) John Paul I: Victim of a Corrupt Vatican

**Keating:** page 226: “And then there was Pope John Paul I, whom Sungenis thinks was murdered.”

**R. Sungenis:** Notice how Keating just throws out these one-liners without any refutation whatsoever, obviously with the intent to make you think that if you also harbor such thoughts you are a conspiracy whacko. This is the “see no evil; hear no evil” world of Karl Keating. The only bad people in the world are the Protestant Fundamentalists and the Muslims. My guess is that Mr. Keating has never read the book by David Yallop titled, *In God’s Name*, which is a detailed and comprehensive report on the likelihood that Pope John Paul I was murdered. The book was on the *New York Times Bestseller List* for four months; was praised by *Daily Variety* as, “The case he makes is indeed impressive, shocking and frightening,” and the *Chicago Tribune* as “a sordid picture of Vatican financial affairs that includes the Mafia, secret Masonic societies, the collapses of governments, bloody assassinations and skullduggery on a scale that would have boggled Verdi’s mind,” yet all Keating can do is whistle in the dark and use it as fodder against fellow Catholics who are trying to clear up the corrupt Church they find themselves in.

50) Our Lady of Fatima: Not Happy with the Popes’ Cover Up

**Keating:** page 226: “He also thinks that recent popes have conspired to hide the truth about the Fatima secrets.”

**R. Sungenis:** Again, no refutation. Keating just gives a one-liner that tells you that if you dare to think that the popes could manage to muck up the Fatima secrets, well, you’re nothing but a conspiracy theorist. Never mind the fact that John Paul II apparently thought that Pius XII failed the Fatima secrets since John Paul II tried to do again in 1984 what Pius XII apparently failed to do in 1942 and 1952 when he tried to consecrate Russia with the bishops to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Never mind that John Paul II made the same mistake as Pius XII since he also did not mention the name of Russia with the bishops when he did his 1984 consecration. Never mind that we never saw the “period of peace” promised by Our Lady after John Paul II did his 1984 “consecration of the
world,” since there were a total of 52 wars and conflicts throughout his 26-year pontificate, and of which he himself complained in 1990 in the midst of the Bosnia-Herzegovina conflict that war on Earth was not ending. Never mind that Pope Benedict XVI said Fatima was over in 2000 and then sought permission from the Russian patriarch in 2007 to consecrate Russia (and got a negative answer) and then told us in 2010 that Fatima was still waiting to be fulfilled. All these things happen but, well, you know, Bob Sungenis is a conspiracy theorist to tell them all to you. 😊

51) Do Jews Ever Do Anything Wrong?

Keating, page 226: “Most of the conspiracies to which Sungenis has subscribed have involved Jews: Jews were behind the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Jews sent Monica Lewinsky to compromise Bill Clinton because he was insufficiently friendly to Israel. Most importantly, Jews are trying to control the Catholic Church precisely because they reject the Messiah and so reject the Church he founded.”

R. Sungenis: This is just more of Keating’s Jew-baiting (i.e., “I dare you to blame any of the Jews, and if you do, I’m going to call you an anti-semite”). Whether these issues are right or wrong, the bottom line is that Keating and his cohorts will simply not allow any Jews to be implicated in any conspiracy against either the United States or the Catholic Church. Ask yourself, is this possible? We already have clear cut evidence that Israel spied on the United States (e.g., Jonathan Pollard) and there are more such cases. Likewise, Jews conspired with Catholic bishops in 2002 to write the “Reflections on Covenant and Missions” document which boldly declared that Jews were no longer to be proselytized to convert to Christianity since it was now discovered that the Jews had their own salvific covenant with God that has never been superseded. This new doctrine finally ended up as a sentence in the 2006 United States Adult catechism that stated the “Mosaic covenant was eternally valid for the Jewish people,” which is an out-an-out heresy. To conclude from these, like Keating does, that there is no possibility for the Jews to be involved in either espionage cases or ecclesiastical infiltration is simply a case of extreme naivety or willful ignorance.
**52) Wilson and Roosevelt: Under Power of the Jews?**

**Keating:** page 227: Quoting me: “The Woodrow Wilson cabinet was completely run by Jews. The same was true with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He had 93 Jews working for him. His cabinet was mostly Jewish. It was run by [Bernard] Baruch and [Louis] Brandeis, who were both Jews…9/11 basically is the capstone of it….” This is nonsense…Of the twenty-four people who served in Roosevelt’s cabinets, only one, Henry Morgenthau, was Jewish.”

**R. Sungenis:** I will tackle these issues again because Keating is using them to attack my credibility as a journalist for *Culture Wars* and my standing as a decent human being, and thus I need to defend against his scurrilous accusations. My credibility will stand or fall on its own merit, not on Keating’s biased and distorted judgment.

As for Roosevelt, I didn’t say that Jews ran his cabinet. I said he had many Jews working for him, and I didn’t say 93, I said 73, and that information was gleaned from the following website (http://globalfire.tv/nj/04en/history/fdrsneokons.htm), which was footnote 53 in my article for *Culture Wars*, titled, A Review of *The Controversy of Zion* by Douglas Reed.

The information I stated in my article about Roosevelt came mainly from Reed’s book. If Mr. Keating wants to contest what Reed wrote, he can do so. Below I give the main portion of the section on Roosevelt that Mr. Keating can investigate:

Reed also deals heavily with **Franklin D. Roosevelt**, since “he created precedent by having his cabinet sworn in the hand of a distinguished Jew, Mr. Justice Cardozo, who was a committed Zionist” and had received his Supreme Court judgeships from the efforts of “Rabbi Wise requesting them for him, first from Governor Al Smith of New York State and then from President Herbert Hoover. Thus the shadow of ‘dual allegiance’ fell on Mr. Roosevelt’s administration at its start.” He was pro-Zionist from the very beginning of his political career and was honored and
influenced by Jews, such as Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Samuel Rosenman, and Bernard Baruch (dubbed the “unofficial president of the United States” and of whom Eleanor said: “Mr. Baruch was a trusted adviser to my husband both in Albany and in Washington”). Reed notes: “These leading names…represent only the pinnacle of an edifice that was set around all American political life….The selection was discriminatory; anti-Zionist, anti-revolutionary and anti-world-government Jews were excluded from it…and Mr. Roosevelt ignored all protests.” It is no surprise, then, that “Mr. Roosevelt evidently was selected before he was elected…Mr. Howden [House’s biographer] says that Mr. House ‘picked Roosevelt as a natural candidate for the presidency long before any other responsible politician…through the years groomed him for the presidency, expecting to govern through him, as through President Wilson’” and “thus Mr. Roosevelt put ‘Philip Dru’s’ ideas into further practice” so much so that Howden writes: ‘It is impossible to compare Dru’s suggested legislation with Mr. Roosevelt’s and not be impressed by their similarity.’ It is now

42 Reed notes: “Apart from this distinct group of young men apparently trained during Roosevelt’s early years in office to take over the State Department, the president was accompanied by a group of Jewish advisers at the highest level. Mr. Henry Morgenthau junior (a leading Zionist, whose ‘Morgenthau Plan’ of 1944 was the original basis for the bisection of Europe in 1945) was his Secretary of the Treasury for eleven of the twelve years. Other intimate associates were Senator Herbert Lehman (another leading Zionist who took great part in promoting the ‘second exodus’ from Europe in 1945-1946, which led to the war in Palestine, Judge Samuel Rosenmann (a resident inmate of the White House, who helped write Mr. Roosevelt’s speeches, Mr. David Niles (of Russian born parentage, and for many years ‘adviser on Jewish affairs’ to Mr. Roosevelt and his successor), Mr. Benjamin Cohen (a drafter of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 and another important Zionist), and three Jews from Russia, Messrs. Sidney Hillman, Isador Lubin and Leo Pasvolsky” (317). The irony of Morgenthau is that his father was against Zionism. Reed notes: “Mr. Henry Morgenthau senior was a notable Jew of America who became an ambassador…He said, ‘Zionism is the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish history. I assert that it is wrong in principle and sterile in its spiritual ideas. Zionism is a betrayal…an Eastern European proposal, fathered in this country by American Jews…which, if they were to succeed, would cost the Jews of America most of what they have gained of liberty, equality and fraternity. I refuse to allow myself to be called a Zionist. I am an American’” (479).
well known that Roosevelt himself was of Jewish origin, and though he knew so, he kept this fact from the public during his campaigning. After a painstaking analysis of his deeds, Reed has no problem concluding that “Mr. Roosevelt’s achievement may now be seen to have been threefold and in each respect perilous to his country’s future: he helped to arm Zionism, he armed the revolution in its Moscow citadel, and he opened the doors of his American citadel to its agents.”(339)

When the Republicans caught on to Roosevelt’s Jewish leanings, they themselves tried to make friends with “the foreign group” but, reminiscent of the Bush administration’s calls against the “Axis of Evil” and “terrorism,” Roosevelt held sway “by invoking the need to beat ‘The Crisis’ and he produced The Permanent Emergency in which his country still lives.” When Huey Long decided to run against Roosevelt in the 1936 election, he took aim at Jewish special interest groups and especially Bernard Baruch. On Sept. 8 1935, in a tale reminiscent of Jack Ruby killing Lee Harvey Oswald, Long was shot [an assassination he predicted two months earlier] in the Louisiana State Capital by a young Jew, Dr. Carl Austin Weiss, but before Weiss could be questioned he was shot by Long’s bodyguard.”(311-7) Truman and Dewey would later do the same fawning since they both “held the Zionist vote to be indispensable to success.”(464) After Roosevelt’s four-term reign, “The Chicago Tribune in 1950 reported the view of a senior official of the State Department that the United States was ruled by ‘a secret government’ consisting of three members of the deceased Mr. Roosevelt’s circle: Mr. Henry Morgenthau junior, Justice Felix Franfurter and Senator Herbert Lehman. The word ‘Jew’ was not used….This article raised much commotion in the Zionist and Jewish press throughout the world…the Tribune Tower in Chicago was besieged by the ADL with preemptory demands for an apology. On this particular occasion none was made; the newspaper was at that time a lonely survivor from the days of independent reporting and comment.”(345) Bernard Baruch, “the unofficial president,” once testified before a Select
Committee of Congress about US activities during the war and stated: “The final determination rested with me…I probably had more power than perhaps any other man did.” Baruch was followed by Jewish advisor Harry Hopkins, considered by biographer Robert Sherwood as “the second most important man in the United States.”(359) In fact, Roosevelt surrounded himself with 75 such Jewish “employees” in his administration. 43 After you thought you heard everything, Reed notes a conversation between Joseph Stalin and Roosevelt at the end of WWII: “Then President Roosevelt, in the manner of a man who is a member of an exclusive club and is sure his host must also belong, ‘said he was a Zionist and asked if Marshal Stalin was one.’ Stalin replied that ‘he was one in principle but he recognized the difficulty.’” No accusations of hearsay can dismiss Roosevelt’s boast since Reed informs us it comes from “the official publication, ‘The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945’ issued by the American State Department on March 16, 1955.” Although the Montreal Star broke the next morning with the headline: “World Capitals Dismayed, Shocked over Disclosures of Yalta Secrets,” but at this late stage of the game Reed resigns his commentary to saying “This was nonsense; by 1955 the masses were apathetic about such things, having been brought by control of the press to the condition of impotent confusion foretold in the Protocols of 1905.”(378)

Reed tells us of similar incidents. “In 1941 the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor ‘on a day that will live in infamy’…but the later disclosures showed that the government in Washington had long been warned of the impending attack and had not alerted the Pearl Harbor defenders….Twelve days earlier Mr. Henry L. Stimson, the Secretary of War, after a cabinet meeting on November 25, 1941, had noted in his diary: ‘The question was how we should maneuver them’ (the Japanese) ‘into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves; it was a difficult proposition.’”(354-7)

As for Woodrow Wilson, these are the notes from Reed’s book that I put into my article for *Culture Wars*. Mr. Keating can judge for himself from Reed’s assessment whether Wilson was the controlled by the Zionists:

The Zionist use and abuse of Churchill mirrored that of the US Presidents. According to Reed’s accounting, **Woodrow Wilson** was little more than a puppet of the Zionist machine. Wilson allowed the creation of the Federal Reserve in 1913, which was basically a Jewish banking cartel devised, at the behest of Lord Rothschild, at Jekyll Island off the Carolinas by seven of the world’s richest men. Wilson also introduced the Federal income tax to pay back, with usury, the money created out of thin air by the Federal Reserve,\(^{44}\) two deeds that it is said Wilson later regretted with the words “I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country,” and later “We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated, governments in the civilized world—no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and the duress of small groups of dominant men….Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.”\(^{45}\)

---


\(^{45}\) There is some dispute as to the origin and authenticity of “I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country” (see http://en.wikiquotes.org/wiki/Talk:Woodrow_Wilson), but there is no doubt of the second two quotes, taken from Woodrow Wilson’s *The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People* (New York and Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1913). In 1913, Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr. stated: “This [Federal Reserve Act] establishes the most gigantic trust on earth. When the President [Wilson] signs this bill, the invisible government of the monetary power will be legalized...the worst legislative crime of the ages is perpetrated by this banking and currency bill.”
The power behind Wilson was Edward Mandell House, popularly known as Colonel House, with his middle name given by his father in honor of a Jewish merchant in Houston. As Reed sees it, “Mr. House did not guide American State policy, but deflected it towards Zionism, the support of the world-revolution and the promotion of the world-government.”(232) House worked with the leading American Zionist, Rabbi Stephen Wise, “and the strength of this secret group is shown by the fact that in 1910, when Mr. House had privately decided that Mr. Wilson should be the next president, Rabbi Wise publicly proclaimed that he would be that, and for two terms,” with Wise adding, “House not only made our cause the object of his very special concern but served as liaison officer between the Wilson administration and the Zionist movement.” “House chose the president’s cabinet officers so that one of them had to introduce himself to Mr. Wilson thus: ‘My name is Land, Mr. President, I believe I am the Secretary of the Interior.’ The president…was frequently seen to visit a small apartment in East 35st New York, where Mr. House lived…Mr. House was often in Washington, where he conducted the president’s interviews and correspondence, and, stopping cabinet officers outside the cabinet room, instructed them what to say inside it.”(261) House was so powerful that “the Democratic party was in fact to owe its victories in 1912 and 1916, as well as President Roosevelt’s and President Truman’s victories in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948 to the application of Mr. House’s plan.” In fact, House published his “plan” in 1912, writing a novel titled Philip Dru: Administrator, an “allusion in the Protocols to ‘The Administrators whom we shall choose,’” with Reed concluding, “The chapter entitled ‘The Making of a President,’ which is obviously not fiction, makes this almost unreadable novel a historical document of the first importance.”(235) The hero, Philip Dru, a young West Pointer under the influence of Karl Marx, assembles an army and marches on Washington and proclaims himself “Administrator of the Republic” with his first major act being the creation of “a graduated income tax exempting no income whatsoever,” reminiscent of the “Communist Manifesto’s heavy progressive
or graduated income tax” as well as “the Protocols progressive tax on property.” La Civiltà Cattolica notes a Jewish rabbi in the 1890s who had already figured this out. Speaking to his fellow Jews the rabbi said: “Under pretext of aiding the masses of workers, we must excessively tax the estates of the big landowners and as soon as their property [through usury] will have been transferred to us, the Christian proletarians’ labor will totally fall to our advantage.”

Reed concludes that Wilson “was promoted [by House and Wise] to make public obeisance to Zionism” upon which “Mr. Wilson, under coaching for the campaign, made a speech on ‘The rights of the Jews, in which he said ‘I am not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow-citizens but to make evident our sense of identity with them. This is not their cause; it is America’s.’” House was coordinating the Zionist machine with the Jewish “presidential advisor” Bernard Baruch; the Jewish jurist Louis Brandeis “who had decided to ‘give his life’ for Zionism”; and Rabbi Stephen Wise, all of which were directing Wilson’s actions to the point in which Wilson “promised not to act independently” of them, but, to his credit, Wilson complained that “the government of the Republic should have got so far out of the hands of the people; should have been captured by interests which are special and not general.” Reed adds: “From this moment the power-groups in America and England worked in perfect synchronization…coordinated their actions at the prompting of the inter-communicating Zionists on both sides of the ocean.”

Reed also goes into some detail about the League of Nations under Wilson. The impetus for the League began “in 1917 when the two kindred forces from Russia, revolutionary-Communism and revolutionary Zionism” wanted a “federation of the world’

---

to take over ‘the management of human affairs’ and to rule by force.” House gave a “sales-talk” to Wilson and thereby camouflaged the League as merely “some plan by which the peace of the world may be maintained.” Then “by 1916 Mr. House had instructed Mr. Wilson as to his duty and in May the president publicly announced support for ‘the plan’ at a meeting of a new body candidly called ‘The League to Enforce Peace,’” but according to House’s private papers Wilson didn’t know its true nature. Since some Americans balked at the use of “force,” the name was changed to “The League of Nations,” but it sought to “transfer control of national armies to some super-national committee.” By April 1917, Wilson referred to the plan as “a new international order.” By 1919 “the authority of this ‘League of Nations’ was used to cover the use of British troops as a bodyguard for the Zionists intending to seize Palestine.”

No doubt, 1913 was a pivotal year for the Zionists, for they gained control of the US banking system and pushed through the 16th Amendment to ensure that the Jewish bankers would be paid usury on the money they would create from thin air, an act which Reed says, “Mr. House had caused President Wilson to write into the American Constitution the chief destructive measure proposed in Karl Marx’s Communist Manifesto of 1848.” To complete the trifecta, the ADL was instituted in 1913 – the Zionist social-police force employed to intimidate anyone who would balk at the banking cartel, ostracizing them as “anti-Semitic,” a label that would be publicized by the Jewish Sulzberger family who owned The New York Times and who were the founding members in the late 1800s of B’nai B’rith (Hebrew for: “Children of the Covenant”), the parent of the ADL. As Reed puts it: “The little offshoot of 1913, the ‘Anti-Defamation League,’ had by 1947 become a secret police of formidable power in America. In Doublespeak, ‘anti-defamation’ means ‘defamation’ and this body lived by calumny, using such terms as anti-semite, fascist, rabble-rouser, Jew-baiter, Red-baiter, paranoiac, lunatic, madman, reactionary, diehard, bigot and more of the like….In 1933, Mr. Bernard J Brown wrote,
‘Through the intervention of the ADL we have succeeded in muzzling the non-Jewish press.’ In 1948 the Jewish *Menorah Journal* wrote, ‘Should but one phrase in a reprinted literary classic reflect unjustly upon Jews, the ADL will promptly belabor the innocent publisher until he bowdlerizes the offending passage. Let one innocent movie-producer incorporate a Jewish prototype, however inoffensive…the ADL will make him wish he’s never heard of Jews…No criticism of Zionism or the world-government plan is allowed to pass without virulent attack….America has today a few surviving writers who fight on for independent debate and comment. They will discuss any public matter, in the light of traditional American policy and interest, save Zionism, which hardly any of them will touch. I have discussed this with four of the leading ones, who all gave the same answer: it could not be done. The employed ones would lose their posts, if they made the attempt. The independent ones would find no publisher for their books…” The *Menorah Journal* itself admitted in an article titled “Anti-Defamation Hysteria” that ‘fighting anti-semitism has been built up into a big business’ with the objective of ‘continuing to beat the anti-semitic drum’ and ‘to scare the pants off prospective contributors’ in order to raise funds,’ including ‘blackmail’ against fellow Jews, with the conclusion that American Jews were being ‘stampeded into a state of mass-hysteria by their self-styled defenders.’….As Dr. Weizmann said: ‘the technique of propaganda and the approach to the masses’ is an ancient, Asiatic art and was described on a famous occasion by St. Matthew: ‘the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude…the chief priests moved the people.’”

The fervor of the ADL was supported by other publications, beginning with Max Nordau’s *Degeneration* in 1895 and Theodore Kaufmann’s *Germany Must Perish* in 1941 which perpetuated “Talmudic chauvinism,” and others such as William Zukerman’s article, “Raising the Hair of the Jewish People” in 1950 so as “to keep Jews constantly on edge with the scare of
anti-semitism,” as well as Meyer Levine’s 1949 *In Search* asserting “Jewishness” as the motive for Zionist superiority and the conquering of Gentiles.(480-7) Even Karl Stern’s 1951 conversion story to Catholicism, *Pillar of Fire*, contained remnants of Jewish racism. As Stern continued to speak of “the great Jewish catastrophe” that was suffered during WWII, Reed remarks that Stern “was offended by reading in a Catholic paper the statement that so many members of the crew of a sunken British submarine were ‘Catholics,’ saying, ‘I do not understand why anyone would care for such statistics.’”(488-9) In any case, Zukerman probably made one of the most astute realizations recorded in Reed’s entire book: “‘The generally accepted theory that the emergence of the state of Israel would serve to unify and cement the Jewish people has turned out to be wrong. On the contrary, the Zionist Congress in Jerusalem, 1951, has dramatically demonstrated that the creation of a Jewish political state after two thousand years has introduced a new and potent distinction which Jews as a group have not known in centuries and that Israel is likely to separate rather than unite Jews in the future.’”(512) But Reed says something even more astute. Commenting on Churchill being viewed as “‘an old student of the Bible who knows very well that the Zionist aspirations remain unfulfilled until Israel is fully restored within the historic boundaries, the land of the Ten Tribes,’” Reed warns: “If the West, as these words implied, was secretly harnessed to the unqualified ‘fulfillment of Zionist aspirations,’ that could only mean a greater war than the West had yet endured, in which its armies would play the parts of pawns in a ruinous game, for the purpose of dividing the Christian peoples, crushing the Muslim ones, setting up the Zionist empire, and thereafter acting as its janissaries. In this great gamble, Jews everywhere in the world, on whatever side of the apparent fighting line, would be expected under the ‘law of the return’ to act in the overriding interest of Zion.’”(516)

---

47 South African *Jewish Times*, May 19, 1950.
Reed notes that “The ADL and the American Jewish Committee” (the latter of which Rabbi David Rosen is the current president and who recently attended Assisi III put on by Pope Benedict), “‘set out to make the American people aware of anti-semitism.’ It informed Jews that ‘25 out of every 100 Americans are infected with anti-semitism,’ and that another 50 might develop the disease. By 1945 it was carrying out ‘a high-powered educational program geared to reach every man, woman and child’ in America through the press, radio, advertising, children’s comic books and school books, lectures, films, churches and trade unions. This program included ‘219 broadcasts a day,’ full-page advertisements in 397 newspapers, poster advertising in 130 cities, and ‘persuasions’ subtly incorporated in the printed matter on blotters, matchbox covers, and envelopes. The entire national press (‘1900 dailies with a 43,000,000 circulation’) and the provincial, Negro, foreign-language and labor newspapers were kept supplied with ‘and used’ its material in the form of ‘news, background material, cartoons and comic strips,’…and the name of the body [the ADL] which supplied this mass of suggestive material never reached the public.”(340-4) By the end of WWII, “one of the first acts of the Allied High Commission was to enact a law ‘against anti-semitism,’ thus they extended to the West the law which identified the nature of the first Bolshevist administration in Russia…introduced on July 27, 1918.” In 1955, “a western German law…made it an offence ‘to utter anti-semitic remarks or be unduly prejudiced against Jews.’”(403)

Reed notes that “‘Mr. Martin Dies once described the ADL…as ‘a terrorist organization, using its resources, not to defend the good name of Jews, but to force and compel compliance with the objectives of their organization by terrorist methods; it is a league of defamation.’ The description was borne out…when about a hundred American Senators and Congressman then learned that they (and some of their wives) were shown as ‘Nazis’ on cards in the Civil Service files…which bore a note saying that the defamationist information on them was ‘copied
from the subversive files’ of a private firm of Zionist lawyers. These files, the note continued, ‘were made up in co-operation with the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League; the sources of this information must not be disclosed under any circumstances.’”(350)

Added to this propaganda was that of the treatment of Jewish people in Germany in order to keep alive the groundswell of sympathy towards the Jews. Reed uses one episode “from his own experience and reporting” to show how this was done: “Rabbi Stephen Wise, writing in 1949, gave the following version of events personally reported by me in 1933…. ‘The measures against the Jews continued to outstrip in systematic cruelty and planned destruction the terror against other groups. On January 29, 1933 Hitler was summoned to be chancellor… at once the reign of terror began with beatings and imprisonments of Jews… We planned a protest march in New York on May 10, the day of the ordered burning of Jewish books in Germany… the brunt of the attack was borne by Jews… concentration camps were established and filled with Jews.”” Reed retorts: “All these statements are false,” and he then gives the exact details of what actually occurred, and then concludes: “Twenty years later I observed that it was in fact impossible to draw public attention to the misreporting of the nature of the persecution of Germany and to explain that the Jews formed only a small fraction of the victims.”(310)

53) Were 19 Muslims or 19 Jews Behind 911?

Keating: page 235: “The titled was ‘Inside Job.’ Sungenis’s review is worth examining, even though it does not concern geocentrism, because it shows us something about his thought processes. He uses those same thought processes when evaluating scientific evidence.”

R. Sungenis: Keating is a master at saying what appears to be something profound in order to smear his opponent, yet, when you look at it closely, says absolutely nothing. Of course “Inside Job” reveals something about
my thought processes. Whose else’s would they reveal? Of course they also reveal how I evaluate the scientific evidence, unless, of course, I’m just a robot programmed by someone else. The question is not what they reveal but whether they are right or wrong. Be that as it may, Keating’s comments about 911 are worth examining also, since they show us something about his thought processes, which are that he has a penchant, as the saying goes, to look the other way when his ideological castles begin to crumble. See Topic 111 for more information on 911

54) The FAA: Asleep at the Switch or Switched Asleep?

**Keating**, page 237: “He asks, ‘Who knew the intricacies of U.S. commercial flights to get around the FAA air traffic control?’ Only a non-pilot could ask such a question. Air traffic control is unable to exercise any control at all over a plane piloted by someone who ignores ATC’s instructions.”

**R. Sungenis**: Only someone inept would make such a comment. You don’t have to be a pilot to know that when air traffic control notices a commercial plane off course, especially one in a heavily populated area near government buildings and the core of US finances (as were Washington and New York City) it is its responsibility to notify military commanders so that US fighter jets can scramble and intercept the non-responding aircraft. No such orders were given on 911. In fact, Dick Cheney is on record giving a “stand down” order to military personnel witnessing a plane coming toward the Pentagon. Norman Pinetta, the Transportation Secretary, witnessed Cheney maintaining “stand down” orders on the plane coming toward the Pentagon.48

55) The Twin Towers: Built Like Paper Mache?

**Keating**: page 238: “The Twin Towers were not built to withstand the impact of airliners, just as there were not built to withstand the impact of asteroids. Those possibilities were considered too remote. The towers were built to withstand the

48 See [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QlM8Su](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QlM8Su).
impact of small plane because such planet had been known to fly into skyscrapers."

**R. Sungenis:** This is the most outlandish statement Keating has made thus far. It is totally untrue and totally misleading. Notice how he first tries to brainwash you by making it appear that asteroids are similar to airliners. They are not. Airliners are composed of a hollow tube called a fuselage and hollow wings that at times hold liquid fuel, and a hollow vertical and horizontal stabilizer. Asteroids that are 1 to 20 meters in size, disintegrate when they hit Earth’s atmosphere. Asteroids that are larger than 20 meters to the size of an airliner are compact rock, not hollow like airliners.

The Twin Towers were two of the tallest buildings in the world (over a quarter of a mile tall), and thus had to be built very soundly. They were both built on bedrock that went seven stories into the ground. Each building had 236 steel columns around its perimeter, with each side being 208 feet wide. Each of the steel columns were about 1 foot square. The steel itself was between 1 and 2 inches thick. In addition, there were 47 larger steel columns in the center of the buildings, which took up about 40% of the buildings’ volume. The central column is so strong that it could withstand, by itself, five times the weight of the whole building; and the perimeter columns at least two times the weight. A hat truss on top of the buildings connected each of the 47 central steel columns and the 236 outside steel columns. This allowed that if one wall was hit, the force would be distributed to the other three walls and the central column. Each floor of the building had a thick steel belt, called a spandrel, about 2-3 inches thick and 2 feet wide that joined each of the 236 columns by being bolted and welded on; and each spandrel overlapped each floor for greater strength. In addition, double trusses connected the central core to the perimeter columns and also anchored into the spandrel. On top of the trusses was a steel pan that was anchored to the spandrel and the central columns. In the pan was several inches of concrete. The total amount of steel in the Twin Towers was over 140,000 tons. The total concrete was 425,000 tons. Each building of the Twin Towers weighed about 500,000 tons.
It doesn’t take much to get expert testimony that the Twin Towers were built to withstand the impact of an airliner. The very designer of the building says:

Both technical calculations and testimony from WTC structural engineers confirm that the Twin Towers were built to withstand the impact from the passenger jets that hit them on 9/11. Airplane impact tests conducted by WTC structural engineers during the design of the Twin Towers used the Boeing 707, which was one of the largest passenger jets in the world at the time. The results of the test, carried out early in 1964, calculated that the towers would handle the impact of a 707 traveling at 600 mph without collapsing.49

The other elephant in the room is that all seven of the WTC buildings collapsed, yet only two were hit by planes. Building #7 is one of the more anomalous. There were only small fires in the building and the building was equipped with automatic fire extinguishers. But Building #7 collapsed the opposite way that the Twin Towers did. It collapsed in 6.7 seconds by the bottom floors disintegrating by the pressure from the top floors, whereas the Twin Towers collapsed by the top floors crashing and disintegrating into the lower floors.

More puzzling is that CNN, Fox News, and a BBC television station reported the collapse of Building #7 a half hour before it came down. While the British woman was doing her story on live feed reporting that Building #7 had already come down, Building #7 comes down in the background as she is speaking on live feed! Her name is Jane Standley, a BBC World television reporter in New York City on 911. She reported at about 4:54 p.m. (21:54 GMT) that the Salomon Brother’s building owned by Larry Silverstein (WTC 7) had collapsed. Silverstein’s building,

49 http://www1.ae911truth.org/home/655-faq-9-were-the-twin-towers-designed-to-survive-the-impact-of-the-airplanes.html. See also https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9fQIC2AIWrY to understand how the screen netting of the Towers could sustain the impact of an airline crash rather easily.
however, (which he later admitted had been ‘pulled’), did not collapse until 5:20 p.m. (22:20 GMT). BBC news editor Richard Porter subsequently wrote on the BBC website in February 2007: ‘We no longer have the original tapes of our 911 coverage.’ But why would the BBC destroy its original tapes of 911?”

Even more anomalous is that Building #6 experienced a tremendous explosion immediately after the south Twin Tower was hit. In that explosion, 40% of the building was blown away, as if a giant cookie cutter had just ripped away the building, and it then collapsed at the exact time that Tower 2 was falling. How in the world could that have happened, unless it was planned?

Another issue is that if the destruction was caused by floor collapse, the Twin Towers fell at free fall speed, at 32 feet/sec² in about 10 seconds. How could that possibly happen if there are 110 floors, each hitting the other? The momentum would be slowed or stopped at each floor and need to restart, which would take much longer than 10 seconds, probably about 2 minutes or more.

Also important is the fact that 95% of the Twin Towers was disintegrated into very fine powder that remained in the streets of NYC for months afterward. How does that happen if the buildings merely collapsed by gravity? Something very powerful blew the steel and concrete into powder, so fine that it lingered in the air of NYC weeks after 911.

Of course, we can’t leave out the fact that during the two days of Sept. 6-7, 2001, over 4,700 put options were placed on United Airlines. On Sept. 10, over 4,500 put options were placed on American Airlines. These events then led to the largest SEC investigation in history.

The upshot of all these facts is that neither airliner impact nor internal fires destroyed the WTC buildings. Either they were laced by thermite explosives and/or they were brought down by mini-nukes, which means it was planned by those who had complete and uninterrupted access to the buildings, and that certainly could not be 19 Muslims. See Topic 111.
56) No Need to Know How to Fly a Jetliner, says Keating

Keating: page 238, “…it is worth challenging Sungenis’s assumption that the nineteen could not have been capable of maneuvering airliners. That just isn’t so. At least two of the terrorists obtained instrument ratings through a flight school at Montgomery Field airport in San Diego….The terrorists did not need to know how to control an airliner in the take-off or landing configurations; they needed to know only how to maneuver it while it was in the air. They obtained sufficient information through their instrument-rating instruction.”

R. Sungenis: Either Keating is ignorant or just playing dumb. The Pentagon needed someone to fly a plane at very low altitude, which many pilots said is impossible to do with a big airliner. Moreover, there is no film of a plane hitting the Pentagon. The FBI confiscated the three outside films available from commercial businesses and have not released them, and the Pentagon’s own ground film, displayed on national television, does not show a plane hitting the Pentagon. The hole at the Pentagon was not that of an airliner with huge engines on the wings but of a missile. The Twin Towers are said to have been hit by planes traveling 500 mph, but airliners will begin to break apart at that speed, if they could reach it. John Lear, the famous pilot and jet manufacturer, wrote a 50-page paper for 911 Truthers stating that airliners cannot fly that fast. Lear said that he was not able to hit the Twin Towers in a simulator until the fifth try, yet these Muslim pilots are said to have done so on the first try. “Pilots for 911 Truth” have much to tell in this regard, especially regarding a plane hitting the Pentagon. Karl Keating, unwittingly, will find himself agreeing with the 911 Truthers, since when he begins to give an explanation for Building 7 he will argue on page 240 that “a plane would have had to descend steeply, something no jetliner is capable of doing” (see page 240).

Lastly, the airliner that supposedly crashed in Shanksville showed no plane parts at the scene, as was the case at the Pentagon.

Also interesting is that in the same paragraph of mine that Keating quotes from my Culture Wars paper, this information is at the end of the sentence: “…most of the “nineteen Muslims” are still alive, as reported by the BBC
on Sept. 23, 2001,” and I give their names in the footnote,\textsuperscript{50} but Keating decides not to include that part of the sentence, probably because he doesn’t want anyone looking up the names of these individuals.

Keating also fails to quote from this paragraph:

Speaking of bin Laden, few are aware of the fact that neither he nor his Taliban have ever been officially accused by the US for orchestrating 911. His “Most Wanted” poster issued by the FBI in 2006 did not list the 911 attacks in his resumé. The reason, says Rex Tomb, Chief of Investigative Publicity for the FBI, “is because the FBI has no hard evidence connecting bin Laden to 911” thus “Bin Laden has not been formally charged in connection with 911.” Likewise, Dick Cheney stated in an interview with Tony Snow on March 26, 2006: “So we’ve never made the case, or argued the case that somehow Osama bin Laden was directly involved in 911. That evidence has never been forthcoming.” Robert Muller of the FBI admitted much the same: “In our investigation, we have not uncovered a single piece of paper either here in the U.S. or in the treasure trove of information that has turned up in Afghanistan and elsewhere that mentioned any aspect of the September 11th plot.”\textsuperscript{51} Bollyn also notes that “On October 5, 2001, the Taliban offered to try Bin Laden in an Afghan court if the United States provided ‘solid evidence’ of his guilt, but the US refused to provide any evidence and launched its invasion [two days later] on October 7, 2001.” So why was bin Laden hunted down by the US and killed? Perhaps it’s the same reason they hunted down and killed Sadaam Hussein. They disseminated a false story of him having

\textsuperscript{50} Satam al Suqami, Wail and Waleed al Shehri (two brothers) alive; Abdul Aziz al Omari, alive; Fayez Banihammad (from the UAE), Ahmed al Ghamdi, Hamza al Ghamdi, Mohand al Shehri, alive; Saeed al Ghamdi, alive; Ahmad al Haznawi, Ahmed al Nami, alive; Majed Moqed and Salem al Hazmi, alive (the brother of Nawaf al Hazmi). See http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/1559151.stm; http://911research.wtc7.net/mirrors/guardian2/september-eleven/hijackers-alive.htm; http://911research.wtc7.net/disinfo/deceptions/identities.html

“weapons of mass destruction,” as Bollyn says, “for the purpose of deceiving the public and provoking another illegal invasion.”

Of course, Tomb and Cheney’s admission also means the US has no hard evidence that “nineteen Muslims” piloted and crashed four US planes; except, perhaps for the passport of Mohammed Atta that just happen to survive the crash into the Twin Towers and flutter unmolested onto the street below. But in that case Mr. Bollyn would be glad to offer you his options in Florida swamp land. Later the report on Atta’s passport was revised to say that it actually belonged to another hijacker of Flight 11, Satan al Suqami. Incidentally, the Atta passport was first presented as evidence to Mayor Giuliani by his police commissioner, Bernard Kerik, who has a notorious past and who is presently in jail for various crimes. Moreover, when Giuliani was presented with the questions at a press conference of explosions at WTC, he turned to Kerik who simply shook his head and said “no.” This was the first “official” answer to the question that would never go away. Additionally, the US presented videos of bin Laden supposedly taking responsibility and/or being delighted for the 911 attacks. It was later discovered that the videos, which were obviously fakes, originated from ex-Israeli Occupation Forces (IOF) soldier Rita Katz through her SITE Institute.

52 See the coverage of this by Wikileaks at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PG3uaQxc8uQ&feature=related at the 9:40 mark.
53 See “9/11 Israel’s Masterpiece” at Lost Scribe Media,
57) Engines, Bodies, Luggage, Wings: Where are They?

**Keating:** page 239: “Much debris was found by first-responders, and many people saw an airliner coming in low and hitting the side of the Pentagon.”

**R. Sungenis:** Keating gives no references to back up his assertion. At least I put in a reference to backup what I stated. It was footnote 50, which said: “See CNN report at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mcWT2lQszEE&feature=related. This video was only aired once on television and never seen again. Whatever debris there was, the FBI and many unidentified people were out on the Pentagon lawn combing the ground for something, walking back and forth. But this was a crime scene.”

58) Witnesses Dying. Don’t Worry. Just Coincidence

**Keating:** page 240: “he thinks it ominous that ‘many 9/11 witnesses have been mysteriously dying since 2001,’ but one should expect over more than a decade, that some of the people who say the destruction of the Twin Towers…would go to their eternal reward.”

**R. Sungenis:** Notice that Keating doesn’t give you any examples of such deaths, since if you saw the circumstances, you would think differently than he. These include Barry Jennings, the New York Housing Authority Emergency Coordinator, who reported of explosions at Building 7 before it came down; and Beverly Eckert who sued the United States over 911 and refused to take a cash settlement; and Ken Johannemann, the janitor at the Towers, who reported seeing explosions at the base and upper floors.54

---

www.lostscribemedia.com/news/911-israels-masterpiece, which is a summation of Bollyn’s work.

54 See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bvay28lZiHU&feature=related; See Jennings’ testimony at the 5:48 mark of this video http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jazdG3-ZETM&feature=g-vrec.
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59) I Change My Mind. They Can’t Fly Into Buildings

Keating: page 240: “Sungenis thinks that Flight 93, which crashed in a field in Pennsylvania, ‘was supposed to hit Building 7’ of the World Trade Center and that, once it failed to do so, the Jewish owner of that building ordered the building’s destruction. But how could any plane, except a very small one, have been maneuvered to hit Building 7, which was 47 stories tall (less than half the height of the Twin Towers) and in an area of taller buildings? To strike it, a plane would have had to descend steeply, something no jetliner is capable of doing. (The planes that struck the Twin Towers were in almost level flight at the moment of impact.)

R. Sungenis: Keating just hung himself. He claims that an airliner hit the Pentagon, and the point of impact was almost ground level. Yet above he says that no plane could have hit Building 7 because “a plane would have had to descend steeply, something no jetliner is capable of doing.” So Keating wants his cake and eat it, too. Like the government’s story, Keating’s is a mass of contradictions.

60) The Mossad: Dancing During 911

Keating: page 240: “Perhaps the most bizarre allegation written by Sungenis…is his claim that the agents were seen celebrating their triumph in three widely-separated locations….How could someone write this with a straight face?....Are we to believe that Mossad agents moves from place to place, each time showing spontaneous expressions of jubilation...And could these really have been agents of the Mossad, an organization famed for stealth?

R. Sungenis: Perhaps if Keating had quoted the reasons for such allegations the reader would be more inclined to agree with me, but Keating will have none of that, since his book is not about uncovering the truth as much as it is smearing me. The first part of my paper shows the cover up of the Israeli involvement in 911. It is based on the four-part FOX news story by Carl Cameron, accompanied by Brit Hume and Tony
Snow, on its details to know that Bollyn is following the leads where they go. The FBI and other US government agencies told Cameron that Israelis were involved in 911, but that the information was “classified.” One can view these videos at several places on the Internet.\(^{55}\) The intrigue is only heightened by the fact that FOX pulled the series shortly after unidentified Zionist groups asked for its removal in 2001. Not only did FOX obey, as if following some Orwellian prophecy, it also removed the written transcripts and in its place put “This story no longer exists.”\(^ {56}\) Here are some gripping excerpts from the series:

\[\text{CARL CAMERON: Since Sept. 11, more than 60 Israelis have been arrested or detained, either under the new patriot anti-terrorism law, or for immigration violations. A handful of active Israeli military were among those detained, according to investigators, who say some of the detainees also failed polygraph questions when asked about alleged surveillance activities against and in the United States...Investigators from numerous government agencies are part of a working group that’s been compiling evidence since the mid ‘90s. These documents detail hundreds of incidents in cities and towns across the country that investigators say, “may well be an organized intelligence gathering activity.”...Documents say they “targeted and penetrated military bases.” The DEA, FBI and dozens of government facilities, and even secret offices and unlisted...}\]

\(^{55}\)whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/spyring.php
See also: www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q5f4fbknkD4, www.youtube.com/watch?v=saoZyIsHVh4&feature=relmfu
\(^{56}\) If one tries to obtain the videos from the original Youtube outlets, such as wee.youtube.com/watch?v=cAFRgT2w6Dk, these words appear: “This video has been removed because its content violated YouTube’s Terms of Service. Sorry about that.”
private homes of law enforcement and intelligence personnel. The majority of those questioned “stated they served in military intelligence, electronic surveillance intercept and or explosive ordnance units.”…Why would Israelis spy in and on the U.S.? A general accounting office investigation referred to Israel as country A and said, “According to a U.S. intelligence agency, the government of country A conducts the most aggressive espionage operations against the U.S. of any U.S. ally.”…The document concludes: “Israel possesses the resources and technical capability to achieve its collection objectives.”…A spokesman for the Israeli embassy here in Washington issued a denial saying that any suggestion that Israelis are spying in or on the U.S. is “simply not true.”…Tonight, in the second of four reports on spying by Israelis in the U.S., we learn about an Israeli-based private communications company, for whom a half-dozen of those 60 detained suspects worked…Fox News has learned that some American terrorist investigators fear certain suspects in the Sept. 11 attacks may have managed to stay ahead of them, by knowing who and when investigators are calling on the telephone…In recent years, the FBI and other government agencies have investigated Amdocs more than once. The firm has repeatedly and adamantly denied any security breaches or wrongdoing. But sources tell Fox News that in 1999, the super secret national security agency, headquartered in northern Maryland, issued what’s called a Top Secret sensitive compartmentalized information report, TS/SCI, warning that records of calls in the United States were getting into foreign hands – in Israel, in particular…Fox News has documents of a 1997 drug trafficking case in Los Angeles, in which telephone information, the type that Amdocs collects, was used to “completely compromise the communications of the FBI, the Secret Service, the DEO and the LAPD.”…There was a report, you’ll recall, that the Mossad, the Israeli intelligence agency, did indeed send representatives to the U.S. to warn, just before 9/11, that a major terrorist attack was imminent…In tonight’s report, we learn that the concern about phone security extends to another company, founded in Israel, that provides the technology
that the U.S. government uses for electronic eavesdropping…The company is Comverse Infosys, a subsidiary of an Israeli-run private telecommunications firm, with offices throughout the U.S. It provides wiretapping equipment for law enforcement…Every time you make a call, it passes through the nation’s elaborate network of switchers and routers run by the phone companies. Custom computers and software, made by companies like Comverse, are tied into that network to intercept, record and store the wiretapped calls, and at the same time transmit them to investigators…Congress insists the equipment it installs is secure. But the complaint about this system is that the wiretap computer programs made by Comverse have, in effect, a back door through which wiretaps themselves can be intercepted by unauthorized parties…Adding to the suspicions is the fact that in Israel, Comverse works closely with the Israeli government…But investigators within the DEA, INS and FBI have all told Fox News that to pursue or even suggest Israeli spying through Comverse is considered career suicide…And sources say that while various F.B.I. inquiries into Comverse have been conducted over the years…A 1999 F.C.C. document indicates several government agencies expressed deep concerns that too many unauthorized non-law enforcement personnel can access the wiretap system…But there is a bitter turf war internally at F.B.I. It is the FBI’s office in Quantico, Virginia, that has jurisdiction over awarding contracts and buying intercept equipment. And for years, they’ve thrown much of the business to Comverse. A handful of former U.S. law enforcement officials involved in awarding Comverse government contracts over the years now work for the company…Numerous sources say some of those individuals were asked to leave government service under what knowledgeable sources call “troublesome circumstances” that remain under administrative review within the Justice Department…And what troubles investigators most, particularly in New York, in the counter terrorism investigation of the World Trade Center attack, is that on a number of cases, suspects that they had sought to wiretap and survey immediately changed their
telecommunications processes. They started acting much differently as soon as those supposedly secret wiretaps went into place…Federal officials this year have arrested or detained nearly 200 Israeli citizens suspected of belonging to an “organized intelligence-gathering operation.” The Bush administration has deported most of those arrested after Sept. 11…The suspects: Israeli organized crime with operations in New York, Miami, Las Vegas, Canada, Israel and Egypt…The problem: according to classified law enforcement documents obtained by Fox News, the bad guys had the cops’ beepers, cell phones, even home phones under surveillance. Some who did get caught admitted to having hundreds of numbers and using them to avoid arrest…Asked this week about another sprawling investigation and the detention of 60 Israelis since Sept. 11, the Bush administration treated the questions like hot potatoes…Beyond the 60 apprehended or detained, and many deported since Sept. 11, another group of 140 Israeli individuals have been arrested and detained in this year in what government documents describe as “an organized intelligence gathering operation,” designed to “penetrate government facilities.” Most of those individuals said they had served in the Israeli military…But they also had, most of them, intelligence expertise, and either worked for Amdocs or other companies in Israel that specialize in wiretapping…Well, there’s real pandemonium described at the FBI, the DEA and the INS. A lot of these problems have been well known to some investigators, many of who have contributed to the reporting on this story…They want to find out how it is all this has come out, as well as be very careful because of the explosive nature and very political ramifications of the story itself – Tony. SNOW: All right, Carl, thanks.

Further evidence of the Mossad involvement is the Foreword of Bollyn’s book which is written by Glen Stanish, a professional pilot and the author of “Where is the Wreckage of UAL 93?” Whereas we might expect Stanish to confirm what many other professional pilots have stated, namely, that it would be quite difficult if not impossible to fly a huge
passenger plane into a designated building. Stanish covers the motive aspect of 911 in his 27-page treatment. Stanish’s treatment dovetails perfectly with Bollyn’s first piece of evidence – the Israeli men who were seen jumping for joy and taking pictures of themselves with the collapse of the Twin Towers in the background while, of course, thousands of people were, as Bollyn puts it, “being roasted alive.” Witnesses saw them jumping for joy in Liberty State Park after the initial impact. Later on, other witnesses saw them celebrating on a roof in Weehawken, NJ, and still more witnesses later saw them celebrating with high fives in a Jersey City parking lot. Residents of the area quickly called the police and the Israeli men, who were posing as Arabs running a New Jersey moving company, were arrested. Two of the five men were later identified as Israeli Mossad agents.

That the Israelis knew they could bamboozle the United States into helping with the attack on New York was more or less proven in the way the arrested Israelis were handled. Although two of them were Mossad agents, the US media ignored this revealing fact. That they were carrying multiple passports, thousands of dollars in cash and tested positive for explosives was reported only by the Bergen Record in the small town of Paolo Lima, NJ while the New York Post reported that one of the white vans was seized just prior to the Lincoln Tunnel, and another van at the George Washington Bridge, apparently with enough explosives to bring the bridge

---

57 See commercial pilots confirm the impossibility at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V5zvCdD9D1A&feature=related
58 It stated: “About eight hours after terrorist struck Manhattan’s tallest skyscraper, police in Bergen county detained five men on the suspicion that they are tied to the blasts. The five men were stopped by East Rutherford police late Tuesday afternoon….Sources close to the investigation said the men said they are Israeli tourists….East Rutherford officers stopped the van along Route 3 about 4:30pm…Three individuals were seen celebrating in Liberty State Park after the impact. They said three people were jumping up and down.…. ‘Vehicle possibly related to New York terrorist attacks. White 2000 Chevrolet van with New Jersey registration with ‘Urban Moving Systems’ sign on back seen at Liberty State Park, Jersey City, NJ at the time of the first impact of jetliner into World Trade Center…Business records show an Urban Moving Systems with offices on West 50th Street in Manhattan…Business records show the owner as Dominik Suter of Fair Lawn. Wednesday September 12, 2001.”
down. A third van was found on King St. between 6th and 7th which the Israelis fled after they blew it up. It was later found that the moving company, Urban Moving Systems (UMS), was a Mossad front and that the Kurzburg brothers, Paul and Sivan, were the two Mossad agents. The entire police communication was recorded and is available on the Internet. One of the police officers describes one of the vans having a **mural of a plane** hitting the Twin Towers. Dominic Suter, another Mossad agent and the registered owner of UMS, was allowed to flee to Israel by the FBI on Sept. 14, 2001, just three days after the attacks.

See print version for photo on this page

---

59 The Jerusalem Post, the Israeli National News, and Yediot America, however, reported that the white van was seized prior to the George Washington Bridge, several miles north of the Lincoln Tunnel. Dan Rather reported the following: “two suspects are in FBI custody after a truckload of explosives was discovered around the George Washington Bridge...The FBI...says enough explosives were in the truck to do great damage to the George Washington Bridge.” http://gold-silver.us/forum/showthread.php?55836-Shocking-evidence-showing-Urban-Moving-Systems-involvement-in-9-11

The other five Israelis, although they failed lie detector tests when questioned about 911, were released weeks later when an order came down from Michael Chertoff, the Jewish head of FBI activities, to deport them to Israel, where they remain to this day. Upon arrival in Israel, three of the men, Oded Ellner, Omer Marmari and Yaron Schmuel (without the Kurzburgs) appeared on Israeli television in November 2001 with Ellner taking the lead and saying: “Our purpose was to document the [911] event.” Since his admission documents that Israel had prior knowledge of the attacks, one might think this would be a newsworthy item for the New York Times, the Washington Post, the LA Times, or the Chicago Tribune. Not a word was revealed from these Jewish-owned newspapers, or anyone else for that matter. As one 911 commentator put it: “Why aren’t ‘60 minutes.’ ‘Nightline,’ ‘20/20,’ and the rest of the Zionist media aggressively pursuing the story behind the Israeli “art students” and “movers” with 1/1,000th the zeal that they pursued Martha Stewart over allegations of insider trading (who cares?), or 1/10,000th the zeal that they pursued the Catholic Church over an occasional pedophile priest? (funny how we never hear about the documented cases of pedophile rabbis!) or 1/100,000th the zeal that they pursue the Muslim bogeyman on a daily basis? Something smells rotten here!”

But the five arrested Israelis was just the tip of the iceberg. FOX news reported that a total of two hundred Israeli spies were arrested in the United States between 2000 and 2001. It was the largest spy ring ever to be uncovered. The Atlantic Journal-Constitution had an article in Nov. 2001 titled: “Israeli caught up in terror sweep” stating that immediately after 911 over 90 Israelis were arrested in the US for espionage. The Washington Post reported that some of the Israelis were arrested in connection with the 911 investigation. On this note, Bollyn quotes Israel’s chief of staff, General Rafael Eitan from the Jerusalem Post of Sept. 1,
1989 saying: “Someday, perhaps, if it’s decided that the stories can be
told, you’ll see that the state [of Israel] has been involved in acts which are
a thousand times more dirty than anything going on in Columbia. But
these things were decided by the government, in cabinet meetings. As long
as the government decides to do something…then it is legitimate.”

Dr. Alan Sabrosky, Director of Strategic Studies at the US Army War
College\(^63\) says: “It is 100 percent certain that 9-11 was a Mossad operation.
Period.”\(^64\) General Hamid Gul, former Pakistan intelligence chief, agrees:
“It was a Zionist/Neo Con conspiracy. It was an inside job. They wanted to
go on world conquest, looking at it as an opportunity window when the
Muslim world was lying prostrate; Russia was nowhere in sight; China
was still not an economic giant that it has turned out to be. And they
thought this was a good time to fill those strategic areas which are still
lying without any American presence; and of course to control the energy
tap of the world. Presently it is the Middle East and in the future it is going
to be central Asia.”\(^65\)

Francesco Cossiga, former Italian president, is of the same opinion, telling
Italy’s most respected newspaper that the attacks were run by the CIA and
Mossad: “all the [intelligence services] of America and Europe ... now
know well that the disastrous attack has been planned and realized from
the CIA American and the Mossad with the aid of the Zionist world in
order to put under accusation the Arabic Countries and in order to induce
the western powers to take part ... in Iraq [and] Afghanistan.”\(^66\) In
September 2001 the *Washington Times* ran a story from the Army School
of Advanced Military Studies which said of the Mossad: “Wildcard.

\(^63\)http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article23460.htm;http://www.bigeye.c
om/sabrosky.htm; http://www.veteranstoday.com/2011/07/17/911-and-israel-alan-
sabroskys-shocking-press-tv-interview/

\(^64\)See the interview of Dr. Sabrosky four part interview at
(1) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bT5IVEQuzv8&feature=related;
(2) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EV4SIG9NIs&feature=relmfu;
(3) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VcCiyKFPC08&feature=relmfu;
(4) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wx6I9bOhWrM&feature=relmfu

\(^65\)http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z7Lbmb0-ibQ&feature=related;
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mSLgC4cTKcs

\(^66\)http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/december2007/120407_common_knowled
ge.htm
Ruthless and cunning. Has capability to target US forces and make it look like a Palestinian/Arab act.\textsuperscript{67}

As for Sabrosky, in our day and age when the “anti-semitic” label is thrown around with abandon, there is one fact we should know about Dr. Sabrosky to help accept his conclusion: he is part Jewish on his father’s side. He thus corroborates the numerous other experts who have finally connected the dots about a massive Israeli undercover invasion into America. Internet sites such as Wikispooks have a compete dossier on all the Jewish connections to 911, titled “911: Israel Did It” at https://wikispooks.com/wiki/9/11:Israel_did_it. Many others have the same information, including the story that the WTC complex already had “emergency nuclear demolition devices” built into the base of the structures.\textsuperscript{68}

As for the odd Israeli reaction to 911, \textbf{Benjamin Netanyahu} himself admitted in an off guard moment: “We are benefiting from one thing, and that is the attack on the Twin Towers and Pentagon, and the American struggle in Iraq…these events swung American public opinion in our favor.”\textsuperscript{69} The day after, Netanyahu uttered an even more audacious remark

\textsuperscript{67} “U.S. troops would enforce peace under Army study” by Rowan Scarborough - The Washington Times September 10, 2001 (Article ID: U00682760115, available through http://www.washtimes.com/archives.htm, search key "MOSSAD SAMS." The article also says, “On the Palestinian side, the paper describes their youth as ‘loose cannons; under no control, sometimes violent.’ The study lists five Arab terrorist groups that could target American troops for assassination and hostage-taking.”

\textsuperscript{68}http://www.whodidit.org/cocon.html; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=brQqRLCxJew&feature=related; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFgxqY128Wc&feature=related, which features Dimitri Khalezov, a former Russian agent, saying that 911 was a Mossad operation run by Mossad agent Michael Harari who confessed to his involvement, and says that the WTC complex was built with “emergency nuclear demolition devices” in the Twin Towers and Building 7 and that a nuclear cruise missile hit the Pentagon, possibly a Granit missile. See also; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aDrSr_h0A7I&feature=related; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a_UsC6GvKf0&feature=related. Khalezov also says that Chernobyl was set off by a pre-set nuclear bomb at the base of the facility.

on the 911 attacks, saying: “It’s very good.” Realizing the implications, he caught himself and said, “Well, it’s not good, but it will generate immediate sympathy.” Similar to Netanyahu’s capitalizing on 911, Ehud Barak, which Bollyn says “is suspected of being one of the real masterminds of 911,” did much the same since “within minutes of the explosive demolitions of the Twin Towers on 911, the Israeli politician and military leader Ehud Barak was in the London studio of the BBC” and “before any evidence of culpability was found, Barak called for a ‘War on Terror’ and US military intervention in Afghanistan,” which is a “textbook example of how false-flag terrorism is supposed to work. The perpetrator is the first one to assign blame…which is the real purpose of such atrocities.”

61) Lucky Larry’s Doctor’s Appointment on 911

Keating: page 241: “Sungenis believes that Larry Silverstein, owner of Building 7, was ‘the key to 9/11’”

R. Sungenis: Mr. Keating offers no rebuttal. Apparently he thinks that merely asserting that I believe Silverstein was responsible is outlandish enough to refute itself. But let’s take a closer look by actually reading my paper. Here are the paragraphs on Silverstein:

One of the issues that the official version does not address is the widely known account concerning Larry Silverstein, the Jewish lease holder of the Twin Towers and Building 7. Not only did Larry obtain the lease for the Twin Towers just ten weeks before 911, he doubled the insurance and included a clause for “terrorists acts.” Then, when it came time to collect, Larry claimed that there were two incidents of “terror” since two buildings were hit by planes, which allowed him to seek for

---

70 Interview with James Bennett of the New York Times on September 12, 2001.
71 “Just 10 weeks before the attacks, Mr. Silverstein and his investment group closed on a 99-year lease of the World Trade Center from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey in a deal valued at $3.2 billion.”
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB1002750955959300920.html?mod=googlenw
72 “…they also insured the property for $3.546 billion – more than twice the amount of insurance previously maintained on the same property.”
double indemnity.\textsuperscript{73} A Jewish judge, Michael B. Mukasey, oversaw the litigation. Suffice it to say that Larry won.\textsuperscript{74} Larry is known to consort with the highest officials in Israel and is an ardent advocate of Zionist causes.\textsuperscript{75} On the morning of 911, Larry, who ate breakfast every single morning at the Windows of the World restaurant at the Twin Towers, said he didn’t eat there on 911. A \textit{Haaretz} article noted that Larry “was saved only because a meeting he had scheduled that morning with officials of the Port Authority on the 88th floor of [WTC 1] was canceled at the last minute.” The real truth is that Larry and the Port Authority were scheduled to have a meeting on September 11 concerning terror attacks and the meeting was canceled the night before because Larry said he could not attend.\textsuperscript{76} On September

\textsuperscript{73}http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dNhhy98FxVQ&feature=related; http://dprogram.net/2011/04/17/did-wtc-owner-larry-silverstein-just-make-another-1-2-billion-from-911/

\textsuperscript{74} “Mr. Silverstein’s group has scored numerous victories in its efforts to rebuild, particularly its $4.55 billion victory over the World Trade Center’s insurers.” “In February of 2002 Silverstein Properties won $861 million from Industrial Risk Insurers to rebuild on the site of WTC 7. Silverstein Properties' estimated investment in WTC 7 was $386 million. So: This building's collapse resulted in a profit of about $500 million.”

http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/background/owners.html
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122108942858221349.html?mod=hpp_us_inside_today

\textsuperscript{75} According to Haaretz.com, “Many Israeli politicians are acquainted in one degree or another with the 70-year-old Silverstein.” He has a close friendship with no less than three former Israeli prime ministers, namely Benjamin Netanyahu, Ariel Sharon and Ehud Barak. Silverstein is especially close to Benjamin Netanyahu who was in New York on the morning of 9/11. Silverstein is an “ardent supporter” of the state of Israel and committed to Jewish causes. He was chairman of the board of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) and remains on the Board of Directors, along with his wife, Klara, who is also a founding member of the Jewish Women’s Foundation. His son, Roger, and his daughter, Lisa, are also UJA contributors. Roger Silverstein, director of leasing for WTC 7, serves on the executive committee of the Real Estate Executive Division of the UJA, and his daughter Lisa is co-chair of the UJA (source). According to its website, the UJA is the most successful local charity in the history of the United States, and over the last 60 years has raised more than $1 billion for the state of Israel. See http://wakeupfromyourslumber.com/node/2210

\textsuperscript{76} Published: September 12, 2001: “Mr. Silverstein’s company had planned a meeting yesterday morning on the 88th floor of one tower to discuss what to do in
he went to a doctor’s appointment and later stated, ‘I had said to my wife, sweetheart, cancel my doctor's appointment. I have so much to do at the Trade Center... She got very upset and told me I had to go. As it turns out, that saved my life.’” Larry put this in his own words on the Charlie Rose Show. Coincidentally, his son, Roger, and daughter, Lisa, did not show up for work at WTC on the morning of 911.

The list of other Jewish Zionists connected with the Twin Tower complex but missing on 911 is astounding. Frank Lowy, a member of the Golani Brigade who fought in Israel’s war of independence, had a 99-year lease on the retail area at WTC but was absent on 911. Lewis Eisenberg, who is a prominent supporter of the ADL and the United Jewish Appeal, authorized the lease for Silverstein on the WTC complex. Ronald S. Lauder, whose affiliates include the World Jewish Congress and the ADL, and who funded a school for the Mossad in Herzliya, Israel, was on the New York board of directors and the key individual who obtained privatization for the WTC complex. Jules Kroll and Jerome Hauer, the latter from a family involved in Zionist organizations to promote the state of Israel, had the security contract on the WTC complex (although Hauer told journalist Sander Hicks that Larry hired a private security team at that time, but that cause even more suspicion).

The event of a terrorist attack. The meeting was canceled Monday night because one participant could not attend.”

---

77 http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110010066
78 Beginning at the 4:50 mark at:
http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=4949024470881667817&ei=_U1mS4edJ96Flgf2o7nCBA&q=larry+silverstein&hl=en&view=3&dur=3#
79 “His son, Roger, and his daughter, Lisa, were working for him in temporary offices on the 88th floor of the W.T.C. north tower. Regular meetings with tenants in the weeks immediately following their July 26, 2001, takeover of the building were held each morning at Windows on the World. But on Sept. 11, Roger and Lisa Silverstein were running late.” http://www.observer.com/node/47252
80 Silverstein hired Securacom (now Stratasec) for the management of electronic security of the WTC complex. The president's brother, Marvin Bush, was on Securacom’s board of directors (1993 to June 2000), and George Bush’s distant
also Yoram Shalmon of PowerLoc Technologies who contracted to remove the 250 tons of steel girders from ground zero. He had the trucks wired with GPS so that he could see their whereabouts at each second, perhaps fearing that the dust on them could be used as evidence of explosive devices at 911. Then there is Philip Zelikow\(^81\) who, like many others in the US government is a citizen of the state of Israel. He wrote the government’s report on 911 which, oddly enough, is subtitled, “The Uncensored History of the 911 Commission.”\(^82\) Perhaps we should also mention Rabbi Dov Zakheim, co-author of the infamous Sept. 2000 PNAC paper with Cheney, Rumsfeld and Wolfawitz, “Rebuilding America’s Defenses,” which boldly advocated another “catastrophic and catalyzing event – like Pearl Harbor” in order to get public opinion behind and accelerate the US’s takeover of the Middle East. The PNAC paper was a follow up to the 1996 paper titled “Clean Break” authored by high post Zionist Jews such as Douglas Feith, David Wurmser and Richard Perle. Its purpose was to chart a course for the invasion of Lebanon and Iraq and to foment antagonistic actions against Iran and Syria, all of which, with uncanny accuracy, have come to pass.

Zakheim was also the Pentagon’s comptroller from May 4, 2001 to March 10, 2004, during which over 3 trillion dollars was reported missing from the Pentagon by Donald Rumsfeld on September 10, 2001. Zakheim was put in charge of the investigation and in the process most of his researchers were cousin, Wirt Walker III, was the CEO. Securacom was also responsible for the security of United Airlines Inc. and Dulles International airport at the time, which both had starring roles in the 9/11 attacks. The other security company servicing the airports used on 9/11 was the Israeli-owned ICTS, predominantly staffed by Israeli ex-Shin Bet officers.

\(^81\) http://www.rense.com/general78/rapestory.htm  
found dead, with more than half of them being civilian accountants, bookkeepers and budget analysts. Afterwards, Zakheim arranged to have F-15s and F-16s sold to Israel as surplus for only a fraction of their value. It is probably not a coincidence that Zakheim was also involved in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center since his Tridata company was authorized to investigate the incident that he said was an “Arab attack on the US.”

Incidentally, others who made huge profits off of 911 were the Israelis who, for the two weeks prior to 911, placed substantial put options (a stock option that predicts the value of the stock will go down) on companies directly impacted by the tragedy, including American Airlines, United Airlines, Swiss Reinsurance and Munich Reinsurance. During the two days of Sept. 6-7, 2001, over 4,700 put options were placed on United Airlines. On Sept. 10, over 4,500 put options were placed on American Airlines. Among the put option investors was Mayor Michael Bloomberg of New York, who also covered up the put options of fellow Zionist Jew, Maurice Greenberg. To this day, none of these option speculators have been investigated by the SEC, the FBI or the DHS.

62) Don’t Pay Attention to the Facts

Keating: page 233: “This catalogue of odd beliefs is not given here to embarrass Sungenis but to suggest that a man who is so unreliable in his judgments and so suspicious in attributing motives cannot be relied on when explaining matter of science, history or theology.”

R. Sungenis: The other odd beliefs that Keating speaks about regarding 911 are all covered in my paper on 911. Suffice it to say, the issues I

---


84 http://middleeastatemporal.wordpress.com/
covered are enough to give a fair taste of how Keating has totally distorted the picture and also revealed his ineptness to deal with problems in the Church and in our country. In fact, Keating’s willful blindness in divulging and dealing with these problems has forced us to conclude that the days of Catholic Answers apologetics – where we blindly accept everything the Catholic hierarchy and the US Government tell us – are over. The New Apologetics will put the Catholic hierarchy under the magnifying glass.

63) Poor Galileo Was Wrong – Not Selling Very Well?

Keating: page 243: “Sungenis may have saturated his market early on. His trilogy languishes around the two million mark at Amazon’s best sellers ranking, meaning that two million books are better sellers. No doubt his most devoted followers purchased Galileo Was Wrong years ago, when it appeared as two fat volumes instead of the later three, and most of them probably have seen insufficient reason to purchase the latest, expanded edition, which is available at his website for $114 or at Amazon for $94.”

R. Sungenis: Let’s check the facts against Mr. Keating’s misinformation. First of all, the hardback book, Galileo Was Wrong, Vol. 1, as of today (March 20, 2015) stands at the #252,462 mark (which, incidentally, is better than Mr. Keating’s The New Geocentrists, which stands today at #284,884). Vol. 2 of Galileo Was Wrong stands at the #302,034 mark; and Vol. 3 stands at the #699,972 mark. None of them are even close to the two million mark Keating claims for GWW. Even better, as of March 11, Galileo Was Wrong, Vol. 1 was at the #123,787 mark on Amazon. (I took snapshots of all these stats in case anyone would like to see them for proof). The fact is, I’ve never seen the Galileo Was Wrong volumes even close to the two million mark for the year they have been for sale on Amazon.

So how did Mr. Keating arrive at “two million”? My guess is that he clicked on the bootleg copy of Galileo Was Wrong that someone, without my permission, put on Amazon a few years ago and has been trying to sell for $290.00, but no one is buying. Of course, no one in their right mind would by a book for $290.00 when he can buy it for $23.00 or $33.00 one
page prior on Amazon. But, of course, the $290 bootleg copy is the one that would give Mr. Keating the most fodder to make his case that no one is interested in *Galileo Was Wrong*. Another possibility is that Mr. Keating waited patiently until one of the three GWW volumes was not selling so well, and he used that particular day for his evidence in order to make his desired negative impression on the reader of *The New Geocentrists*.

In any case, the “two million” figure is a total distortion, and Mr. Keating knows it. It wouldn’t be so bad, except Mr. Keating tried this same devious trick a year and a half ago on his blog. I then wrote him a letter, sent by USPS, alerting him that I was aware of his ploy. The letter was dated Nov. 5, 2013. It was written to Mr. Keating when I was selling only the CDROM of GWW, not the actual hardcover books. The letter stated:

You then made another remark to Mr. Delano. You stated: “By the way, Amazon lists "Galileo Was Wrong" at number 6,402,667 in its best seller rankings. This means that there are 6,402,666 other books that are selling better than Bob's. (By comparison, my own "Catholicism and Fundamentalism" is at number 81,250...See More” I don’t know what the purpose of your remark was, but the reason you got a number of 6 million was because you chose the button in which some person is selling my book privately for $295.00 (copy enclosed). Obviously, no one is going to buy a book for that kind of money, and thus the tabulation of sales is severely affected. But if you chose the button in which the price is $23.00, you get a much lower sales number. I looked at Amazon on Oct 31, 2013 and the ranking was 1,043,222. Ten days prior it was 473,404 (Oct. 21, 2013, copy enclosed). Who knows what it will be tomorrow? You should also know that I do not sell the Galileo Was Wrong books on Amazon. What you see there on Amazon is a CD-ROM, and most people don’t read books from a CD-ROM. Even then, the CD-ROM has a rating of 3.5 stars out of five, so it is hardly a despised item. The actual books of Galileo Was Wrong have sold over a two-thousand copies. It is our best-selling book.”
As you can see, Mr. Keating has not changed his tactics two years later when he published *The New Geocentrists* in early 2015. His objective is to make me, and my book, look as bad as possible and deliberately withholds any other factual information from Amazon that an objective reader could use to modify or even reverse Keating’s judgment. Interestingly enough, I could have done the same thing to Keating. Let’s, for example, look at the book he boasts about in his letter to me, *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*. He crows that it had an Amazon ranking of “81,250.” So be it. But let’s look a little closer at those stats. If today (March 20, 2015) you click on Amazon’s first entry of *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*, which is priced at between 0.87 cents and $14.98 for the paperback, you will see a ranking of #100,461.

But if you go down to the 11th entry where *Catholicism and Fundamentalism* is selling for between $9.41 and $25.99, the ranking is one of the lowest, at #1,438,575! If I wanted to be real mean, I could have cut and pasted that low ranking and claimed to the world that no one likes either Mr. Keating or his book. But, of course, that would mean that I would have become as low in human depravity as Keating. Keating continues on the same page in *The New Geocentrists* with this:

> Seeing that his masterwork could not be sold in volume, Sungenis brought out two variants early in 2014. The first was *Geocentrism 101*…

This is important only because Keating decided not to report the Amazon numbers for *Geocentrism 101*. Could it be that he decided not to do so because the numbers are much higher than *Galileo Was Wrong*? Allow me to give some stats: As of March 11, 2015, *Geocentrism 101* was at #68,972. Last year at this time it was at #22,000. Both numbers are much better than any of the books Keating is selling on Amazon today (not including one Kindle book, which is very cheap at $2.99). As of today, Geocentrism 101 is at #521,115. On most days it hovers between #100,000 and #200,000. Of course, if Mr. Keating reported these stats it would not serve his purposes, since the stats show that people are really interested in geocentrism.
Incidentally, few of Keating’s books are doing particularly well on Amazon, and most are, on average, below the average rankings of *Geocentrism 101*. For example, as of March 20, 2015: “High Level Apologetics” is at #859,282; “The Usual Suspects” is at #1,017,933; “Jeremiah” is at #153,683; “What Catholics Really Believe” is at #148,276. The only one doing very well is “No Apologies” but that is only sold in Kindle edition, and for only $2.99.

So my friends, we see in all this how Keating distorts the evidence in his favor, and this tactic is repeated over and over again in his book, *The New Geocentrists*. What I expose above is only one tiny example of an avalanche of falsehoods and misrepresentations in his book. May I suggest to you in the meantime that the reason Keating’s book, “Nothing But the Truth,” isn’t selling very well is precisely because few people believe Keating is telling the whole truth. As of today it’s ranking on Amazon is #1,004,998.

64) Poor Bob: He’s Not William Faulkner

**Keating:** page 244: “Is is harder to see the sense in Sungenis’s other attempt at popularization, a novel called *The Copernican Conspiracy*.”

**R. Sungenis:** I include this part of Keating’s book only to demonstrate how obsessed he is with me. Keating spends eight pages critiquing my first attempt at a novel. He points out everything from his dislike of “‘Vim and vigor’? The novel is full of such hackneyed phrasing,” to his wish to teach me how best to write a novel by complaining, “Throughout the book Sungenis violates the first principle of fiction writing: show, don’t tell. Don’t say, ‘John looked angry.’ Say, ‘John’s lip curled.’” I found myself laughing out loud as I read picayune after picayune comment from Keating. I couldn’t believe a man could actually sit for hours and hours pouring over someone’s first-time novel to extract little more than literary idiosyncrasies.

65) Aether, Smeather! Does it Exist or Not?

**Keating:** page 250: “Here it is Sungenis who falls into a metaphysical—really, a physical—trap. He thinks that empty
space can’t exist because its emptiness would provide no medium for the transmission of light and no way to keep objects apart. Thus aether must exist....Sungenis believes empty gaps between celestial bodies can’t work: ‘if that was the case the Earth and the Moon would be touching each other.’ But what about gaps between the particles, other than empty space, albeit very small empty space. His notion of aether doesn’t solve a problem he thinks he sees.”

R. Sungenis: First, Keating’s attempt at an explanation does nothing to solve his own problem, which is: how can nothing exist? Metaphysically, we cannot say there is “nothing” between the Earth and Moon because “nothing” does not exist; therefore, empty space cannot exist between two objects. I refer you back to Davies article. Let’s reread the first few paragraphs:

IS SPACE just space? Or is it filled with some sort of mysterious, intangible substance? The ancient Greeks believed so, and so did scientists in the 19th century. Yet by the early part of the 20th century, the idea had been discredited and seemed to have gone for good.

Now, however, quantum physics is casting new light on this murky subject. Some of the ideas that fell from favour are creeping back into modern thought, giving rise to the notion of a quantum ether.

This surprising revival is affording new insights into the nature of motion through space, the deep interconnectedness of the Universe, and the possibility of time travel. Ingenious new experiments may even allow us to detect the quantum ether in the lab, or harness it for technological purposes.

If so, we'll have answered a question that has troubled philosophers and scientists for millennia. In the 5th century BC, Leucippus and Democritus concluded that the physical universe was made of tiny particles, atoms, moving in a void. Impossible, countered the followers of Parmenides. A void implies
nothingness, and if two atoms were separated by nothing, then
they would not be separated at all, they would be touching. So
space cannot exist unless it is filled with something, a substance
they called the plenum.

Second, Keating is assuming that there are “gaps between the particles,”
but I never described my understanding of Planck aether as such. Keating
just assumes it must be the case since he is envisioning the particles as
spheres touching one another which necessarily have “gaps” between the
spheres. I guess he missed the part in my book in which I state that since
the Planck particles are so small (i.e., 20 orders of magnitude smaller than
an electron) that there are no gaps. There would be no more gaps any more
than spherical drops of water have gaps between themselves in the ocean.

One can intuit how this could occur. We’ve all heard of Zeno’s Paradox.
Let’s say a ball is 10 feet from a wall. We roll it closer to the wall by half,
which is 5 feet. We then roll it closer by half again, which is 2.5 feet. If we
keep rolling the ball and dividing the length by half, the distance between
the ball and the wall will get smaller and smaller, but, theoretically, it
should never reach the wall, since you can always divide by half. But
practically, the distance between the ball and the wall will become so
small, that the ball will touch the wall. What is that physical distance?
Well, Quantum mechanics says it is \(10^{-33}\) cm. This is the distance that
matter cannot, for all practical purposes, be divided any longer. It is the
smallest state existing for what we call “matter.” The \(10^{-33}\) cm is the length
of the Planck particle that would appear if you could isolate one particle
from another.

66) Blame Sungenis for Lucas’ Misinformation

Keating, page 253: “Sungenis came upon this quotation from
Lucas and accepted it without further inquiry. He should have
wondered whether a tenured professor could be dismissed
overnight without any due process.”

R. Sungenis: In other words, Keating wants to make it my fault that Dr.
Lucas’ resume had some misinformation on it. According to the website,
EXPERIENCE HISTORY
Vice-President of Common Sense Science since 1997.
Post-Doc research in Theoretical Physics at Catholic University 1972-1995
Professor of Physics at Catholic and American Universities in Washington, D.C.

When Lucas was confronted with the fact that his resume had “professor at Catholic University,” the challenge went as follows:

Lucas: “I know. It’s not my fault. That shouldn’t be on there. I asked them to take it off.”

Me: “So you’re telling me you’re not responsible for what’s on your resume?”

Lucas: “I got a call from Catholic University to notify me.”

Dr. Van Stipdonk yelled from the audience, “When was that? I asked them about it and they seemed concerned.”

JD Lehman interrupted: “That’s not supposed to be on there. Before he visited (the first time) I asked him about it and he said it shouldn’t be.”

Me: “He’s never had a professorship, why should I believe that’s just an accident? He never presented to the AAAS.”

I sat back down. Lehman suggested we end the meeting and asked Lucas if he had any last words. I don’t remember what Lucas said, something about the “Divine Force.”

The truth is probably somewhere in the middle, especially since the operator of the above website is an admitted bully of creationists, much like Keating is. My guess is that Dr. Lucas’ time at CUA as a “Post-Doc research in Theoretical Physics at Catholic University (1972-1995)” was
confused by someone as an actual faculty position and that when Dr. Lucas said he was dismissed from CUA, he was referring to his Post-Doc research. The fact that Keating leaves no room for this possibility shows that he is not interesting in sorting it out, but only interested in hanging Dr. Lucas and making me look bad for quoting Lucas.

67) Did Those Satellites Fall Down Yet?

**Keating:** pages 259-272, “Those Pesky Satellites”

**R. Sungenis:** Keating added these 13 pages near the end of his book to his claim that the Geosynchronous Satellites disprove geocentrism. The previous pages were p. 105 and pp. 135-136. I will not repeat here what I wrote in those two sections, but I will give an additional explanation to counter one of Keating’s additional claims. This was put on the *Catholic World Report* blog and was never answered by Mr. Keating.

Second, to Keating, I hear that you are now saying that my answer to the Geosynchronous satellites can’t be used because the geocentric version would require a “perpetual thrust.” Here’s the problem. So would your Geosynchronous satellite. Your satellite needs to keep up with an Earth rotating counterclockwise at 1054 mph at the equator, hence, your satellite must travel 7000 mph to keep up with one spot over the Earth. How is it going to do so without a “perpetual thrust”?

Now, if you want to argue that your satellite is moving counterclockwise at 7000 mph because of inertia, well, the geocentric satellite can claim the same thing. In both models the satellite is given an initial counter-clockwise thrust of 7000 mph, and in both models it stays at that speed due to inertia. Since the “space” in both models is precisely the same, then neither model presents any friction against the satellite, and thus inertia will move each satellite just as if it is moving a planet around the sun.

So, Mr. Keating, your Geosynchronous satellite disproof of geocentrism has yet again been disproven.
Galileo Was Wrong: Skews More People than Keating?

Keating: page 278: “They think Christianity’s claims would be in jeopardy if God did not position Earth at the center of all things….This is the undergirding notion in Galileo Was Wrong. It is the notion that determines how the book’s chief author interprets and, not uncommonly, skew the writings and work of the hundreds of people he cites.”

R. Sungenis: Not surprisingly, Keating does not give even one example to prove his point. He has gotten so cocky in his dealings with me that he now thinks that mere allegations suffice as evidence. But I think I know what Mr. Keating has in mind. He doesn’t like the hundreds of quotes contained in Galileo Was Wrong that show that secular scientists themselves have admitted that Earth could be motionless and could be the center of the universe. Allow me to quote some of them here for you. Judge for yourself whether I have “skewed” any of them.

“…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 Einstein\(^85\)

“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 Einstein\(^86\)

“Briefly, everything occurs as if the Earth were at rest…”

Physicist, Henrick Lorentz\(^87\)

---

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

Physicist, Arthur Eddington$^{88}$

“The failure of the many attempts to measure terrestrially any effects of the earth’s motion…”

Physicist, Wolfgang Pauli$^{89}$

“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 Poincaré$^{90}$

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

Physicist, Henri Poincaré$^{91}$

“This conclusion directly contradicts the explanation…which presupposes that the Earth moves.”

Physicist, Albert Michelson$^{92}$

“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 Jaffe$^{93}$

“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 Einstein$^{94}$

“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, and, if so, in what particular sense.”

Physicist, Julian B. Barbour⁹⁵

“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 Cohen⁹⁶

“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 Baker⁹⁷

“….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 Coleman⁹⁸

“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. Otis⁹⁹

“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 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 Einstein

“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 Hawking

“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 Hoyle

“…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 Hoyle

100 Lincoln Barnett, The Universe and Dr. Einstein, p. 44.
102 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).
103 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”
“...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 Born\textsuperscript{104}

“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 Gardner\textsuperscript{105}

“...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. Dryer\textsuperscript{106}

“...it is very important to acknowledge that the Copernican theory offers a very exact calculation of the apparent movements of the


\textsuperscript{105} The Relativity Explosion, 1976, pp. 86-87. The previous edition was published in 1962 under the title: *Relativity for the Million*.

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 Reichenbach

“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. Wulfman

“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 Sciama

“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

107 From Copernicus to Einstein, 1970, pp, 18, 82.
109 Quoted from Dennis W. Sciama’s, The Unity of the Universe, 1961, pp. 102-3.
conventions are equally legitimate, though not all are equally convenient.”

Philosopher, Bertrand Russell\textsuperscript{110}

“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 Cohen\textsuperscript{111}

“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 matter of choice as to which we take as our place of observation.”

Physicist, Arthur Lynch\textsuperscript{112}

“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 Hoyle\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{111} I. Bernard Cohen, \textit{Birth of a New Physics}, revised and updated, 1985, p. 78.
\textsuperscript{112} Arthur Lynch, \textit{The Case Against Einstein}, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{113} Fred Hoyle, \textit{Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on His Life and Work}, p. 3.
“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.”

Astronomer, Fred Hoyle\textsuperscript{114}

“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 as 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 Wolfson\textsuperscript{115}

“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. Norton\textsuperscript{116}

“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. Giancoli\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{114} The first quote taken from Fred Hoyle’s \textit{Astronomy and Cosmology}, 1975, p. 416; the second, \textit{Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on His Life and Work}, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{115} The Teaching Company, episode taught by Professor Richard Wolfson of Middlebury College.
“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 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 Wolfson

“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 Wolfson

“...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.... 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 Hawking

“It is both amusing and instructive to speculate on what might have happened if such an experiment could have been performed in the

---


120 *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…”

121 *A Brief History of Time*, p. 42.
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 in some historical context which may be drastically modified by the changing perspective of human knowledge.”

Physicist, G. J. Whitrow 122

“It will be proper to discuss this, in order that we may know whether the universe revolves and the Earth stands still, or the universe stands still and the Earth rotates. For there have been those who asserted that…risings and settings do not occur by virtue of the motion of the heaven, but that we ourselves rise and set. The subject is worthy of consideration…whether the abode allotted to us is the most slowly or the most quickly moving, whether God moves everything around us or ourselves instead.”

Roman philosopher, Seneca 123

But among all the discoveries and corrections probably none has resulted in a deeper influence on the human spirit than the doctrine of Copernicus….Possibly mankind has never been demanded to do more, for considering all that went up in smoke as a result of realizing this change: a second Paradise, a world of innocence, poetry and piety: the witness of the senses, the conviction of a poetical and religious faith. No wonder his contemporaries did not wish to let all this go and offered every possible resistance to a doctrine which in its converts authorized and demanded a freedom of view and greatness of thought so far unknown indeed not even dreamed of.”

Poet, Johann von Goethe 124

“The Copernican revolution outshines everything since the rise of Christianity and reduces the Renaissance and Reformation to the rank of mere episodes, mere internal displacements, within the system of

medieval Christendom. Since it changed the character of men’s habitual mental operations even in the conduct of the non-material sciences, while transforming the whole diagram of the physical universe and the very texture of human life itself, it looms so large as the real origin both of the modern world and of the modern mentality, that our customary periodisation of European history has become an anachronism and an encumbrance.”

Historian, Herbert Butterfield

69) Did I Mention that Sungenis’ Book is Selling Poorly?

Keating: page 274: “Despite its title, Galileo Was Wrong has sold poorly. Perhaps it is that not many people are interested in cosmology—or at least not as many as Sungenis expected.”

R. Sungenis: So if it “has sold poorly” and people aren’t interested, why did Keating bother writing a 350-page book slandering me and trying to discredit geocentrism? Perhaps it’s because Keating knows that the book isn’t selling poorly, considering that he knows that the “2 million” Amazon ranking that he associates with Galileo Was Wrong is from the bootleg copy on sale for $295.00 that no one is buying. My books, the ones that are selling for between $20.00 and $40.00, are selling very well and rank between 22,000 and 300,000. Perhaps it’s also because Keating is well aware of the fact that The Principle is doing rather well in its limited engagement in US theaters. Perhaps it’s also because Keating is aware that every time that he gets on his blog or someone else’s to criticize me or geocentrism, he is bombarded rather quickly and thoroughly by all the people who have embraced geocentrism in the past few years.

70) No Connection Between Morality and Correct Thinking?

Keating: page 275: “There is no obvious connection between a man’s moral failings, for example, and his capacity to reason scientifically.”

R. Sungenis: This is another one of Keating’s ipse dixit moralisms that he presents without anything to verify or back it up.

---

71) We Can’t Know…We Can Know…We Can’t Know

Keating: page 277: “If it is even possible, under relativity, to argue that the universe has a center and that the Earth is at rest at it. Then it equally is possible to say that any other object, whether a planet or a star or a speck of intergalactic dust, is motionless at the center. There is no way to know.”

R. Sungenis: So here we have Keating admitting one of the fundamental theses of geocentric cosmology in its battle against heliocentric cosmology, yet trying to use it against geocentrism instead of support of it. Since Keating believes the theoretical equivalence of the two systems, why isn’t he teaching it to his Catholic Answers patrons? Either there is “no way to know” or there is? He can’t have it both ways. Why is he teaching them that the heliocentric system is the only proven system? Why isn’t he encouraging our elementary and high school children to be taught that both systems are equally plausible; and why isn’t he shouting this from the housetops for all Catholics to hear? The answer probably is, it is one thing to admit it on page 277 of a book that hardly anyone will read; but it is quite another to make it part of your regular teaching repertoire.

72) You, you, you, Conspiracy Theorist, you!

Keating: page 279: “They have not been seen to ‘don tin foil hats,’ and they have not claimed to ‘receive messages from outer space.’….But some of them—Sungenis in particular—subscribe to such outlandish ideas regarding other matters that their competence in judging evidence of any sort is called into question.”

R. Sungenis: As you have seen in my critique of Keating’s book, it is Keating who seems to be the one who is so incompetent in judging other matters that shows his incompetence in judging evidence regarding geocentrism. In fact, it goes beyond his inability to judge and crosses over into the area of the irrational, as when Keating lies about my book sales or says that I don’t have any “character development” for the characters in my novel. Karl Keating, like many Catholics today who believe they are living in the “Springtime of Vatican II,” have a naïve but insidious “hear
no evil, see no evil” mentality. They know that as soon as they admit that things are not as hunky-dory in the Church as they hoped they would be, their world will come crashing down on them. So they keep trying to sweep the evil under the rug in hopes that someday their vision for a utopian Church will be realized. Meanwhile, things get worse and worse instead of better. So, whether it’s the homosexual/pedophile scandal, the Fatima fiasco or the Assisi prayer meetings, or the totally outlandish things that Pope Francis, a consummate liberal Jesuit, says almost on a weekly basis now, or the suspect conspiracies by the US government such as 911, WMDs, Syria, Ukraine, etc. etc., you can depend on Karl Keating to look the other way and condemn anyone who might turn a suspicious eye toward them.

73) Stupid Geocentrists Ignore Four Centuries of Science!

**Keating:** page 280: “Is is prudent for him to ignore four centuries of scientific investigation (much of it by Christians who were as sincere in their faith as are today’s geocentrists) and to adopt the ideas of a writer who has no formal training in science beyond a few lower-division college courses. Is it prudent for the reader to take as his own the historical and theological judgment of someone who is neither a historian nor a theologian? The new geocentrists say ‘yes’ to all of these questions.”

**R. Sungenis:** I find it interesting that Keating, who has been teaching Catholic theology, history and science for the last 35 years at *Catholic Answers*, yet is not a scientist, a theologian or a historian, has the audacity to question me on the very things he is lacking. Keating pontificates on evolution and the Big Bang as if he were an expert. He hires and fires people based on his own understanding of Catholic theology. He has written numerous books portraying himself as one of the authorities on all things theological. So is it prudent to listen to someone who isn’t even aware of the glass house he lives in?

As for myself, the best thing about my work in geocentrism is that its viability comes from those I admit are much more skilled and knowledgeable than me. Using their expertise is the hallmark of my work,
both in science and history. In science there are such experts as Einstein, Hawking, Mach, Hoyle and Ellis, whom I use consistently to support geocentrism scientifically. In history there are people like the Church Fathers, the medievals, the saints, doctors, theologians and popes of the Catholic Church who have all gone before me and have all given their testimony that geocentrism is true. Then there are personal friends of mine who are Ph.D. scientists (Bouw, Bennett, Popov, Bernadic) that I have relied upon to deal with the subject. The only thing I have done is gathered all their work and put it into a book, and used my teaching and writing abilities to communicate all that they have taught before me.

74) Geocentrists Are “Cherry-Pickers”

Keating: page 281: “While much of the reportage is accurate, often the interpretation is not. In many places evidenced has been cherry-picked.”

R. Sungenis: You would think that if Keating is seeking to convince his audience that his accusations are correct, he would cite at least one example of so-called “cherry-picked evidence” in *Galileo Was Wrong*. That he doesn’t do so, only speaks of Keating’s methodology – shoot first, ask questions later.

75) I Risk My Reputation Just to Impress People?

Keating: page 281: Nevertheless, he gives the unwary reader the impression than [sic] he knows more physics and mathematics than does the reader and perhaps more than professional scientists.”

R. Sungenis: With Keating it’s all about impressions. I don’t seek to give impressions. I use the gifts that God has given me to give the truth that His Church laid down many years before both Keating and I were even a thought in our fathers’ minds.

76) Pick on Einstein? Prepare to be Skewed!

Keating: page 283: “Throughout *Galileo Was Wrong* Sungenis questions the motives, backgrounds, and private lives of
scientists associated with the heliocentric position. He does this not just for scientists who lived centuries ago but for those of recent times—Einstein, for example….However one judges the reliability of these scientists…the same approach can be applied toward Sungenis himself. He should not object to seeing his own background and non-scientific writings brought up, his own prejudices examines, his own predilections discussed…because they speak to his capacity to judge.”

R. Sungenis: First, the reason I go into the “private lives” of these scientists is because modern society has made idols out of them. It has put them on pedestals so high that they have become god-like. People have idolized Einstein for almost a century as someone who was an utter genius and lived an impeccable life. The state of Israel even wanted to make Einstein its prime minister, yet he had no political experience. But few people know of his sordid personal life. It was kept under lock and key until about 1987 when the executor of his estate, Helen Dukas, for one reason or another, allowed access to his personal letters and other documents.

As a result of the idolization of Einstein, people had the tendency to look on his theories with god-like devotion, as if they dropped out of heaven. For example, his major biographer, Abraham Pais, says of Einstein in regards to his scientific theories:

A new man appears abruptly, the ‘suddenly famous Doctor Einstein.’ He carries the message of a new order in the universe. He is a new Moses come down from the mountain to bring the law and a new Joshua controlling the motion of heavenly bodies….The new man who appears at that time represents order and power. He becomes the θεῖος ἀνήρ, the divine man, of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{126}

My book takes the mask off of Einstein and shows that no such god-like devotion should be given to him, especially since he was, by all normal standards of decency, a very poor example of a moral man.

\textsuperscript{126} Abraham Pais, \textit{Subtle is the Lord}, 1982, 2005, p. 311. The phrase θεῖος ἀνήρ is the Greek for “divine man.”
Again, the purpose of my delving into their personal lives is not, as Keating claims, to convince someone that these scientists may have been equally inept in their scientific theories as they were in the moral capacities, but to remove the god-like devotion of the scientists from the public, for the public has a tendency, since it doesn’t know the science, to attribute scientific veracity to people like Einstein based on the positive personal image it has absorbed from the adoring press.

I, on the other hand, am not idolized by the public. In fact, I’m excoriated by the public for challenging men like Einstein and Galileo. Additionally, I am still living, whereas the scientists I target in Galileo Was Wrong are all dead. In fact, Einstein’s death in 1955 is the very reason that Helen Dukas released his personal affects in 1987, since sufficient time had passed. So, not only did Keating get his reasoning wrong as to why I expose their personal lives, he has made a scurrilous comparison by making an equality of attacking me, a living person, with my exposure of the lives of deceased people, which even Einstein’s own friends have allowed.

77) Hey, What You Got Against Jews?

**Keating:** page 284: “His obsessive anti-Jewish writings—hundreds of thousands of words spread over more than a decade—may be irrelevant to his calculation of the gravitational force exerted by the Sun on the Earth, but those writings are not irrelevant when it comes to weighing his overall judiciousness and his ability to be fair to scientist with whom he disagrees (he does not hesitate to note that some scientists he disagree with were Jewish). Sungenis’s anti-Jewish writing may be a signal to readers of Galileo Was Wrong and his other pro-geocentrism books that they need to look critically at each representation he makes and not assume that he necessarily plays fair with his scientific opponents. If Sungenis spent a decade accusing Jews of innumerable conspiracies against common sense and the common good, are his representations about supposedly nefarious scientist to be taken at face value?”

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Keating covets to frame my writings as “anti-Jewish” in order to make it an ethnic issue, since his goal is to cast me as an “anti-
semite” who hates Jews and therefore charges them with false allegations. This will help him accomplish his goal of turning people against me due to some irrational hatred or deep-felt animosity they believe I harbor toward the Jewish people.

All I can say is that Karl Keating is a bald-faced liar who slanders people with outright falsehoods in order to accomplish his self-appointed goals. I have made it crystal clear to Mr. Keating that when I write about the misdeeds of Jewish people it is only against those Jews who perpetrate them and has absolutely nothing to do with the Jewish people at large. Unfortunately, Mr. Keating doesn’t have the honesty or the guts to make such distinctions since his goal is not fairness but to silence Robert Sungenis so that the ideas I teach that are against Mr. Keating’s will be shunned.

**78) Not One Passage in the Bible Says Earth is in the Center!**

**Keating:** page 285: “In not one of the passages does Scripture actually teach that the Sun revolves around the Earth, and not a single verse says that the Earth is at the center of the universe—a fact that Sungenis does not advert to. Each passage uses phenomenological language to describe what is seen. This is done even today by professional astronomers, who unanimously accept heliocentrism, when they refer to the Sun rising and setting.

**R. Sungenis:** First, I’ve never claimed that Scripture says Earth is at the center of the universe, and for good reasons. One is that Scripture doesn’t say so; second is because there are two centers in the universe: the geometric center and the mass center, and the two are distinct. For the geocentric universe to work, the Sun must be the geometric center and the Earth must be the mass center around which all the mass of the universe revolves.

Second, for Keating to claim that no passage in Scripture teaches that the Sun revolves around the Earth is to fly directly in the face of the patristic, medieval and Tridentine teaching, not to mention the two popes, Paul V
and Urban VIII, that approved the Holy Office decree that to deny the Sun revolves around the Earth is “formally heretical.”

Keating believes he can do so because he thinks that science has disproven the Church’s claims. He claims that his book, *The New Geocentrists*, has provided scientific proof to back up his claim that the Church was wrong. We have diligently examined each of Keating’s scientific claims and we can honestly say that he has no more proof than Galileo did in his day. Keating’s “best” proof – that the Geosynchronous satellites prove a rotating Earth – has been shown to be baseless both from a General Relativity/Machian and a Newtonian perspective.

Keating’s claim that all passages in the Bible that describe the movements of the heavenly bodies must be read from a phenomenological basis is equally ludicrous and once again shows his failure to make the proper distinctions. His attempt to make Joshua 10 a phenomenological text was the height of hermeneutical hubris. Not once did Keating deal with the fact that the Moon moves independently of the Sun and stars and thus does not allow a phenomenological reading of Joshua’s text, nor does it allow one to claim that the Sun and Moon were stopped by a cessation of a rotating Earth, since the Moon would keep moving in such a scenario. All of this was taught many years prior to Mr. Keating – by the Church Fathers and the hierarchy in the reigns of Paul V and Urban VIII – but Keating refuses to accept their teachings because he thinks he knows better than what the Holy Spirit led the Church to believe. In fact, Mr. Keating must believe God abandoned the Church and left the Devil to lead the Church Fathers and the Popes of the 17th century to reject heliocentrism and believe geocentrism.

79) *Providentissimus Deus* and the Shoehorn

**Keating:** pages 285-286: “Sungenis demands a literalistic interpretation of the passages he lists. To an inquirer he wrote, ‘Church documents only allow for the figurative interpretation if the literal cannot be fulfilled. No Church document allows for a carte blanche figurative interpretation of Scripture. The Church has always held that the literal comes first. Leo XIII was very clear about that in *Providentissimus Deus.*’ A little further on, he
expands his thought: ‘You haven’t proven that the cosmological Scriptures are figurative. If you can’t then you are bound to take it literally.’ This is not what is taught in Providentissimus Deus nor in the later Divino Afflante Spiritu. Neither papal document insists that a reader must try to shoehorn a literalistic interpretation into Scripture. In Providentissimus 19, for example, Leo XIII says, ‘The unshrinking defense of the Holy Scripture, however, does not require that we should equally uphold all the opinions which each of the Fathers or the more recent interpreters have put forth in explaining it; for it may be that, in commenting on passages where physical matters occur, they have sometimes expressed the ideas of their own times, and thus made statements which in these days have been abandoned as incorrect.’”

R. Sungenis: Keating totally misrepresents what the Church teaches in Providentissimus Deus. First, notice by the loaded word “shoehorn” how Keating tries to make it appear as if a literal interpretation of the Bible’s cosmological passages is akin to forcing the Bible to say something it doesn’t want to say.

Second, Keating slices and dices Pope Leo XIII’s words for his own convenience. He leaves out the most important words in the encyclical dealing with the very topic we are addressing. In section 14, Leo says the following:

His teaching, and that of other Holy Fathers, is taken up by the Council of the Vatican, which, in renewing the decree of Trent declares its "mind" to be this - that "in things of faith and morals, belonging to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be considered the true sense of Holy Scripture which has been held and is held by our Holy Mother the Church, whose place it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret Holy Scripture
against such sense or also against the unanimous agreement of the Fathers."(34)\(^{127}\)

Notice that Leo stresses the “unanimous agreement of the Fathers,” and it was upon this basis that St. Robert Bellarmine told Fr. Foscarini and Galileo that they could not interpret the Bible to teach heliocentrism. Leo is merely reiterating what Bellarmine taught, and which was approved by Paul V in 1616 and Urban VIII in 1633. Where do we find this in Keating’s teaching? Nowhere. Keating treats Bellarmine and the two popes who approved the Holy Office’s condemnation of heliocentrism as mere blights on the landscape; and he totally ignores Leo XIII’s admonition that we must follow the Fathers. This was not just a passing thought of Pope Leo’s. He reiterated it in even more detail several lines later:

“The other Fathers have said the same, and have confirmed it by their example, for they ‘endeavoured to acquire the understanding of the Holy Scriptures not by their own lights and ideas, but from the writings and authority of the ancients, who in their turn, as we know, received the rule of interpretation in direct line from the Apostles.’(38) The Holy Fathers ‘to whom, after the Apostles, the Church owes its growth - who have planted, watered, built, governed, and cherished it,’(39) the Holy Fathers, We say, are of supreme authority, whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith or morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith. The opinion of the Fathers is also of very great weight when they treat of these matters in their capacity of doctors, unofficially; not only because they excel in their knowledge of revealed doctrine and in their acquaintance with many things which are useful in understanding the apostolic Books, but because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of His light. Wherefore the

\(^{127}\)http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18111893_providentissimus-deus.html
expositor should make it his duty to follow their footsteps with all reverence, and to use their labours with intelligent appreciation.

Keating’s elimination of Pope Leo’s teaching on the unanimous consent of the Fathers is bad enough, but Keating then leaves out Leo’s teaching on the literal interpretation of Scripture. While Keating talks about “shoehorning” literal interpretation, notice what Leo says in Section 15:

15. But he must not on that account consider that it is forbidden, when just cause exists, to push inquiry and exposition beyond what the Fathers have done; provided he carefully observes the rule so wisely laid down by St. Augustine – not to depart from the literal and obvious sense, except only where reason makes it untenable or necessity requires; (40) a rule to which it is the more necessary to adhere strictly in these times, when the thirst for novelty and unrestrained freedom of thought make the danger of error most real and proximate.

Pope Leo’s words sound very similar to what I teach, which, courtesy of Keating’s verbatim copy stated the following: “Church documents only allow for the figurative interpretation if the literal cannot be fulfilled. No Church document allows for a carte blanche figurative interpretation of Scripture. The Church has always held that the literal comes first.” This is the same as what Leo taught above: “provided he carefully observes the rule so wisely laid down by St. Augustine – not to depart from the literal and obvious sense, except only where reason makes it untenable or necessity requires.” But, by design, these words of Leo’s are totally absent from Keating’s dealing with Providentissimus Deus. We now can see why. He doesn’t like what they have to say. In regards to cosmology, Leo’s teaching would simply mean that we would have to have necessary proof that geocentrism was incorrect in order to depart from the ‘literal and obvious sense’ of Scripture.

Now, four sections later, Leo gets to the part that Keating quotes from the encyclical. Leo writes in Section 19:
“The unshrinking defense of the Holy Scripture, however, does not require that we should equally uphold all the opinions which each of the Fathers or the more recent interpreters have put forth in explaining it; for it may be that, in commenting on passages where physical matters occur, they have sometimes expressed the ideas of their own times, and thus made statements which in these days have been abandoned as incorrect.”

From this passage Mr. Keating infers that Leo is necessarily talking about the Fathers’ consensus that the Sun revolves around the Earth, but Leo doesn’t mention any specific issue, much less point out celestial orbits. Leo merely makes a general statement that the Fathers “may have” expressed issues concerning physical matters with ideas of their own times. Do we know of any such ideas? Yes. Some of the Fathers believed in the Four Humours. Some believed in Spontaneous Generation. Some believed that emotions were caused by blood pressure and bile. Some believed in antipodes. Some believed that the Sons of God in Genesis 6 were evil angels who married human women. Some believed in a future 1000-year reign of Christ on Earth with the Jews. Some believed the Earth was created in 5000 BC, others 5500 BC, and still others with a different chronology. Some believed the Septuagint was inspired. In short, the Fathers had many beliefs we don’t hold to today because they are incorrect.

But geocentrism does not fall into that category for the simple reasons that:

1) Leo does not speak about a consensus of the Fathers on a particular doctrine in Section 19, but only “all of the opinions which each of the Fathers…put forth in explaining it.” In other words, each Father had opinions on various issues. We are not obligated to uphold their various individual opinions nor are we even to consider all their opinions. According to Leo’s previous statements about the Fathers in Sections 14 and 15, we are only obligated to follow the Fathers when they are in consensus on a particular Christian doctrine. None of the above (four humours, spontaneous generation, etc.) were Christian doctrine, nor was there a consensus about them among the Fathers.
2) Geocentrism was understood and declared a doctrine of the Church by the 1566 Tridentine catechism, and also by the two popes who specifically and deliberately dealt with the opposing teaching (i.e., heliocentrism), and condemned it as heretical, and which condemnation was, in part, based on the consensus of the Father for geocentrism and against heliocentrism, as approved by Paul V and Urban VIII. Leo, obviously, gave no indication he was going against this established patristic consensus, nor that he was overturning the decrees approved and facilitated by Paul V and Urban VIII.

In short, Keating basically butchered Pope Leo XIII’s teaching on Scripture in Providentissimus Deus. This in itself should be enough cause to examine each of Keating’s teachings about the Catholic Church with a grain of salt.

80) The Fathers Couldn’t Just Agree. They Had to Argue?

Keating: page 287: “Opponent of geocentrism acknowledge that early Christian writers accepted a geocentric view of the cosmos. In those centuries, nearly everyone did. Such a view formed a backdrop to the Fathers’ writing, but no where did they argue for the scientific factuality of geocentrism over heliocentrism. This is seen (or not seen) in the sixty pages of quotations serve up by Sungenis.”

R. Sungenis: Keating’s premise here, of course, is that a consensus of the Fathers is not legitimate unless the Fathers argue the issue at hand and explicitly state that the issue is a matter of faith. But in the official conciliar or papal declarations, there are no such definitions or limitations. One would assume that if polemical discussion amongst the Fathers was a critical requirement in order to qualify the consensus as legitimate, and, in turn, critical in requiring our obedience to the consensus, the Church would, indeed, address that issue, but it does not. To say otherwise is simply an argument from silence. As such, here are the relevant official text concerning the “consensus of the Fathers.”
**Council of Trent**, 1563: “Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, It decrees, that no one, relying on his own skill, shall, in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church, whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures, hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.”128

**Vatican Council I** in 1870: But, since the rules which the holy Synod of Trent salutarily decreed concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture in order to restrain impetuous minds, are wrongly explained by certain men, We, renewing the same decree, declare this to be its intention: that, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the instruction of Christian Doctrine, that must be considered as the true sense of Sacred Scripture which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge concerning the true understanding and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; and, for that reason, no one is permitted to interpret Sacred Scripture itself contrary to this sense, or even contrary to the unanimous agreement of the Fathers.129

**Pope Leo XIII, Providentissimus Deus**, 1893: …the Council of the Vatican, which, in renewing the decree of Trent declares its “mind” to be this – that “in things of faith and morals, belonging to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be considered the true sense of Holy Scripture which has been held and is held by our Holy Mother the Church, whose place it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret Holy Scripture against such sense or also against the unanimous agreement of the Fathers.” By this most wise decree the Church by no means prevents or restrains the pursuit of Biblical science, but rather protects it from error, and largely assists its real progress….the Holy

128 Council of Trent, Session IV.
129 Vatican Council I, Chapter II, Denz. 1788.
Fathers, We say, are of supreme authority, whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith or morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith.

**Vatican Council II**, 1965: This tradition which comes from the Apostles develop in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. The words of the holy fathers witness to the presence of this living tradition, whose wealth is poured into the practice and life of the believing and praying Church. \(^{130}\) ...faithful to the truth which we have received from the apostles and Fathers of the Church, in harmony with the faith which the Catholic Church has always professed. \(^{131}\)

The only matter that was discussed in later Catholic academic settings was the question regarding how many Fathers, and of those how many prominent Fathers, were needed for a quorum of patristic witnesses to establish itself as a legitimate consensus. The Church simply accepted, regardless of the origin, the consensus of the Fathers as evidence that the Fathers were reiterating Apostolic teaching and were thus guided by the Holy Spirit to preserve that original teaching.

That such would be the understanding of a patristic consensus fits well within the manner by which the Fathers often arrived at their conclusions about Catholic doctrine. It was most often the case that the Church would formulate specific doctrines after a common belief or practice of the Church was threatened by internal or external objectors. Beliefs such as the Trinity and the Incarnation were viciously attacked by many groups and individuals; and the Fathers responded by arguing against the perpetrators. In due time, a Council would be called and the matter would be definitively decided, invariably in favor of the consensus of the Fathers. This process meant, of course, that the customary beliefs of the practicing Church which were not attacked and thus remained as the common conviction of its people were obviously not the results of dialectics or

---

\(^{130}\) *Dei Verbum*, Ch. 2, 8.  
\(^{131}\) *Unitatis Redintegratio*, Ch. 3, II, 24.
polemics. As such, they remained in their original form. This was especially true of geocentrism, since it was a simply matter of deciding, from very decisive statements in Scripture, whether the Earth moved or did not move. For geocentrism, there were no complicated issues to discuss like those involving the Trinity and the Incarnation, especially considering the primitive stage of the natural sciences at that time. The topic of geocentrism versus heliocentrism was more like the doctrine of the resurrection or ascension of Christ: either Christ rose or he did not rise; either he ascended into heaven or he did not ascend. The variations were limited due to the nature of the subject matter. If, for example, a Father had decided to reject geocentrism, he would automatically have become a heliocentrist, since these were the only two options available in the theological and scientific circles of the day. The only change to these options came in the twentieth century when the concept of acentrism arose from Einstein’s theory of Relativity, but even then one must decide, as the Fathers had done long ago, whether the sun revolves around the Earth or the Earth revolves around the sun, since at least one must be true to explain what is observed in the cosmos every day.

Generally speaking, even when the Fathers were in dialectical or polemical discussions on a particular topic, they often did not reach the pinnacle of the Catholic understanding of the doctrine. For example, the Fathers’ discussions about the Holy Eucharist were many and varied. All the Fathers believed, based on their literal interpretation of Scripture, during the Mass the bread changed into the body of Christ. This was their unanimous consent and it was supported by various statements in Church teaching made by early popes and councils. But the precise debate as to what actually occurs when the bread is changed into the body of Christ was not much argued amongst the Fathers, for that particular debate would not occur until almost a millennia later when Berengarius (c. 1040), a priest from Tours who was following the doctrine of Ratramnus, had rejected the doctrine. Although Berengarius was condemned by Gregory VII, there was no discussion about how the change to the body of Christ occurred; only that it did occur and the faithful were required to accept it.

The ultimate understanding of how the Eucharist occurred did not come into being until Thomas Aquinas applied Aristotelian constructs to describe the change, and using the word “transubstantiation,” which was here introduced for the first time in history and later confirmed by the Lateran Council in 1215. The point to be made here is, even when the Fathers engaged in a dialectic regarding a particular subject, they did not establish the Church’s ultimate understanding of the issue but merely laid the foundation for belief upon which the Church would build and communicate Her actual and official doctrine. Hence, with regard to the issue of geocentrism, even if the Fathers were to argue the issue openly, this does not mean they would have reached a definitive understanding, but only that they would have maintained their consensus based on the clear statements in Scripture that provided the basic belief, both for geocentrism and the bread being changed into the body of Christ.

All that being said, however, there is certainly an element of dialectic and polemics within the patristic era on cosmology and cosmogony. The writings of the Fathers are filled with polemics against the Greeks for believing in what was essentially the prototype to Darwin’s evolution and Copernicus’ heliocentrism. For example, in The Prooemium, Hippolytus refutes Echphantus’ belief in a rotating Earth.\(^{133}\) This shows us that the Fathers understood Scripture’s statements regarding a non-moving Earth to include both a non-rotation as well as a non-translation – the same two non-movements that Galileo sought to nullify. In fact, the documents containing the condemnation of Galileo make reference to the “Pythagorean school” that advocated heliocentrism as the basis for Galileo’s reintroduction of the system. By the same token, the Fathers commended the Greek geocentrists, such as Aristotle, although they unanimously rejected the astrology of the Greeks at large. The Fathers were also aware that Babylonian, Egyptian and early Greek thought advanced the idea of a flat Earth, but the Fathers, in consensus, rejected that system for a spherical Earth.

All in all, the Fathers were very aware of the polemical issues concerning cosmogony and cosmology in their day. The major point to be made here

\(^{133}\) “And that the earth in the middle of the cosmical system is moved round its own center towards the east.” (The Prooemium, Ch XIII).
is, obviously we have little record of them arguing against each other about these specific issues simply because there was no Father who either contested a motionless Earth or contested that God created the Earth in six miraculous days (except, perhaps, Augustine on the latter issue, preferring a miraculous one-day event than a six-day event, although he accommodated the six days as a real possibility). Scripture was very clear about these two issues and thus there was not much room for disagreement, except for a few minor details. In any case, the patristic consensus on geocentrism was a legitimate consensus. The consensus was based on the fact that Scripture taught the Earth is motionless, and thus the Fathers understood that this very fact of cosmology was a matter of faith upon which to build our understanding of God’s creation; and it was the very basis upon which Cardinal Bellarmine, backed by Pope Paul V, employed that consensus against the innovations of Galileo.

As for examples where the Fathers contest the cosmogony of cosmology of the Greeks, we have the above example of Hippolytus: [Refuting the view of the Greek Ecphantus]: “And that the earth in the middle of the cosmical system is moved round its own center towards the east.” There are other occasions in which the Fathers confront the Greeks on either cosmogony or cosmogony. Hippolytus, for example, also critiques the Greek philosophers for allegorizing the days of Genesis. He writes:

“‘When, therefore, Moses has spoken of ‘the six days in which God made heaven and earth’...Simon, in a manner already specified, giving these and other passages of Scripture a different application from the one intended by the holy writers, deifies himself. When, therefore, the followers of Simon affirm that there are three days begotten before sun and moon, they speak enigmatically.’”

Other include the following, speaking against the Greeks:

**Anatolious of Alexandria:** “And Thales discovered the eclipse of the sun and its period in the tropics in its constant inequality. And Anaximander

---

134 *The Prooemium*, Ch XIII.
135 *Refutation of All Heresies*, Book VI, Ch IX
discovered that the earth is poised in space, and moves round the axis of the universe. And Anaximenes discovered that the moon has her light from the sun, and found out also the way in which she suffers eclipse. And the rest of the mathematicians have also made additions to these discoveries. We may instance the facts – that the fixed stars move round the axis passing through the poles, while the planets remove from each other round the perpendicular axis of the zodiac; and that the axis of the fixed stars and the planets is the side of a pente-decagon with four-and-twenty parts.”

Methodius: “Resuming then, let us first lay bare, in speaking of those things according to our power, the imposture of those who boast as though they alone had comprehended from what forms the heaven is arranged, in accordance with the hypothesis of the Chaldeans and Egyptians. For they say that the circumference of the world is likened to the turnings of a well-rounded globe, the earth having a central point. For its outline being spherical, it is necessary, they say, since there are the same distances of the parts, that the earth should be the center of the universe, around which as being older, the heaven is whirling. For if a circumference is described from the central point, which seems to be a circle – for it is impossible for a circle to be described without a point, and it is impossible for a circle to be without a point, - surely the earth consisted before all, they say, in a state of chaos and disorganization. Now certainly the wretched ones were overwhelmed in the chaos of error, “because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.”

Clement of Rome: “For the Greek philosophers, inquiring into the beginning of the world, have gone, some in one way and some in another. In short, Pythagoras says that numbers are the elements of its beginnings; Callistratus, that qualities; Alcmaeon, that contrarieties; Anaximander, that immensity; Anaxagoras, that equalities of parts; Epicurus, that atoms; Diodorus, things in which there are no parts...Democritus, that ideas; Thales, that water; Heraclitus, that fire; Diogenes, that air; Parmenides, that earth; Zeno, Empedocles, Plato, that fire, water, air and earth.

136 The Paschal Canon, Chapter XVII.
137 Discourse On the Virgins, Dis. VIII, Thekla, Ch XIV.
Aristotle also introduced a fifth element...by joining the four elements into one...”138

**Basil:** “The philosophers of Greece have made much ado to explain nature, and not one of their systems has remained firm and unshaken, each being overturned by its successor. It is vain to refute them; they are sufficient in themselves to destroy one another.”139

**Hippolytus:** “But Leucippus, an associate of Zeno...affirms things to be infinite, and always in motion, and that generation and change exist continuously....And he asserts that worlds are produced when many bodies are congregated and flow together from the surrounding space to a common point, so that by mutual contact they made substances of the same figure and similar in form come into connection; and when thus intertwined, there are transmutations into other bodies, and that created things wax and wane through necessity...”140

81) Let’s Go Round the Elliptical Bush

**Keating:** pages 288-289: “He refers to Ronald W. Clark’s biography of Albert Einstein, *Einstein: The Life and Times*. In the introduction Sungenis photo-reproduces two pages from Clark’s book. On the left-hand image he boxes several sentences. On the right-hand image he underlines the first three lines of text. He presents Clark’s words this way

In the United States Albert Michelson and Edward Morley had performed an experiment which confronted scientists with an appalling choice...leaving science with the alternatives of tossing aside the key which had helped to explain the phenomena of electricity, magnetism, and light of deciding that the earth was not in fact moving at all....For there seemed to be

---

138 Clement of Rome, Pseudo-Clementine, Ch. XV, *Theories of Creation*.

139 *The Hexameron*, Homily 3, 2.

140 *The Refutation of All Heresies*, Ch. X: Leucippus and His Atomic Theory. Hippolytus also critiques Thales, Founder of Greek Astronomy; Pythagoras on his Cosmogony and the Transmigration of Souls; Empedocles on Causality; Heraclitus on his Theory of Flux; Anaximenes on the idea of “Infinite Air”; Anaxagoras on his Theory of Mind and Efficient Cause; Parmenides on his Theory of Unity, and other Greek philosophic and scientific ideas.
only three alternatives. The first was that the earth was standing still, which meant scuttling the whole Copernican theory and was unthinkable.  

Several observations need to be made here….Two ellipses are within the quotation, but another might be said to be at the end, after ‘unthinkable.’ Sungenis truncates Clark’s words to suit his own needs. Clark mentions ‘there alternatives,’ but Sungenis lets his reader see only one. Here are the other two, which immediately follow ‘unthinkable.’

The second [alternative] was that the aether was carried along by the Earth in its passage through space, a possibility which already had been ruled out to the satisfaction of the scientific community by a number of experiments, notably those of English astronomer James Bradley. The third solution was that the aether simply did not exist, which to many nineteenth-century scientist was equivalent to scrapping current view of light, electricity, and magnetism, and starting again.

By ending the quotation at ‘unthinkable,’ Sungenis starts to lat the framework for what he regards as a century’s worth of scientific malfeasance….In reality it is Sungenis who is hiding the truth. He omits two of Clarks’ three alternatives and does not present the reader with what turned out to be the correct interpretation of the results of the Michelson-Morley experiment: that aether does not exist and, as a consequence, that nineteenth-century ‘views of light, electricity, and magnetism’ were flawed and had to be reworked.

R. Sungenis: I have never seen such a convoluted and distorted analysis of someone’s ellipses. Keating deserves the prize for being the most deceptive reviewer. Really. I say that with no exaggeration. Here’s why: First, as even Keating himself admits, “Sungenis photo-reproduces two pages from Clark’s book.” As such, the pages themselves show the reader the whole context of the quote, and this was the very reason I put the actual pages in my book – so that no one could complain of taking the

quotes out of context. On the next two pages are the two pages from Clark’s biography. Check them out yourself.

Second, Keating extracts my quote from Volume 3 of the *Galileo Was Wrong* series, which deals with the history between Galileo and the Church, not the science. But in Volumes 1 and 2, in which I deal with the science, I not only quote and present the whole passage, I thoroughly present to the reader the other two explanations for the Michelson-Morley experiment that Mr. Keating claims I purposely left out of the quote in Volume 3. In fact, in the beginning of Volume 3, I tell the reader that since he has now finished Volumes 1 and 2, he is now ready to read Volume 3.

Third, the reader knows why I truncated the quote, since I want to emphasize to him something that I know he has never heard in his lifetime, namely, that instead of Einstein’s Special Relativity theory, an equally plausible solution to the Michelson-Morley experiment is that the Earth is not moving in space, but that this solution was dismissed out of hand because it was “unthinkable” for modern man. In other words, it wasn’t science that led Einstein to Special Relativity, it was his philosophy!

Hence, what Mr. Keating regards as “the correct interpretation” was arrived at by eliminating the other equally plausible alternative – a non-moving Earth – from the scientific possibilities before the examination ever got started! Some science. The simple fact is, Keating didn’t like the fact that a biography of Einstein told the reader, not once, but twice, that a motionless Earth was a legitimate answer to Michelson-Morley, so instead of admitting that to his reader, he tries to make me look devious in presenting it to the world. I’m beginning to think that Keating has, shall we say, reached the end of his rope.

See next page…
See print version for the photocopy of this page
82) Using Ellipses to Prove Aether?

**Keating:** page 290: “The two internal ellipses also deserve examination. The first replaces these words: ‘Designed to show the existence of the aether, at that time considered essential, it had yielded a null result.’ This description shows the purpose of the Michelson-Morley experiment. It was intended to prove that aether exists, but it ‘yielded a null result.’”

**R. Sungenis:** Again, contrary to what Keating is implying, nothing is being hidden from the reader since he can see the full quote on the page I reproduced for him. As for Keating’s contention that Michelson-Morley was designed to show the existence of aether, it really makes little difference. As the saying goes, “it’s six of one and half a dozen of the other.” The fact remains that one of the possible solutions to Michelson-Morley was that the Earth wasn’t moving in the aether, as opposed to claiming that the aether didn’t exist. This is precisely what Michelson said of his own experiment in 1881:

“This conclusion directly contradicts the explanation…which presupposes that the Earth moves.” Albert Michelson

Other concluded the same:

“The data were almost unbelievable… There was only one other possible conclusion to draw — that the Earth was at rest.”

Bernard Jaffe

“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

---


143 Bernard Jaffe, *Michelson and the Speed of Light*, 1960, p. 76. Jaffe adds this conclusion to the above sentence: “This, of course, was preposterous.”
Galileo that the Earth is not the center of the universe. Why should it be at rest in space?” Physicist, Adolph Baker\textsuperscript{144}

“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 Coleman\textsuperscript{145}

“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. Otis\textsuperscript{146}

“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 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 Einstein\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{144} Adolf Baker, Modern Physics & Antiphysics, pp. 53-54.
\textsuperscript{145} James A. Coleman, Relativity for the Layman, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{146} Arthur S. Otis, Light Velocity and Relativity, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{147} Lincoln Barnett, The Universe and Dr. Einstein, p. 44.
“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. Giancoli

83) No Aether, No Geocentrism?

**Keating:** page 291: “But the non-existence of aether is fatal to geocentrism—or at least to the majority school of thought within geocentrism, the one holding that the Earth not only is at the center of the universe but also does not rotate on its axis. Without aether, there is no mechanism for the diurnal revolution of the universe around the Earth.”

**R. Sungenis:** As we have answered this question previously, I just want to point out here how Keating makes up his own rules and uses them to limit his opponent’s options. The lack of aether is not fatal to geocentrism. All one need do is read Chapter 2 of Galileo Was Wrong to see the Newtonian and Machian equations to see the non-aether geocentric system. But it is a fact, however, that the presence of aether is certainly fatal to Einstein’s Special Relativity and the very reason he fought so hard against it.

84) Using Ellipses to Hide Stuff, Again

**Keating:** page 291: “Through his use of the first ellipsis within the quotation, Sungenis tries to keep the reader away from considering that the non-existence of aether is a possibility.”

**R. Sungenis:** As I argued above, Keating defeated his own argument by acknowledging that I presented to the reader the exact opposite of Keating’s accusation, since the reader saw photocopies of the very pages from which the quotes were extracted. Additionally, the *Galileo Was Wrong* volumes are continually educating the reader to the “no aether”

---

argument, but showing them why it is not plausible. That Mr. Keating failed to point this out to the reader and, instead, made it appear as if I was trying to hide it from the reader, once again shows the deviousness of Mr. Keating’s methodology.

85) Mr. Michelson and Mr. Morley, What Were You Doing?

Keating: page 291: “He also fosters a wrong understanding of what the Michelson-Morley experiment was intended to prove. Scientist of the time postulated that aether was a substance so thin that its existence was not easily demonstrated. It was not like the wind, which is invisible but can be felt. The aether would not be able to be seen or measured directly through any scientific instrument, but its existence could be inferred if it disrupted the passage of light, even if only minutely. That disruption if what the experiment failed to show.”

R. Sungenis: Again, let’s review. First, all the Michelson-Morley type experiments showed a small positive result, but Einstein and his colleagues did their best to try to make it appear as if there were no positive results. Second, the very reason that Einstein and his colleagues judged that there was no aether present in space is because they assumed, without proof, that the Earth was going around the Sun. If the Earth is going around the Sun, then a predictable interference pattern of light waves would have been caused by the aether and would be seen in Michelson’s interferometer. But since the interference pattern was not even close to what was expected for an Earth going around the Sun, Einstein claimed there was no aether; and the little aether that showed up he dismissed as “experimental error,” even though every single experiment done in the next several decades all showed the same small presence of aether. In effect, Einstein kept from the world the knowledge that a motionless Earth was a viable answer to the Michelson-Morley experiment.

86) Parallax and Aberration Were an Aberration

Keating: page 291: “Scientists of the time were convinced that it [the Earth] does move—the discovery of stellar parallax earlier
in the century and of stellar aberration in 1728 were sufficient proof…”

**R. Sungenis**: As we see, Keating refuses to accept that stellar parallax and stellar aberration are no longer proofs for heliocentrism since they have now been discredited by geocentric models that show both phenomena quite easily.

**87) Gosh, Another Ellipsis**

**Keating**: page 292: “What about the second internal ellipsis in the quotation given by Sungenis? It may be the most problematic of the three. In normal usage, an ellipsis indicates that several words and perhaps even a sentence or two have been omitted, without changing the meaning of the passage. In this case, Sungenis has omitted no fewer than 18,000 words. The first part of the quotation, up through the words ‘moving at all,’ appears on page 57 of Clark’s book. The remaining words appear on page 110. Sungenis has reached back 53 pages to cobble together an authoritative-looking quotation that misleads the reader.”

**R. Sungenis**: The only one “misleading the reader” here is Karl Keating. That he would try to make an issue out of this trivial matter shows how underhanded he really is and that he simply cannot be trusted to give a fair and unbiased account of his opponent’s position. Keating makes it appear as if the “18,000 words between pages 57 and 110 were deliberately eliminated so that I could somehow “cobble together an authoritative-looking quotation”! In reality, the only reason the two quotes were put together was to show the reader the two instances in Clark’s book where even he, an obvious admirer of Einstein, admits that one of Einstein’s choices in explaining the Michelson-Morley experiment was to posit that the Earth wasn’t moving in space but that Einstein refused to consider it. Whereas Keating tries to eliminate a motionless Earth as a possibility, Clark mentions it at least twice, and possibly a third time when he says on page 267: “As Einstein wrestled with the cosmological implications of the General Theory, the first of these alternatives, the earth-centered universe of the Middle Ages, was effectively ruled out.”
Hey, Giuseppe, How a You Geta an Imprimatur, eh?

**Keating**: pages 295-296: “Giuseppe Settele’s Elements of Astronomy argued that heliocentrism had been proven. The Church’s chief censor refused to license the book, and Settele appealed directly to the pope, Pius VII….The Pope went beyond mere permission. ‘[Pius VII] has, moreover, suggested the insertion of several notations into this work, aimed at demonstrating that the above mentioned affirmation [of heliocentrism by Copernicus], as it has come to be understood, does not present any difficulties, difficulties that existed in times past, prior to the subsequent astronomical observations that have not occurred.’”

**R. Sungenis**: We see that Keating has decided to accept the outright falsehood that Cardinal Olivieri and Father Grandi cooked up in order to deceive Pius VII in allowing Canon Settele to obtain an imprimatur over the strenuous objection of Father Filippo Anfossi, the Master of the Sacred Palace and the only one, according to Lateran Council V, who had the authority to give or rescind an imprimatur. Cardinal Olivieri, a devoted heliocentrist, went around Anfossi and told a pack of lies to Pius VII.

The lies were as follows: Olivieri told Pius VII that the real reason the 1616 and 1633 Church had condemned Galileo and heliocentrism was because: (1) Galileo had no answer to why the Earth’s atmosphere would not be sucked away if the Earth was moving around the Sun, and (2) that since Galileo didn’t include the elliptical orbits of Kepler, his heliocentric model didn’t work. Olivieri argued that since it was now known in 1820 that the Earth’s atmosphere would not be sucked away thanks to gravity, and that all subsequent models of heliocentrism after Galileo incorporated elliptical orbits of the planets, there was no more reason to reject heliocentrism. It was an ingenious argument, especially for a Church that was being bombarded by the press on a daily basis to get with modern times and give Settele an imprimatur.

There was only one problem – Olivieri’s two reasons were baldfaced lies. The 1616 and 1633 Church didn’t even mention the atmosphere or elliptical orbits as a criteria for legitimacy of the heliocentric model, much
less argue them against Galileo. Both Paul V and Urban VIII approved condemnations of Galileo and heliocentrism for one reason only – they made the Earth move around the Sun instead of the Sun move around the Earth.

In fact, the 1616 Church had already put Kepler’s book, the _Epitome_, on the Index of Forbidden Books in 1619, and it remained on all subsequent Indexes up to 1835, and it was the very book that taught the elliptical orbits of the planets!

That Keating would give the impression that all was well and that there was no chicanery occurring is just another indication of how he schemes to hide the truth from his reader.

89) The Discipline of Doctrine or the Doctrine of Discipline?

**Keating:** page 296: “The decision of the authorities in the Galileo case, and Urban VIII’s subsequent approbation of the decision, were exercises not in defining doctrine but in discipline.”

**R. Sungenis:** Where has the Church ever officially categorized the Galileo condemnations as mere “discipline”? Nowhere. Understandably, Keating provides no reference to back up his assertion, since there is none. It is just another _ipse dixit_ judgment.

Let’s ask a probing question: how could the Galileo condemnations be mere “disciplinary” matters when, in fact, Galileo was convicted at a canonical trial of being “vehemently suspect of heresy”? To be convicted of being suspect of heresy means that a heresy had to have been adjudicated and established before Galileo could have been convicted of it. Heresies are not determined by mere “disciplinary” procedures. They are made only by the highest ecclesiastical authorities in the Church, namely, (1) the Pope, (2) his Holy Office with the approval of the Pope, or (3) a Council with the approval of the Pope.

As such, the doctrine of heliocentrism would have necessarily been required to have been declared and defined as a heresy in order for Galileo to have been convicted of being “vehemently suspect of heresy.” There is
no other way it could have happened. In fact, this is exactly what we read in the condemnation of Galileo. It states:

“And whereas a book appeared here recently, printed last year at Florence, the title of which shows that you were the author, this title being: “Dialogue of Galileo Galilei on the Great World Systems: Ptolemy and Copernicus”; and whereas the Holy Congregation was afterwards informed that through the publication of the said book the false opinion of the motion of the Earth and the stability of the sun was daily gaining ground, the said book was taken into careful consideration, and in it there was discovered a patent violation of the aforesaid injunction that had been imposed upon you, for in this book you have defended the said opinion previously condemned and to your face declared to be so, although in the said book you strive by various devices to produce the impression that you leave it undecided, and in express terms probable: which, however, is a most grievous error, as an opinion can in no wise be probable which has been declared and defined to be contrary to divine Scripture.”

So, whatever level of authority the 1616 and 1633 condemnations of Galileo and heliocentrism are, they were certainly not mere “disciplinary” moves by the Church. Mr. Keating only wishes it were a mere disciplinary issue, since he would not have to deal with the obvious weight of the decision.

90) The Catholic Encyclopedia Turns Protestant

Keating: page 296: “This is made clear in the discussion of the Galileo case in the Catholic Encyclopedia—published a century ago, in 1914—which says that it ‘is undeniable that the ecclesiastical authorities committed a grave and deplorable error’ when they condemned Copernicanism and that they ‘sanctioned an altogether false principle as to the proper use of Scripture.’”

R. Sungenis: So let’s ask a similar question that we did above: Where has the Church ever officially categorized the Galileo condemnations as a “grave and deplorable error”; or that Pope Paul V and Pope Urban VIII “sanctioned an altogether false principle as to the proper use of Scripture”? Nowhere. Understandably, Keating provides no official reference to back up his assertion, since there is none. He cites the 1914 Catholic Encyclopedia (without a footnote of the page number) but it has no official authorization as the spokesman for Catholic doctrine from the magisterium of the Catholic Church and, in fact, is written by a single author, John Gerard (stemming from the 1909 edition, pages 342-346), who has no official standing in the Church.

In fact, the 1909 Catholic Encyclopedia give us a bird’s eye view at just how liberal-minded and dominated by the scientific status quo the Church had become by this time – 40 years after Darwin and four years after Einstein’s 1905 paper denying the Earth’s motionlessness. Note how Gerard tries to cover over the issue, in addition to the fact that almost every point he makes has an error in it:

Gerard: Such in brief is the history of this famous conflict between ecclesiastical authority and science, to which special theological importance has been attached in connexion with the question of papal infallibility. Can it be said that either Paul V or Urban VIII so committed himself to the doctrine of geocentricism as to impose it upon the Church as an article of faith, and so to teach as pope what is now acknowledged to be untrue?

R. Sungenis: Notice that Gerard starts from the premise that “geocentricism…is now acknowledged to be untrue,” as if it is a scientific fact. Having accepted it as fact, Gerard, like most Catholic apologists mired in the edicts of modern Scientism, knows that the battle immediately shifts toward the credibility of the two popes who, for all intents and purposes, did “impose it upon the Church as an article of faith and so to teach as pope.” After all, Pope Urban VIII approved a conviction of “vehemently suspect of heresy” against Galileo, which, as noted above, requires that a formal “declaring and defining” of the heresy be in place before Galileo is convicted of it. Pope Urban then sent out a decree to all
of Europe announcing the Vatican’s decision against Galileo, and he demanded the immediate compliance of each nuncio and institution he sent it to. How could Galileo be convicted of the heresy if the heresy did not stem from a rejection of an “article of faith”? If it was not an “article of faith,” then what else has the power to convict someone of heresy?

**Gerard:** That both these pontiffs were convinced anti-Copernicans cannot be doubted, nor that they believed the Copernican system to be unscriptural and desired its suppression. The question is, however, whether either of them condemned the doctrine *ex cathedra*. This, it is clear, they never did.

**R. Sungenis:** So we see that, in order to answer the conundrum, Gerard automatically retreats to the fail-safe position – papal infallibility – as if that somehow gets the pope off the hook and saves the credibility of the Catholic Church. So let’s ask a similar question to what we asked above: Where has the Church ever officially categorized the Galileo condemnations as non-infallible or an instance when the pope was not “committing himself to the doctrine of geocentricism so as to impose it upon the Church as an article of faith”? Nowhere. Understandably, Gerard provides no reference to back up his assertion, since there is none. It is just another *ipse dixit* judgment. As we noted earlier, Fr. Coyne, a member of the Galileo commission organized by John Paul II in 1981, has argued:

So far as we can conclude from the circumstances of the condemnation, Pope Urban VIII and the cardinals of the Holy Office certainly did not themselves think it to be reformable. Furthermore, if it was reformable, why has the condemnation of 1633 or, for that matter, the Decree of the Congregation of the Index in 1616 never explicitly been “reformed? (The Church and Galileo, p. 354).

Likewise, Galileo historian Ernan McMullin has argued:

And let there be no mistake, the judgment of the qualifiers in 1616 and the language of the decree supported by it were couched in definitive terms; it was not proposed as something ‘reformable,’ to use a term favored by some recent theologians.
The decree did not say that in the absence of a demonstration, maintaining the Copernican theses would be risky (‘temerarious’). It described the theses as ‘contrary to Scripture,’ period, just as the qualifiers had “qualified” the heliocentric claim as “formally heretical. (*The Church and Galileo*, p. 159.)

Gerard’s argumentation is subjective since the doctrine of papal infallibility would not be defined until 250 years after Paul V and Urban VIII made their judgment of heresy against Galileo, so any argument of whether the judgments were “ex cathedra” or “infallible” is unavoidably anachronistic.

**Gerard:** As to the decree of 1616, we have seen that it was issued by the Congregation of the Index, which can raise no difficulty in regard of infallibility, this tribunal being absolutely incompetent to make a dogmatic decree. Nor is the case altered by the fact that the pope approved the Congregation’s decision *in forma communi*, that is to say, to the extent needful for the purpose intended, namely to prohibit the circulation of writings which were judged harmful. The pope and his assessors may have been wrong in such a judgment, but this does not alter the character of the pronouncement, or convert it into a decree *ex cathedra*.

**R. Sungenis:** What right does Gerard have to access the Congregation of the Index as “absolutely incompetent to make a dogmatic decree”? They were advised by the eleven cardinals selected for the pope’s commission, composed mostly of Dominicans who were selected for their erudition. They were led by the staunchest defender and most competent of theologians, St. Robert Bellarmine. What Gerard means to say as he reads back his own historiography into the Congregation is that since the Congregation was not privy to the “scientific proof” that Gerard is, then naturally, he is forced to judge any cleric as “incompetent,” including Bellarmine and Paul V. But, of course, that just begs the question, and it does on two counts: (1) where is the guidance of the Holy Spirit in Gerard’s judgment of this whole time period in history, much less the same guidance stemming from the Fathers through the Tridentine catechism that all taught geocentrism, and (2) Gerard would soon come to
find out that six years after he wrote his piece in the Catholic Encyclopedia, Einstein would invent his General Theory of Relativity in 1915. It is this theory that more or less reversed the conclusion of the Special Relativity, since it allowed the Earth, once again, to be motionless and occupy the center of the universe.

Second, on what basis does Gerard have the right to say that the pope approved the decision of the Congregation in forma communi? Is there an official document of the Church that categorizes Paul V’s approval in this way? I don’t know of any. Or was this just a convenient label put on the approval by those who wanted to lessen its authority from in forma specifica?

Third, on what basis does Gerard have the right to judge “the extent needful for the purpose intended” was merely “to prohibit the circulation of writings which were judged harmful”? The Congregation used the words “formally heretical” to classify heliocentrism. It was on that basis that Galileo’s writings were “prohibited from being circulated and judged harmful.” That is the most severe judgment it could have made. The same was true in 1633. Heliocentrism was judged as “formally heretical” and it was censored on that basis, not merely because it was “harmful,” whatever that means. And what difference does it make whether it was later understood as in forma communi by someone who is probably judging the decree with the same Copernican bias that Gerard is judging it?

Gerard: As to the second trial in 1633, this was concerned not so much with the doctrine as with the person of Galileo, and his manifest breach of contract in not abstaining from the active propaganda of Copernican doctrines. The sentence passed upon him in consequence, clearly implied a condemnation of Copernicanism, but it made no formal decree on the subject, and did not receive the pope’s signature.

R. Sungenis: Gerard’s view, namely, that the 1633 judgment was more about Galileo than the doctrine, is absurd. This was not a contest between what was more important. As noted above, Galileo was convicted of being “vehemently suspect of heresy,” and in order to be so convicted, there first had to be an establishment of what was heretical that Galileo was suspect
of holding. That heresy was “declared and defined” both in 1616 and 1633, which applied to anyone who said the Earth revolved around the Sun.

Gerard’s statement that “The sentence passed upon him in consequence, clearly implied a condemnation of Copernicanism,” is merely another attempt to dilute the 1633 judgment for those, like Gerard, who have already adopted Copernicanism. The 1633 did not merely “imply” a condemnation; rather, it was indicated very clearly and succinctly, and it was upon that clarity that Galileo was convicted of being “vehemently suspect of that very heresy.”

Lastly, that Pope Urban VIII did not sign the decree does not, as far as I understand Church protocol, lessen the severity of the judgment of heresy. I don’t know of any official Church document that requires the signature of the pope to make the act binding or official. Obviously, everyone in the papal court took the pope’s decision as binding and official since Galileo was put under house arrest and the rest of Europe was told not to teach the Copernican doctrine by order of the pope. As for “formal decree,” evidently Pope Urban VIII and his Holy Office did have in hand such a formal decree since they would not have been able to judge Galileo as “vehemently suspect of heresy” if they had no formal decree of heresy with which to convict him. Gerard, like so many other Catholic Copernicans, are incessantly trying to dismiss the severity of these events by hand waving.

We should also mention that the 1909 and 1914 Catholic encyclopedia also supports evolution, giving many arguments for it at the same time it denies special creationism. The article is written by A. J. Mass and is another clear sign that the Church had already started to capitulate to popular Darwinian belief long before Pius XII wrote *Divino Afflante Spiritu* in 1943.

**91) The Church: So Disciplined She Didn’t Change a Thing**

**Keating:** page 297: “Disciplinary decisions can be modified or even reversed.”

**R. Sungenis:** First, we noted above that the Church has given no official decision that the 1616 and 1633 decrees deeming Copernicanism heretical
and Galileo suspect of that heresy are merely “disciplinary decisions.” Second, even if they were disciplinary, the fact remains that they have never been “modified or reversed.” Hence, Keating only tied the knot a little tighter around himself.

92) Who Wants to Debate Sungenis? Not Me…Not Me!

Keating: page 302: “‘I knew in advance that the individual who had stepped forward to debate Dr. Sungenis was not a professor of astronomy or even a graduate of that program. They had recruited, with a week’s notice, an undergraduate student.’ He was Adam Cousins, whom Flora called ‘knowledgeble,’ but she was disappointed that no faculty member volunteered to square off against Sungenis. ‘I would have sorely loved to see him verbally eviscerated.’”

R. Sungenis: I include this incident from Keating’s book just to show that, like Keating who refused to debate yet throws stones at his opponents, so it was the case at this debate at the University of Manitoba. In attendance was a woman who was a post-doctorate student in astrophysics from the University of Manitoba. Instead of offering to represent the university in a debate against me, she chose to watch an undergraduate who obviously didn’t know a whole lot about geocentric cosmology, or even heliocentric cosmology. Interestingly enough, Keating titles this chapter, “Stumped at a Debate,” implying that I was stumped by Mr. Cousins on some question he posed to me. Keating doesn’t specify any particular issue that was supposed to have stumped me, so we are left guessing. If I had to guess, I would point out Keating’s paragraph on page 303 which says the following:

“Sungenis believes that the Earth is kept motionless at the center of the universe because the aether rapidly rotates around it, exerting equal force from all sides. Cousins, to demonstrate that the Earth could not remain motionless if the aether (assuming it existed) circled it each twenty-four hours, brought out a dish of water in which a ping pong ball floated. The ball was the Earth, and the water was the aether. He stirred the water in a circle. Instead of remaining motionless at the center of the bowl, the
First, although Keating implies that I was “stumped” by this question, the fact is that Keating admits on page 302 that the vote as to who won the debate (taken immediately afterward from the audience) was 24 to 18 in favor of me, which begs the question as to how I could have won the debate if the audience believed I was stumped on the very question that would have exposed my whole theory as false if I had no adequate answer for it. Not one person at the debate or in on-line discussions of the debate stated that they believed I was “stumped” at this or any question that Mr. Cousins posed, which makes us wonder where Keating is getting his information. Even Mr. Keating’s attempt to poison the well by soliciting the vitriol of a woman named Flora said nothing about me being “stumped.” Such lack of evidence leads to the conclusion that the “stumping” is a figment of Keating’s overcritical imagination – what he wishes had occurred, and will make appear occurred, since he is the only one writing his book.

Second, Mr. Cousins was given an answer to his question but I could tell it went right over his head since he was not familiar with General Relativity. As I do in my book to answer this very question, I show that if we use the principle of counter-moving fluids in rotating systems that is detailed in the book *Gravitation* by Misner, Thorne and Wheeler, we have a simple answer to the challenge. The paragraph in my book states:

Consider a rotating, solid sphere immersed in a viscous fluid. As it rotates, the sphere will drag the fluid along with it. At various points in the fluid, set down little rods, and watch how the fluid rotates them as it flows past. Near the poles the fluid will clearly rotate the rods in the same direction as the star \([i.e., \text{sphere}]\) rotates. But near the equator, because the fluid is dragged more rapidly at small radii than at large, the end of a rod closest to the sphere is dragged by the fluid more rapidly than the far end of
the rod. Consequently, the rod rotates in the direction opposite to
the rotation of the sphere.\textsuperscript{150}

If we want to cause the sphere to rotate clockwise, we would need to turn
the rods at the poles clockwise, and the ones at the equators counter-
clockwise….This picture is clear then: to turn the sphere, the rotation of
the particles (MTW’s “rods”) at the poles must be the opposite of that at
the equator….However, in the case of a rotating firmament, all the
particles are rotating in the same direction, with the angular velocity
common to the entire firmament. The equatorial inertial drag is in the
opposite direction as that acting near the poles.

See print version for photo on this page

The figure depicts the Geo-Lock Position. All of the red rings are rotating
in the same clockwise direction, which represents the daily rotation of the
universe around the Earth. The four outside red rings represent the
universe’s rotation around the Earth’s equator, while the red ring in the
center represents the universe’s rotation around the Earth’s north or south
poles. The four red rings represent the universe’s counter-clockwise force
at the Earth’s equator, but the red ring in the center represents the
universe’s clockwise force on the Earth’s north and south poles. The

\textsuperscript{150} Misner, Thorne and Wheeler, \textit{Gravitation}, p. 1120. When the authors say “the
fluid is dragged more rapidly at small radii than at large,” they are referring to a
rod positioned perpendicular to the tangent of the sphere, wherein the part of the
rod closest to the sphere’s tangent is the “small radii” while that farther away is
the large radii.
opposing forces are situated within the on-axis body, the Earth, rather than in contra-rotating equatorial and polar frames. The result is a neutralizing of forces to zero, namely, the Geo-Lock Position.

We could also demonstrate the Geo-lock position from Newtonian mechanics. The center of mass does not sustain any torque, that is, there is no force that will turn the center of mass. As such, if the Earth is the center of mass for a rotating universe, it will not sustain any torque from the universe and thus there will be no force to turn the Earth. The equation used for this phenomenon is the following, which I have marked with the universe’s corresponding force components:

93) The Big Bang Has Big Problems

Keating: page 304: “Then it was Sungenis’s turn. Flora was not impressed by what she heard. ‘He argued that the mass of the universe isn’t accounted for by heliocentrism’ and ‘that scientists have added dark matter *ad hoc* to make equations work. He argued that if the Big Bang is true, the universe must be homogeneous and yet did not explain why that should be true. If anything, Newtonian physics—the law of universal gravitation—says that things would form in clumps as larger masses attracted smaller masses into them.’ This was an astute observation. If one posits that at the beginning of the Big Bang…matter or proto-matter was spewed out in all directions, it is hard to conceive how that material could have radiated exactly equally toward all distant point. If there were the slightest disturbance from equal
distribution and speed, matter indeed would have begun to ‘form into clumps.’ When those clumps became large enough, they would have formed stars and various bodies that orbit stars. Perfect homogeneity is precisely what one would not expect to find. This means that the lack of homogeneity, which can be seen even with the naked eye, is no argument against the Big Bang.”

R. Sungenis: This is what happens when people who don’t study the issue begin to think they are experts on how to explain it when presented with challenges. Neither Keating nor Flora understand what the problem is.

The Big Bang, in opposition to Steady State cosmology, believes in a beginning to our universe – an explosion of some undefined infinitesimal entity that occurred 13.7 billion years ago. This entity is said to have been spawned from a previous universe, and that universe from an even earlier universe (which, as will see in chapter 3, is the same mysticism inherent in ancient Indian cosmology that believed the world rested on the backs of successive turtles).

As if getting something from nothing is not enough of a problem, the second thorn in the side for the Big Bang appears when the rate of the explosion must be determined. If it’s too slow, the universe will go into what is called the “Big Crunch,” that is, gravity will pull all the exploding parts back together before it can evolve into the organized biophilic system we see today. If it’s too fast, the universe will be diffuse and likewise will not be able to produce galactic structure and biological life. Like Goldilocks and her porridge, the expansion must be just right otherwise life couldn’t exist (at least under modern science’s illusory belief in evolution as the mechanical process that produces life). Too boot, the amount of matter in the explosion must also be just right. Too much and the universe will not expand. Too little and no complex structures will be formed. As one scientist put it, it’s like trying to balance a pencil on its point.

As one can see, modern cosmology is in a real pickle. But it didn’t start here. When Newton discovered gravity, one of his first problems was having to deal with Copernicus’ limited universe. Newton realized that the
very gravity he discovered would eventually pull the stars into one massive ball. In order to compensate for this problem, Newton opted for an infinite universe. As time went by, science realized there were too many problems with an infinite universe, so Einstein tried to compensate for gravity by introducing an opposing force, which he called the “cosmological constant.” As Misner, et al, describe it:

In 1915, when Einstein developed his general relativity theory, the permanence of the universe was a fixed item of belief in Western philosophy. “The heavens endure from everlasting to everlasting.” Thus, it disturbed Einstein greatly to discover that his geometrodynamic law $G = 8\pi T$ predicts a non-permanent universe; a dynamic universe; a universe that originated in a “big-bang” explosion, or will be destroyed eventually by contraction to infinite density, or both. Faced with this contradiction between his theory and the firm philosophical belief of the day, Einstein weakened; he modified his theory.\(^\text{151}\)

His new theory would reverse the effects of gravity and keep the universe from falling in on itself. The universe would remain static, not expanding or contracting. It would also follow Mach’s principle, wherein space was defined by the matter within it. But Wilhelm de Sitter didn’t follow Mach’s rules and created a variation for Einstein’s cosmological constant. De Sitter ignored all the matter of the universe and only concentrated on its quantum energy, an energy that would be enough to propel the expansion of the universe. So the choice was between Einstein’s static but matter-filled universe and de Sitter’s expanding but matter-deficient universe.

Next, Alexander Friedmann then fiddled with Einstein’s math and eliminated the cosmological constant and produced an expanding universe still under the constraints of General Relativity.\(^\text{152}\) But this required that he make the equations produce a universe whose matter was spread out evenly and was the same everywhere (\textit{i.e.}, isotropic and homogeneous), otherwise known as the “cosmological principle.” This made Arthur


\(^{152}\) For a good analysis of Friedmann’s five equations, see http://nicadd.niu.edu/~bterzic/PHYS652/Lecture_05.pdf
Eddington backtrack to point out that, even with the cosmological constant, an Einstein-type universe was not really static or balanced. Since gravity and Einstein’s cosmological constant (Λ) had to be balanced so perfectly (e.g., like balancing a pencil on its point), even minute fluctuations would produce a runaway expansion or an unstoppable contraction. The best Friedmann could do was propose a universe with enough matter (what he called “the critical density”) that would allow the universe to expand for eternity but at an ever decreasing rate, even though this solution itself was counterintuitive. As NASA puts it:

Einstein first proposed the cosmological constant...as a mathematical fix to the theory of general relativity. In its simplest form, general relativity predicted that the universe must either expand or contract. Einstein thought the universe was static, so he added this new term [(Λ) lambda] to stop the expansion. Friedmann, a Russian mathematician, realized that this was an unstable fix, like balancing a pencil on its point, and proposed an expanding universe model, now called the Big Bang theory.153

In retrospect, when Hubble relieved some of the problem by interpreting the redshift of galaxies as a sign that the universe was expanding, still, in order to have the matter move yet remain homogeneous (as required by Friedmann’s equation), the value of its rate of expansion (H); as well as the value of its density (Ω); and the energy to propel the expansion (Λ), had to fulfill the Goldilocks rule – it had to be just right or there would be no universe. Various scientists have spent their entire careers trying to figure out the perfect combination to these three numbers, but to no avail. Again, it is like trying to balance a pencil on its point. This is what happens when the universe is made to start from a big bang instead of creative fiat – the math never produces what we actually see. Postulating a big bang is easy. Making it work with all the other laws of science is impossible.154

154 One of those “laws of science” cropped up in what was known as the “horizon problem.” If the speed of light is limited (and thus the spread of information from
Another problem arose at the tail end of the twentieth century. Observations of class 1a supernovae, which are used as measuring devices for time and distance in Big Bang cosmology, revealed that the universe wasn’t slowing down in its expansion but was speeding up. This meant that there was no possibility this new acceleration (H^2) could be accounted for by the present amount of energy and baryonic matter (Λ + Ω) in the Big Bang universe.

A related problem arose when the 2001 Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) apparently found that the geometry of the universe is “flat,” which Big Bang advocates prefer because it is the only one which

one end of the Big Bang to the other is also limited), how could the right hand of the explosion know what the left hand was doing? This problem was solved by the imposition of yet another fudge factor – the inflation theory. Designed by Alan Guth of MIT, it postulates that the Big Bang exploded 10^{50} times faster than previously thought, which then allowed the information to travel 10^{50} times faster. The 1a Supernovae explosions were dimmer than expected, which, based on redshift values, translated into them being farther away from Earth than what astronomers previously believed. Since their light has taken longer to reach Earth, Big Bang cosmologists assume the universe must have taken longer to grow to its current size. Consequently, the expansion rate must have been slower in the past than previously thought. Hence, the supernovae are dim enough that the expansion must have accelerated to have caught up with its current expansion rate. Yet the universe’s matter should have slowed the expansion. So what is making it speed up? If the cosmological principle is accepted such that the acceleration occurs evenly and smoothly for the entire universe, it forces the introduction of “dark energy” to sustain the acceleration. See “Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant,” Adam G. Riess, et al, 1998. The abstract concludes: “A Universe closed by ordinary matter (i.e., Ω_m = 1) is formally ruled out at the 7σ to 8σ confidence level for the two different fitting methods.” (http://arxiv.org/pdf/astro-ph/9805201v1.pdf). See also “Surveying Spacetime with Supernovae,” Craig J. Hogan, et al., Scientific American, January 1999. See also Marie-Noëlle Célérier who concludes: “The interpretation of recently published data from high redshift SNIa surveys…It has been shown that a straight reading of these data does not exclude the possibility of ruling out the Cosmological Principle” (“Do we really see a Cosmological Constant in the Supernovae data?” Aston. & Astro. Feb. 2008, p. 9.

A “flat” universe is a Euclidean 3-dimensional universe as opposed to a Reimann curved universe. Taken as a whole, the universe is Euclidean. In a “flat” universe, if one were to inscribe a giant triangle in a circle in outer space, the value would be π (3.14). Another way to describe it is to say that light travels in straight lines in a flat universe. In Big Bang cosmology, the “flatness” of the universe is determined by its energy density (Ω). If Ω is > 1 or < 1, then the
will allow the negative energy of gravity to balance out the positive energy of matter so that the net energy is zero.\textsuperscript{157} Big Bang advocates want a zero universe is curved or non-Euclidean and the above triangle would be $> \pi$, and light would travel a curved directions. Big Bang cosmologists prefer a “flat” universe so that it can expand forever (as opposed to curving back in on itself). It is believed that the distribution of the cosmic microwave radiation (CMB) found by the 2001 WMAP showed a density fitting a “flat” universe.\textsuperscript{157} Krauss claims that WMAP determined the universe is “flat” by the following reasoning: The energy at the very beginning of the Big Bang was not zero, so one needs to arrive at zero sometime in the aftermath of the Big Bang. This was accomplished by finding a measurement in space that appeared to be zero. A triangle is drawn in space as the measuring device and applied as follows: if the universe is 13.78 billion years old, one should be able to see the beginning of the Big Bang (looking backwards into time, as it were). But one cannot see all the way back to the Big Bang because there is an opaque wall in the way. This wall is due to the fact that the temperature at the Big Bang was hot enough (3000K) to break apart hydrogen atoms to produce protons and electrons, which is a ‘charged plasma’ that is opaque to radiation. One cannot see past this part of the universe since it is opaque. But light bounces off the surface of the opaque wall and is radiated back to Earth (See Figure 2). This light is the CMB at 2.73K (instead of the original 3000K), so the protons have captured the electrons and made space transparent instead of opaque, and thus one can see this part of space from Earth. Moreover, the radiation should be coming to Earth from all directions since the wall surrounds earth like a sphere. Then, if one takes 1 arc second on the wall of the CMB (where it is opaque), it represents 100,000 light years in distance. Since Einstein said no information can be transferred faster than light, this means that anything that happened on one side of the CMB could not affect anything on the other side. Thus, big lumps of matter (bigger than 100,000 light years across) could not collapse because gravity, which Einstein limited to the speed of light, could not go across them. Lumps that collapsed had to be 100,000 light years or less in size. Since 100,000 light years equals one arc second for the base of the triangle; and the distance to the “opaque wall” provides the two other sides of the isosceles triangle (and since light rays travel in straight lines in the “transparent” part, then the sides of the triangle are straight), Viola! the needed “triangle” is produced to “measure” the energy. In an Open universe the light rays will diverge as one looks back into time, so the distance across the “lump” (the “ruler”) will look smaller, perhaps half an arc second. In a Closed universe the light rays look bigger as one looks back into time so the distance across the lump would be bigger than 1 arc second. The lumps are measured to see if they are a half, one, or 1.5 arc seconds. Boomerang and WMAP took a picture of the opaque wall and found the separation of the lumps was about 1 arc second, which matches a “flat” universe. Using a computer generated lump-picture in which the lump is less than 1 arc second produces a “Closed” universe. If the lumps are larger than one, they get an “Open” universe. (See Figure 1). As Krauss puts it: “the universe is flat, it has zero total energy, and it could have come from nothing.”
energy sum because they believe it will answer the haunting question concerning the origins of the Big Bang, with the answer being “it came from nothing.” As Lawrence Krauss puts it: “The laws of physics allow the universe to begin from nothing. You don’t need a deity. You have nothing, zero total energy, and quantum fluctuations can produce a universe.”¹⁵⁸ In the same video, the crass Krauss also says:

You are all stardust. You couldn’t be here today if stars hadn’t exploded…because the elements…carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, iron, all the things that matter for evolution weren’t created at the beginning of time, they were created in the nuclear furnaces of stars, and the only way they could get into your body is if the stars were kind enough to explode. So forget Jesus. The stars died so you could be here today.

To arrive at zero energy to counterbalance the negative energy of gravity, our universe has only 4% of the needed matter. Additionally, if they were going to use Friedmann’s equations, then a “flat” universe requires that the “critical density” must be equal to the average density. But even adding in 23% Dark Matter and 4% normal matter, this left 73% positive energy still required to counterbalance gravity. Yet another problem was the time needed for the formation of stars and galaxies. Under present calculations it appeared that the age of the universe was younger than the age of its oldest stars! NASA describes the dilemma and the proposed solution:

Many cosmologists advocate reviving [Einstein’s] cosmological constant term on theoretical grounds, as a way to explain the rate of expansion of the universe….The main attraction of the cosmological constant term is that it significantly improves the agreement between theory and observation….For example, if the cosmological constant today comprises most of the energy density of the universe, then the extrapolated age of the universe is much larger than it would be without such a term, which helps

¹⁵⁸ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7ImvlS8PLIo
avoid the dilemma that the extrapolated age of the universe is younger than some of the oldest stars we observe!\textsuperscript{159}

So what is a Big Bang cosmologist to do? If he has no energy source for the accelerating universe and is missing more than two-thirds of the needed “critical density” for a flat universe, then he would have to abandon the Big Bang theory and perhaps start reading Genesis 1 with a little more open-mindedness. But he will have none of that. So he does the same thing with this problem that he did with the spiral galaxies that were spinning too erratically to fit Newton’s and Einstein’s laws of motion – he simply invents the energy he needs. This time it is called Dark Energy, but he can’t see, hear, feel, taste or smell it. How much does he need? According to the equations, about 73% of the universe must be composed of Dark Energy to make the Big Bang conform to \textit{1a} supernovae requirements. This invention then allows the universe to be 13.7 billion years old (so that it is older than the stars) and give enough energy to reach the needed “critical density.”

The proponents of this convenient manipulation of data seem oblivious to their ploys. But George Ellis is not ashamed to admit that the whole thing is based on wishing or presuming that the Copernican Principle is true:

Additionally, we must take seriously the idea that the acceleration apparently indicated by supernova data could be due to large scale inhomogeneity with no dark energy. Observational tests of the latter possibility are as important as pursuing the dark energy (exotic physics) option in a homogeneous universe. Theoretical prejudices as to the universe’s geometry, and our place in it, must bow to such observational tests. Precisely because of the foundational nature of the Copernican Principle for standard cosmology, we need to fully check this foundation. And one must emphasize here that standard CMB anisotropy studies do not prove the Copernican principle: they assume it at the start….The further issue that arises is that while some form of averaging process is in principle what one should do to arrive

at the large scale geometry of the universe on the basis of observations, in practice what is normally done is the inverse. One assumes a priori a FLRW model as a background model, and then uses some form of observationally-based fitting process to determine its basic parameters.¹⁶⁰

Michio Kaku is a perfect example of cosmology not heeding Ellis’ warning:

No one at the present time has any understanding of where this ‘energy of nothing’ comes from….If we take the latest theory of subatomic particles and try to compute the value of this dark energy, we find a number that is off by 10¹²⁰.¹⁶¹

As Kaku’s admits that modern theory is “off by 10¹²⁰,” he is referring to the discovery by Russian physicist Yakov Zel’dovich, and later established in quantum electrodynamics (QED) or quantum field theory (QFT), that empty space has an energy of 10¹²⁰ more than the Dark Energy needed to propel the proposed “accelerating expansion of the universe.”¹⁶² The 10¹²⁰ excess energy is the only source available but it cannot be cut up into slices. It is all or nothing. This is precisely why Big Bang advocates invented “Dark Energy” – a hoped for source of energy that is more than the miniscule energy created by baryonic matter but less than the 10¹²⁰ excess energy given by quantum theory.

Here is an even bigger problem. Since Big Bang cosmologists believe space contains 10¹²⁰ more energy than what we have detected; and since

¹⁶¹ Parallel Worlds, p. 12.
¹⁶² The actual number is 1.38 × 10¹²³. But this is only after any energy greater than the Planck scale is excluded. According to Sean Carroll at California Technical Institute: “You can add up all the effects of these virtual particles….and you get infinity….So we cut things off by saying we will exclude contributions of virtual particles whose energy is larger than the Planck scale…which we have no right to think we understand what’s going on…Then you get a finite answer for the vacuum, and answer that is bigger than what you observer by a factor of 10 to the 120th power.” (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SwyTaSt0XxE &feature=watch-vrec). This is one of the reasons Carroll runs the website titled: “The Preposterous Universe” at http://preposterousuniverse.com.
Einstein’s General Theory of Relativity requires that all forms of energy (even the $10^{120}$) function as a source of gravity; and since Einstein’s equations require that the “curvature” of the universe depends on its energy content, then, since the energy content is $10^{120}$ more than what Einstein proposed, the whole universe should presently be curled up into a space smaller than the dot on this i. Obviously it isn’t. As we can see, the Big Bang universe simply does not work under present empirical evidence.

Noted physicist Paul Steinhardt of Princeton has gone on record against the present Big Bang theory. He opts for what can best be called the Big Brane theory. In a recent lecture, Steinhardt says the following of the Big Bang:

So, the first point I want to make about the Big Bang model is that the Big Bang model of 2011…that model I just described, definitely fails….We have to fix the Big Bang model, we have to add things to it to make it work.163

Indeed, things like Inflation, Dark Matter, Dark Energy, Lambda values and Hubble “constants” of which the only thing constant is that they are constantly being changed to accommodate the next fudge factor that will prop up the Big Bang. Along these lines, Richard Lieu submitted a scathing critique of the $\Lambda$CDM [Big Bang] model in a 2007 paper:

…Cosmology is not even astrophysics: all the principal assumptions in this field are unverified (or unverifiable) in the laboratory, and researches are quite comfortable with inventing unknowns to explain the unknown. How then could, after fifty years of failed attempts in finding dark matter, the fields of dark matter and now, dark energy have become such lofty priorities in astronomy funding, to the detriment of all other branches of astronomy?…$\Lambda$CDM cosmology has been propped by a paralyzing amount of propaganda which suppress counter evidence and subdue competing models….I believe astronomy is no longer heading towards a healthy future….Charging under the banner of Einstein’s extreme eminence and his forbidding theory

163 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1cxptlJS7kQ.
of General Relativity, have cosmologists been over-exercising our privileges?...Could this be a sign of a person (or camp of people in prestigious institutes) who become angry because they are embarrassed?\textsuperscript{164}

94) The Dubious Doppler

\textbf{Keating:} page 304: “Later in the debate, Cousins brought up the Doppler shift, in which light from stars varies in color depending on whether the stars are moving toward or away from us....Sungenis, said Flora, ‘countered the Doppler shift data by citing data from 1932 and citing his book. Note that he was not actually providing evidence from his book, merely promising answers which only could be obtained by purchasing and reading it.”

\textbf{R. Sungenis:} Keating (and Flora) leave out most of what occurred since their purpose is not to give all the facts but to make me look as foolish as possible. Flora continually compared me to a snake oil salesman who is just out to sell books to make money, and Keating (as he does on pages 299-302) quoted Flora \textit{ad nauseum} in order to make the most of her complete and utter contempt for me because I was challenging the status quo of modern science.\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{164} “ΛCDM cosmology: how much suppression of credible evidence, and does the model really lead its competitors, using all evidence,” Richard Lieu, Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Alabama, May 17, 2007. Although Lieu presents equally flawed models due to the fact that all cosmologists are searching in vain for how the universe started and develops, he candidly admits “Perhaps all models are equally poor” (p. 12).

\textsuperscript{165} Keating quotes Flora using such flowery language against me as: “He shamelessly promoted his book throughout the lecture...the thing itself could be used to hold down a helium balloon in a hurricane...it is a lovely demonstration of his complete inability to get to the point.” “Flora thought that the science was presented poorly. ‘It was a “Look! Science! I’m smarter than you, so you couldn’t possibly understand this, but trust me, this is science!” kind of moment. He threw around words like “quasar,” “isotropic,” and “anisotropic” without definition or explanation. I was annoyed.’... ‘I must confess that I was quite excited by the prospect of having someone debate him. He was clearly an experienced orator, but it was hair-pullingly aggravating to have to sit through a solid hour of his verbal diarrhea [at the previous night’s lecture].’”
To begin, as did Newton before him, Einstein envisioned a static and infinite universe. Newton was drawn to an infinite universe because it was the only way he knew to explain how the gravitational attraction of all the bodies in the universe could be counterbalanced so that the universe would not eventually collapse in on itself. Einstein believed the same, and he developed an equation to show the stability of this universe, his famous field equation.

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$$

This equation simply says that the inward force of gravity ($G_{\mu\nu}$) is counterbalanced by the outward force of energy ($8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$), and thus the universe can remain steady and stable. Maintaining the stability of the universe was paramount. If there were any unsteadiness in the universe, it necessarily meant the universe would have collapsed or dispersed at some point in the infinite past and thus it could not exist today.

The stability was knocked on its heels, however, when in 1929 astronomer Edwin Hubble discovered something peculiar about the galaxies. In each of them he noticed their light exhibited a shift toward the red end of the spectrum (except some in our local galactic area).

According to Hubble’s analysis, the red shift could only be due to one of two things. Either the light lost energy as it traveled through space or the wavelength of the light was being stretched. Although he admitted he could not be certain, Hubble sided with the view that red shift was due to a stretching of the wavelength, which he then further speculated was caused by the galaxies expanding away from the Earth. He reasoned that the higher the red shift, the farther the galaxy was from Earth and the faster it was receding from Earth. Hubble showed this relationship by a chart in his 1937 book, *The Observational Approach to Cosmology*.

Hubble’s new theory of an expanding universe became an acute problem, however, because it meant the universe was not steady. In other words, in the distant past it would have eventually collapsed or been ripped apart, and thus could not exist today. A solution to this problem had to be found, which usually means that the scientists are going to readjust their mathematical equations to produce the desired universe even though they
have little or no empirical evidence that will support the desired universe. Accordingly, Einstein tweaked his field equation in order to counteract Hubble’s expanding universe. He thus changed the equation from

\[ G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu} \]

\[ \text{to} \quad G_{\mu\nu} - \lambda = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu} \]

Lambda (\(\lambda\)) was given no precise value, much less an identity as to what kind of force or matter it could be in order to retard the presumed expansion of the universe. It became the mysterious figure that filled in whatever was required to eventually slow down or stop the expansion and keep the universe steady. Common sense, of course, reveals that this solution was doomed to failure since, if an expanding universe is eventually pulled back, then it, too, would have collapsed in the infinite past and therefore could not exist today. In any case, adding an arbitrary component to make Einstein’s equation balance with the data demonstrates how easy it was, and still is, to create mathematical equations that give an aura of knowledge and certainty. In reality, lambda was just an ad hoc adjustment to make Einstein’s General Relativity theory conform to Hubble’s interpretation of red shift. As the famous 20th-century historian Arthur C. Clarke once said:

“The lesson to be learned from these examples is one that can never be repeated too often, and is one that is seldom understood by laymen – who have an almost superstitious awe of mathematics. But mathematics is only a tool, though an immensely powerful one. No equations, however impressive and complex, can arrive at the truth if the initial assumptions are incorrect. It is really quite amazing by what margins competent but conservative scientists and engineers can miss the mark, when they start with the preconceived idea that what they are investigating is impossible. When this happens, the most well-informed men become blinded by their prejudices and are unable to see what lies directly ahead of them. What is even more incredible, they refuse to learn from experience; they will continue to make the same mistake over and over again. Some of my best friends are astronomers, and I am sorry to keep throwing
Irrespective of Einstein’s *ad hoc* fixes, Hubble had quite a problem. If the cause of redshifts was because the galaxies all had an increasing velocity away from Earth, this meant the universe had a beginning. Logic requires that if there is a present expansion there must have been a point in which the expansion started in the remote past.

But Hubble’s calculations would only allow, at most, 1.5 billion years for creation and expansion of the universe, about ten times shorter than what was desired for the theory of biological evolution. As Hubble puts it on page 43 of his book:

> The age of the universe is considerably shorter than that permitted by the linear law...The maximum permissible span appears to be of the order of 1,500 million years...The initial instant, the $t_0$, clearly falls within the life-history of the earth, probably within the history of life on the earth...Thus the familiar interpretation of red-shifts as velocity-shifts leads to strange and dubious conclusions.”

If, on the other hand, Hubble had proposed that redshifts were not caused by the galaxies receding from Earth but by their different but static linear distances from Earth, this would have forced him to conclude that the galaxies did not decrease in their population at large distances from Earth. For this reason, Hubble rejected the linear theory. What interests us most, however, is the motive for Hubble’s decision – the motive was to keep the Earth out of the center of the universe. As he puts it in his book on pages 50-51:

> Such a condition would imply that we occupy a unique position in the universe, analogous, in a sense, to the ancient conception of a central earth. The hypothesis cannot be disproved but it is unwelcome and would be accepted only as a last resort in order to save the phenomena. Therefore, we disregard this possibility

---

and consider the alternative, namely, a distribution which thins out with distance….The unwelcome supposition of a favored location must be avoided at all costs.\textsuperscript{167}

But choosing a universe wherein the galaxies thin out with distance did not solve Hubble’s problem. Whether the galaxies thinned out or not, if what surrounded the Earth in all directions were galaxies that all exhibited a redshift, this meant the Earth was in the center of the distribution. Otherwise, we would see as many galaxies blue-shifted as red-shifted. As Stephen Hawking put it in his popular book, *A Brief History of Time*:

> At that time most people expected the galaxies to be moving around quite randomly, and so expected to find as many blue-shifted spectra as red-shifted ones. It was quite a surprise, therefore, to find that most galaxies appeared red-shifted…\textsuperscript{168}

If, as the statistics show, 99.99% of the galaxies are red-shifted from our observation point, Earth, it means the universe is geocentric. Ironically, it means that all the efforts of both Einstein and Hubble only confirmed the ancient worldview of a central and motionless Earth.

So, to keep Earth out of the center, Hubble had to come up with another explanation. The only way to do so, Hubble reasoned, was to eliminate a center altogether and put every galaxy, including the Milky Way in which the Earth resided, on the surface of a balloon-shaped universe that had no center. By analogy, if Hubble could make the universe into a balloon instead of a solid spherical ball, then the universe would have no center, only a surface. This could be accomplished, at least on paper, if they allowed themselves to dispense with Euclidean geometry and employ Riemann geometry, which deals in curves and two dimensions rather than straight lines and three dimensions.

In Hubble’s new universe, the galaxies would be expanding away from each other as if they were dots on the surface of a balloon that was being inflated. Hubble explains how this universe would work and why he chose it on page 54 of his book:

\textsuperscript{167} *The Observational Approach to Cosmology*, 1937, pp. 50, 51.
\textsuperscript{168} *A Brief History of Time*, Stephen Hawking, p. 39.
…all observers, regardless of their location, will see the same general picture of the universe…if we see the nebulae all receding from our position in space, then every other observer, no matter where he may be located, will see the nebulae all receding from his position. However, the assumption is adopted. There must be no favored location in the universe, no center, no boundary; all must see the universe alike. And, in order to ensure this situation, the cosmologist postulates spatial isotropy and spatial homogeneity, which is his way of stating that the universe must be pretty much alike everywhere and in all directions.169

Today, we often hear cosmologists on popular television shows saying the universe is “isotropic and homogeneous.” They do so because it is required of the universe they desire if they want at least some plausible answer for why we see 99.99% of the galaxies with a redshift. An entirely smooth universe (i.e., isotropic and homogeneous) allows no distinguishable place, especially a center point that could be occupied by the Earth. Hubble says much the same on pages 58-59:

Such a favored position, of course, is intolerable; moreover, it represents a discrepancy with the theory, because the theory

169 The Observational Approach to Cosmology, 1937, p. 54.
postulates homogeneity. Therefore, in order to restore homogeneity, and to escape the horror of a unique position, the departures from uniformity, which are introduced by the recession factors, must be compensated by the second term representing effects of spatial curvature. There seems to be no other escape.\textsuperscript{170}

As Hubble admits that he must postulate recession factors and rely on spatial curvature in order keep Earth out of the center, he also admits that these \textit{ad hoc} additions seem artificial and create serious problems, which we will address momentarily. On page 59 he writes:

To the observer the procedure seems artificial….Now, in testing the relativistic theory, he introduces a new postulate, namely, recession of the nebulae, and it leads to discrepancies. Therefore, he adds still another postulate, namely, spatial curvature, in order to compensate the discrepancies introduced by the first. The accumulation of assumptions is uneconomical…\textsuperscript{171}

Hubble was not the only one who understood that the empirical evidence placed Earth in the center of the universe; and likewise, not the only one who did not like what he saw. Fifty years later, the second most famous scientist in the world next to Einstein said much the same regarding Hubble’s analysis. In his best-selling book, \textit{A Brief History of Time}, Stephen Hawking writes:

“Now at first sight, all this evidence that the universe looks the same whichever direction we look 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.”\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{170} \textit{The Observational Approach to Cosmology}, 1937, pp. 58-59.
\textsuperscript{171} \textit{The Observational Approach to Cosmology}, 1937, p. 59.
\textsuperscript{172} \textit{A Brief History of Time}, 1988, p. 42.
This is quite an admission from Hawking. Unfortunately, the philosophical biases of the men in Hubble and Hawking’s generation do not allow them to accept a central and motionless Earth as the most obvious answer to the astounding telescopic data. The “Copernican” bias drove modern cosmology to its presently-accepted interpretation of Hubble’s data: instead of galaxies being organized around a common center as the evidence plainly showed, they insisted, rather, that the universe is merely a balloon-like surface wherein space is curved. The galaxies are said to lie on this curved surface and are spreading out from each other; and most important, Earth is in one of those moving galaxies, not in the center of the universe, for there is no center to a balloon universe.

As it was for Einstein in 1905 when he invented Special Relativity, any ad hoc solution other than an Earth in the center of the universe would be acceptable for modern man. The reason was plain. As Hubble put it in his book: “Such a favored position, of course, is intolerable.”

Essentially, spatial curvature and homogeneity are modern cosmology’s manufactured but necessary ingredients to maintain the Copernican Principle, the presuppositional belief that the Earth is not special and inhabits no special place in the universe. Spatial curvature removes the Earth from the center of a three-dimensional Euclidean universe and puts it on the surface of a two-dimensional hyperspace. As the balloon expands (an expansion that Hubble believed was occurring due to his observation of redshift in all the galaxies), all the objects on the balloon will stay equidistant from one another and no galaxy could be designated as the center. At the same time, modern cosmology would conveniently claim that the universe is “flat,” that is, Euclidean, since we observers are so small compared to the size of the universe that we wouldn’t notice its curvature and therefore it would appear flat to us.

As noted in his book, Hubble also wanted a homogeneous universe. This means that as one looks into the universe, everything will appear to be precisely the same, analogous to homogenized milk that has no cream on top and no lumps in the middle. This is otherwise known as the Cosmological Principle, which then leads to the conclusion that the universe has no distinguished place, and thus no center and no motionless celestial body to occupy a center. It would be the same as if one were in
the desert and looked north, east, south and west and saw the same sand in each direction with no distinguishing features.

After Einstein and Hubble presented the foundation for cosmology, all subsequent theories had to be based on a homogeneous and spatially curved universe, otherwise it would necessarily be geocentric. As noted, the amount of curvature needed was calculated by using Einstein’s famous tensor equation, \( G = 8\pi T \) and \( G - \lambda = 8\pi T \).

The homogeneity that was needed to make Einstein and Hubble’s universe feasible was calculated by a Russian physicist named Alexander Friedmann who adjusted Einstein’s equations for this very purpose.

A few decades later, Stephen Hawking admitted the real motivation behind Friedmann’s attempt to make the universe homogeneous. As was becoming common in modern cosmology, the motivation was to eliminate a center, and more specifically, Earth’s possible occupation of the center. Hawking writes in *A Brief History of Time*:

> There is, however, an alternate explanation [to a central Earth]: 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.\(^{173}\)

So we see that the men of Hubble and Hawking’s generation choose their cosmological model based not so much on science (since the science is ambiguous) but on a commitment to a universe that best fits their philosophy. One wonders, then, whether Hawking’s claim of “modesty” in deciding against a central Earth is actually pride in disguise, especially since he has since become known for proposing the universe did not need a God to begin it or continue it. According to Hawking, who is an avowed atheist, the universe could start all by itself, from nothing.

---

95) Mathematics to the Rescue! It Saves Us Every Time

Keating: Quoting Flora, page 305: “Another gem: ‘Mathematics cannot prove anything.’ Ironic considering that mathematics is the only science that can deal in literal proofs!”

R. Sungenis: Keating doesn’t comment on Flora’s benign statement, the purpose being to allow the misrepresentation to remain as is. The statement I made at the debate was prefaced by an example showing that both $2 + 2$ equals 4 and $1 + 3$ equals 4. Both equations get the same sum but as to which one has the proper addends depends on which one has the proper model or ingredients. It was a simple illustration to show that math equations can only be made to represent someone’s conception of reality, but if the conception of reality is wrong, the math equation used to represent it will be wrong, even though it might end up with the correct sum. Likewise, a bare math equation can never prove the reality; it can only demonstrate the individual’s conception of reality.

This calls for a quote from one of my favorite authors concerning mathematics, Arthur C. Clarke:

The lesson to be learned from these examples is one that can never be repeated too often, and is one that is seldom understood by laymen – who have an almost superstitious awe of mathematics. But mathematics is only a tool, though an immensely powerful one. No equations, however impressive and complex, can arrive at the truth if the initial assumptions are incorrect. It is really quite amazing by what margins competent but conservative scientists and engineers can miss the mark, when they start with the preconceived idea that what they are investigating is impossible. When this happens, the most well-informed men become blinded by their prejudices and are unable to see what lies directly ahead of them. What is even more incredible, they refuse to learn from experience; they will continue to make the same mistake over and over again. Some of my best friends are astronomers, and I am sorry to keep throwing
stones at them – but they do seem to have an appalling record as prophets.\textsuperscript{174}

96) Quasars and Quadrupoles: What’s the Difference?

Keating: page 305: “Flora found the question and answer period amusing. ‘An astrophysics postdoctoral student asked Dr. Sungenis to define the dipole, quadrupole and octopole—something he couldn’t do. She also rightly point out that of course we are at the center of the observable universe, by sheer definition, since we can see a specific radius around us. Dr. Sungenis countered—utterly failing to appreciate the irony of his statement—that of course she might think that, since she had been indoctrinated over the course of her Ph.D.’”

R. Sungenis: Let me first point out that this “astrophysics postdoctoral student” was sitting in the audience for the entire debate while she watched an undergraduate, Adam Cousins, who had only a week to prepare, do a debate against an experienced debater. If she could come to the debate, why didn’t she offer to do the debate in place of Mr. Cousins? Why would she allow Mr. Cousins to flail around while she, so knowledgeable and experienced in all things astrophysical, could just swat me like the fly she apparently wanted to make of me with her comment that “of course we are at the center of the observable universe”? Why didn’t this “postdoctoral astrophysicist” either write to me after the debate to humble me with her superior information or even ask me to accept an invitation to debate her at a future date if she felt so confident that she could trounce me with just a flick of her academic finger? For that matter, since Keating’s motive for titling his chapter, “Stumped at a Debate,” as well as his motive for displaying Flora’s academic vitriol against me, is to portray me as an incompetent boob that anyone can beat at a debate, why didn’t Mr. Keating accept my challenge, or Mr. Ferrara’s challenge, to debate these very issues? Curious minds want to know.

As for the claim that I “could not…define the dipole, quadrupole and octopole” sounds good on paper but it has no relationship to reality,

especially coming from one such as Flora who already admitted she didn’t know the definition of “quasar, isotropic, and anisotropic” (see previous footnote), the last two being specific words associated with the distribution and alignment of the dipole, quadrupole and octupole with the Earth’s equinoxes and the ecliptic. If my book goes into detail about the dipole, quadrupole and octupole (using all of Chapter 3 to discuss the issue), how would it be possible that I couldn’t “define” them at the debate? Isn’t it more likely that Flora, who already admitted she didn’t understand the terminology and complained that I was using too many big words, simply had no way of comprehending what I said, and then, in order to save her own skin and put the blame on me, made it appear as if I didn’t know what I was talking about? Yes, it happens all the time with intransigent opponents who have already decided that they will not accept anything you say.

As for the issue about the center of the universe, granted, if we are looking out in every direction in the universe it will be at the same radius, and therefore we would be in the center of that observation. But my demonstration at the debate did not deal with that obvious point but on the less obvious point (which was ignored by the “postdoctoral astrophysicist”) that the alignment of the dipole, quadrupole and octupole was with the Earth’s equator and the ecliptic, which means that we were physically in the center of the universe, not merely the observable center. But since Flora didn’t understand what the dipole, quadrupole and octupole were, it is easy to see how she would have turned her own lack of understanding into my lack of understanding, especially in the hypercritical state of mind she was in when she wrote her review.

As for those in the “astrophysical” community who would agree with my conclusion about us being in the center of the universe in light of the anisotropy of the quadrupole and octupole, allow me to quote from Lawrence Krauss of Arizona State University:

But when you look at CMB map, you also see that the structure that is observed, is in fact, in a weird way, correlated with the plane of the earth around the sun. Is this Copernicus coming back to haunt us? That’s crazy. We’re looking out at the whole universe. There’s no way there should be a correlation of
structure with our motion of the earth around the sun — the plane of the earth around the sun — the ecliptic. That would say we are truly the center of the universe.\(^{175}\)

Additionally, the consensus among the researchers concerning the universe’s microwave radiation aligning with the sun and Earth was that it does not agree with the predictions of the Big Bang. As the University of Michigan team put it in their 2012 paper:

Looking into this anomaly more deeply we will find that it remains robust throughout all seven years of published WMAP data, and furthermore that it is very difficult to explain within the context of the canonical Inflationary Lambda Cold Dark Matter of cosmology \([i.e.,\] the Big Bang\)…. the observations disagree markedly with the predictions of the \([\text{Big Bang}]\) theory.\(^{176}\)

In a paper published in May, 2013, with the title “Is there a violation of the Copernican principle in radio sky?” Indian astrophysicist Ashok K. Singal states:

Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation (CMBR) observations from the WMAP satellite have shown some unexpected anisotropies, which surprisingly seem to be aligned with the ecliptic. This alignment has been dubbed the “axis of evil” with very damaging implications for the standard model of cosmology. The latest data from the Planck satellite have confirmed the presence of these anisotropies.

Singal adds, “The apparent alignment in the cosmic microwave background in one particular direction through space is called ‘evil’ because it undermines our ideas about the standard cosmological model,”

\(^{175}\) “The Energy of Empty Space is not Zero,” 2006, http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/krauss06/krauss06.2_index.html

from which Singal concludes his analysis with the words, “the Copernican Principle seems to be in jeopardy.”

97) Did I Mention Sungenis has “Animosity” Toward the Jews?

Keating: page 307: “At one time Gerhardus Bouw was the most prominent geocentrist in America. Today that title is held by Robert Sungenis. In word count he has written more on geocentrism than have all other living geocentrists combined. He has written a comparable number of words in support of a wide variety of conspiracy theories and against what he thinks are malign influences by Jews in politics, culture, and current events. In his mind, the two categories often become conflated: conspiracies run by Jews. Sungenis does not subscribe to just one or two conspiracy theories. At his website and in other venues he wrote in favor of many such theories or provided links to the writings of other conspiracists. He has removed those writings and links from his website and has tried to distance himself from his pro-conspiracy and anti-Jewish writings, though not with great success. Instead of disavowing what he wrote, he has said that he no longer wishes to discuss topics that once preoccupied his mind. There has been no change of heart, but there has been a change of tactics. The change was necessitated by his most recent project, the production and promotion of a motion picture.”

R. Sungenis: Notice how Keating sets himself up as the judge, jury and executioner of the life or Robert Sungenis. Religious-power statements like “there has been no change of heart,” or motive-determining statements like “the change was necessitated by” are from a pompous, know-it-all, kind of individual who believes he is superior to everyone else and can levy such personal and career-determining judgments anytime he wishes, with absolutely no regard to what the ramifications are if he is wrong about those judgments, which is almost invariably the case.

177 “Is there a violation of the Copernican principle in radio sky?” May 17, 2013, Ashok K. Singal, Astronomy and Astrophysics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad, India.
Keating’s favorite target of derision against me is my criticism of various Jewish politicians and professionals. Underneath of this targeting is the fact that Keating somehow got the notion that it is simply not socially acceptable to criticize publicly any Jewish person, no matter how suspect and no matter how blatantly evil he may be. That is the code he lives by, and you can verify this by scouring his writings and finding absolutely no criticism of any Jewish person, but reams of criticism against Protestant Fundamentalists and Muslims. When it comes to malfeasance done by those in authority or influence in the Catholic Church or the Jewish community, Keating’s philosophy is, as the saying goes, simply “look the other way.” If you dare to point out any malfeasance in these two groups, you will invariably be labeled an “anti-Catholic” (or “radtrad” or something akin) or an “anti-semite,” the latter being much more damaging in social circles.

Of course, all this pompous judgment of his opponents begs the question of whether Mr. Keating’s philosophy and apologetic is, indeed, correct. Is a true and honest Catholic apologist one that consistently ‘looks the other way’ when high members of the Catholic Church and certain Jewish leaders commit horrendous sins against humanity? Are Protestant Fundamentalists and Muslims the only ones with aberrant ideas and false doctrines? We all know that the answer to that question is a resounding no. In fact, things are so bad these days in the Catholic Church that it, contrary to Mr. Keating’s statement, was the main motive for me taking down all of the material on my website about two years ago. I could not escape the fact that as I was critiquing Jews, Muslims, Protestants and many other prominent figures in the world while the clerics from my own Church in Rome are some of the biggest sinners and some of the biggest propagators of false doctrine in the world. I am not speaking of true Catholics who abide by the traditions of the Church and the teachings of Holy Scripture, but of the radical Catholic modernists and liberals who not only live lives of debauchery and who have changed many of the beliefs and practices in the Church, but who teach other Catholics, including our dear children, that such things are acceptable and no longer sinful. These things have been going on in the Catholic Church for decades, but Karl Keating of “Catholic Answers” always has an answer that will hide what is bad that
the Catholic Church is doing and make it appear that everything is fine and dandy. It is disgusting beyond belief.

Of course, this same “we admit to no wrong” mentality carries over into Keating’s idolization of the Jews. To suspect a Jew of being a perpetrator behind 911, for example, is a sin in itself, according to Keating’s mentality. Nevermind the evidence that thousands of investigators have uncovered that shows quite clearly that some very influential and high-placed Jewish and Gentile people in the Bush administration were involved in 911. Like the use of “anti-semite,” Keating and his cronies have found a similar show-stopping epithet to silence them – “conspiracy theorist.” Keating used the word “conspiracy” or its derivations over a hundred times in his book, *The New Geocentrists*. Keating accuses them of being so because he claims, “For many, a conspiracy theory is a way to get around the hard work of having to think things through” (page 308), when in actuality it is these very people who have done the tens-of thousands of man hours of investigation into the 911 anomalies so as to catalogue the inordinate contradictions and downright lies in the official government report, while, ironically, it was the government itself that was stalling the investigation and withholding resources to operate. This persisted until enough pressure was put on the government by the public to at least get a modicum of investigation, yet, even then, and no surprise to the public, it was compromised from the beginning.

98) *The Principle* Does What??

**Keating:** page 312: “*The Principle* is not an overt argument for geocentrism. It approaches the topic through indirection. It does not compare the Ptolemaic, Tychonian, Copernican, and Keplerian systems. It does not feature illustrations of orbits with epicycles.”

**R. Sungenis:** Either Keating was asleep through half *The Principle* or he is getting old enough where his memory escapes him. *The Principle* certainly did cover the Ptolemaic, Tychonian, Copernican, and Keplerian systems, along with graphics of orbits and epicycles.
Keating: p. 313: “In The Principle Sungenis and Delano note that certain features of the CMB are aligned with Earth’s equator and with the ecliptic….These alignments are only approximate, though that is not the impression given in the film, which argues that the alignments ‘point’ more or less directly to Earth. They do not. They point neither to Earth nor to anything else. They are indicators of general arrangement within the visible cosmos but that is all. They do not show spatial location and they are not signposts.”

R. Sungenis: Mr. Keating wants to try to win this war by hedging his bets on the word “approximate” and the phrase “point more or less directly to Earth.” Interestingly enough, Keating seems a little less precise when on page 350 he says:

While that alignment may be said to ‘point’ in a general direction, it doesn’t point at anything in particular, but geocentrists disingenuously insist it points to Earth. They conclude that the Earth is the center of the universe…

So, after all the commotion, Keating agrees that the CMB does “point,” but he disagrees with us as to where it points. It appears that since he believes the “pointing” to Earth’s equator and ecliptic is only “approximate,” he reserves the right to conclude that the CMB “doesn’t point at anything in particular.” But isn’t that a bit extreme? Keating’s conclusion is like saying that if someone asks me how to get to the North Pole and I look on my compass and wait for the needle to stop near N, and then point the person in that general direction—even though I know that the north magnetic field is off a few degrees from exact North Pole—that my help is only “approximate” and I really didn’t point him to the particular place he needed to go! That, of course, is absurd.

Later we will find that Keating is getting his extreme point of view and “approximations” from a physicist he and David Palm employed to attempt to debunk geocentrism, but for now, let’s review what more qualified physicists say (those who actually work on the CMB for a
living). In that light, do Keating’s conclusions match what I quoted earlier from Lawrence Krauss, professor of physics at Arizona State University? Krauss said these amazing words when no geocentrist was looking:

But when you look at CMB map, you also see that the structure that is observed, is in fact, in a weird way, correlated with the plane of the earth around the sun. Is this Copernicus coming back to haunt us? That’s crazy. We’re looking out at the whole universe. There’s no way there should be a correlation of structure with our motion of the earth around the sun — the plane of the earth around the sun — the ecliptic. That would say we are truly the center of the universe.\textsuperscript{178}

Does it match the penetrating words from Ashok Singal’s paper published in May, 2013, “Is there a violation of the Copernican principle in radio sky?” which states:

Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation (CMBR) observations from the WMAP satellite have shown some unexpected anisotropies, which surprisingly seem to be aligned with the ecliptic. This alignment has been dubbed the “axis of evil” with very damaging implications for the standard model of cosmology. The latest data from the Planck satellite have confirmed the presence of these anisotropies.

The apparent alignment in the cosmic microwave background in one particular direction through space is called ‘evil’ because it undermines our ideas about the standard cosmological model,” from which Singal concludes his analysis with the words, “the Copernican Principle seems to be in jeopardy.\textsuperscript{179}

Notice that Singal says that the CMB…anisotropies…seem to be aligned with the ecliptic” and that the “alignment in the cosmic microwave background [is] in one particular direction through space.” So it is

\textsuperscript{178} “The Energy of Empty Space is not Zero,” 2006, http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/krauss06/krauss06.2_index.html
\textsuperscript{179} “Is there a violation of the Copernican principle in radio sky?” May 17, 2013, Ashok K. Singal, Astronomy and Astrophysics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad, India.
obvious that “one particular direction” lines up with our “ecliptic.” Now why would Keating have any objections equating that language with the CMB “pointing” to Earth? If someone wanted to get from New York City to Los Angeles and I pointed him west-southwest to the approximate place I determined Los Angeles to be, what is different than if I drew “one particular direction” on a map and lined it up with New York City and Los Angeles? There might only be a difference for those who want to hairsplit the direction in order to throw people off and make them think there is nothing really significant to the CMB alignments. Phrases such as the one Keating invented above, namely, “indicators of general arrangement within the visible cosmos” are much more vague and ambiguous if, as Keating it trying to do, lessen the CMB’s significance. Ask yourself. What is an “indicator of general arrangement with the visible cosmos”? It is really nothing, and that’s exactly the way Keating wants it to be – nothing.

He makes the same attempt by using the word “approximate.” He has learned this little trick from an atheistic retired physicist in England by the name of Alec MacAndrew – a person with a vested interest to keep the Copernican Principle alive and well. Recently, MacAndrew did his own analysis of the 2013 Planck probe results, using Table 18. His cohort, David Palm, describes MacAndrew’s results as:

But in fact, these CMB alignments are only approximate. Indeed, the measured data show that they can be quite a ways off. We present the actual numbers in Dr. MacAndrew’s article, “The CMB and Geocentrism”:

- The quadrupole to the equinox is 23.1°
- The octopole to the equinox is 17.6°
- The quadrupole to the dipole is 28.5°
- The quadrupole to the octopole is 7.7°
- The dipole to the equinox is well known and is 14.1°
- The dipole to the ecliptic plane is 11.1°
- The quadrupole to the ecliptic plane is 16.0°
- The octopole to the ecliptic plane is 8.6°

Dr. MacAndrew divulged precisely where he obtained the data on which these figures are based, namely, Table 18 of “Planck Collaboration, Planck 2013 Results. XXIII. Isotropy and statistics of the CMB,” arXiv:1303.5083v3.
The purpose of MacAndrew’s study is to attempt to make the CMB alignments with the Earth “only approximate” (and now you know where Keating is getting his stress on “approximate”). But later we find out from Mr. Palm himself that all the above figures (except the lowest one at 7.7°) that give values to the “approximations” are MacAndrew’s own figures, not those of the Planck study!

Recently a group of geocentrists asked for my comments on MacAndrew’s calculations. Here is what I told them:

This is all smoke and mirrors. First, even if we were to accept these figures, the fact is it spells the death for MacAndrew’s and Palm’s Big Bang theory since there should be NO ALIGNMENTS in the Big Bang universe with the Earth, much less these rather acute alignments that are within the known limits of precision of the Planck probe.

The only thing MacAndrew has done for us with these figures is admit that the Axis of Evil exists and that the Earth, within the margin of error, is aligned with it. This is the pink elephant in the room, but MacAndrew wants you to ignore the elephant and pay attention to the flea that is on the elephant’s back. He doesn’t tell you that the elephant should NOT be in the room in the first place, that is, if the Big Bang is true and geocentrism is false. If you don’t believe me, look at what the European Space Agency said about the Planck findings:

“One of the most surprising findings is that the fluctuations in the cosmic microwave radiation (CMB) temperatures at large angular scales do not match those predicted by the standard [Big Bang] model.”

“Another is an asymmetry in the average temperatures on opposite hemispheres of the sky. This runs counter to the prediction made by the standard [Big Bang] model that the Universe should be broadly similar in any direction we look.”
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Next, David Palm says that MacAndrew got the above figures from Table 18 of the January 2014 Planck study. Palm writes: “Dr. MacAndrew divulged precisely where he obtained the data on which these figures are based, namely, Table 18 of “Planck Collaboration, Planck 2013 Results. XXIII. Isotropy and statistics of the CMB,” arXiv:1303.5083v3.”

The real truth is that MacAndrew did no such thing. Table 18 of the study on Planck only speaks about the quadrupole and octupole alignments. More on Palm’s misrepresentation later.

For now, the conclusion of the study on page 20 is that the misalignment of the quadrupole and octupole is “approximately 8 degrees,” which is not much at all.

How do we know it is not much? Because in Table 18 the study also tells us what the odds are of the quadrupole and octupole aligning within a margin of 8 degrees. The average probability is 0.018 to 1. That’s 18 hundredths to 1. Not too shabby at all. If I told you to bet on red in Las Vegas and that your odds of winning were 1800 to 1, would you place bet? Sure you would.

See print version for photo on this page

**Table 18, taken from page 21 of the Planck study**

All the other values above are calculations done by Alec MacAndrew, not the STUDY! David Palm says so. He writes: “Dr. MacAndrew cited the scientific work in question and even directed the geocentrists to the very page and table containing
the data. He did the calculations to transform the galactic coordinates given in the paper to ecliptic coordinates that would express these vectors with relation to the ecliptic and equinoxes, and then calculated the angles between the various CMB features and the ecliptic plane and equinox. Most significantly, you’ll notice that in that very table, one of the angles (between the quadrupole and octopole) is specifically reported and Dr. MacAndrew got the same result, which supports our claim that the method he used is correct.”

But MacAndrew is not an astrophysicist or a cosmologist, so we don’t accept his ipse dixit calculations. It’s as simple as that.

But even if we did accept them, that means that MacAndrew has to explain how there are such acute alignments that lie within his own margins of error for the Axis of Evil with the Earth! In other words, MacAndrew has done all this huffing and puffing while the pink elephant is staring at everyone in the room! According to the Big Bang theory that MacAndrews swears by, there should be NO SUCH alignments, nada, nilch, zero. Forced into a corner, MacAndrew puts on his magicians hat and then tries to make you believe that odds of 1800 to 1 against any such alignments actually supports his Big Bang cosmology instead of outright denies it. It’s an amazing spectacle.

Bottom line: within the margin of error of the Planck probe, the alignment of the Axis of Evil with the Sun-Earth ecliptic clearly exists, and it is as plain as the nose on MacAndrew’s and Palm’s face. They don’t want to admit it because they have already decided that geocentrism is impossible. That’s a fact. I’ve never seen two more biased individuals in my entire life. MacAndrew I can understand, because he’s an atheist.

In fact, the alignment of the Dipole Axis with our equator also exists, although NASA and ESA try to attribute that to a presumed motion of our solar system through a stationary CMB. But not only does the Doppler shift give a value that is four times too high for such an explanation, it presumes that the CMB
is stationary and the solar system is moving through it, all without any proof. In other words, they use as proof the very thing they are trying to prove. Not good science.

100) Promises, Promises!

Keating: page 315: “Sungenis and Delano had promised that The Principle would be in theaters by the spring of 2014, that it would be handled by a major film distribution company, and that it would open nationwide in multiple theaters. None of that came to pass. The theatrical debut of the film occurred on October 24, 2014, about six months later than predicted. The film opened not nationwide but in a single theater in Addison, Illinois…”

R. Sungenis: First, we didn’t “promise” anything. Second one of the very reasons we ran into difficulty was because Mr. Keating organized a “get The Principle” campaign which mushroomed into The Principle becoming the third highest trending story on the Internet in April 2014 when approximately 150 news outlets across the world began to accuse me of being a “holocaust denier” (which I am not) and an “anti-semite” (which I am not). This barrage from the press followed the comment Keating made on his blog (which was seen by two witnesses before he took it down the same day) that he was going to enlist the help of “B’nai B’rith” to help stop The Principle. As a result, the Prints and Advertising money that was going to be used to make our nationwide debut suddenly pulled out from under us and we were stuck having only one theater in which to make our theatrical debut. But we made it into the theaters despite Keating’s attempt to stop us, and we continue our theatrical run to this very day, the next stop being several more cities in the US beginning April 24, 2015.

101) The Rocky Road of Rocky Mountain Pictures

Keating: page 315: “And The Principle was promoted not by a major distributor but by the two proprietors of Rocky Mountain Pictures, a firm that has represented few films, nearly all of them financial failures.”

R. Sungenis: Now, is it my imagination or does Mr. Keating seem like a man obsessed, or possibly even possessed? He even has to denigrate us by
making our distributor look as bad as possible. Even on that note, he fails to inform the reader that most films do not make money, which means that even the major distributors have a long list of films that were “financial failures.” Perhaps 1 out of 1,000 films make it to the theaters, and out of those perhaps 3 out of 10 actually make money. (So The Principle is actually doing very well, since we’ve made money in each of eight cities we have debuted). Regarding Rocky Mountain Pictures, look them up yourself. You will find one of their most recent releases, “Obama 2016,” made over 33 million dollars. Not too shabby for a company that Keating describes as having a number of “financial failures.”

102) Lawrence, Kate, and the Missing Memory

Keating: page 316-317: “Lawrence Krauss also appeared in the Sungenis and DeLano film, and, after its premiere, he denounced it and claimed he was duped into being interviewed for it. Krauss was not the only member of the cast to complain about The Principle. Kate Mulgrew’s best-remembered role is as Capt. Kathryn Janeway on Star Trek: Voyager (1995-2001)….When asked to do the work, she was not told that the film was intended to lay the groundwork for a pro-geocentric argument. When she discovered the real purpose of the film and who was behind it, she issue this disclaimer at her Facebook page on April 8, 2014.”

R. Sungenis: First, I suggest that if you want to get the full story of what happened as opposed to the slanted version Keating is consistently trying to pass off, go to our link which covers the story in full detail (http://www.theprinciplemovie.com/controversy). There you will find that Lawrence Krauss was not “duped into being interviewed” and that Kate Mulgrew no more had to be a geocentrist to do The Principle than she had to believe in warp drive to do Star Trek: Voyager. But what else could we expect from Ms. Mulgrew when she was bombarded by the press that I was an “anti-semite” (which I am not) and that I was some lunatic with a tin foil hat receiving messages from space that Earthlings were the center of the universe? Ms. Mulgrew never contacted me to get my side of the story, and I’m sure she was told by her publicity agents not to do so. The press basically put me on the “Ten Most Wanted” list and I instantly became a villain for people to hate, and that is all Ms. Mulgrew was
allowed to know. Of course, Mr. Keating was wringing his hands with glee when all this commotion began in April 2014, since he was one of the agitators who helped start the controversy. Yet through all this we have survived, and *The Principle* is still appearing in theaters across the country, and, to everyone’s delight, it includes the narration of Ms. Mulgrew and the admission of Lawrence Krauss that the Earth is likely to be in the center of the universe. Imagine that.

103) “I Know the REAL Purpose of the Film!”

Keating: pages 323-4: “The first *Mic’d Up* show aired on January 8, 2014, the second on May 28….In the second Sungenis and DeLano said that they had in their possession signed releases from the unbelieving cosmologists interviewed in their film….The flourishing of the signed releases by Sungenis and DeLano was a dodge, since no one had asserted that Krauss, Michio Kaku, Max Tegmark and the other interviewees had not signed releases in exchange for modest honoraria. Voris failed to pick up on this. He did not ask Sungenis and DeLano how open they had been about the purpose of their film.”

R. Sungenis: The premise from which Keating is working is that he has some inside knowledge at to the *real* purpose of the film that the general public, and even the producers, are not privy to. But the real purpose of the film, I can assure you, was to examine the Copernican Principle and its possible demise in light of the new scientific evidence that has come forth in the last 20 or so years. Why this should be a surprise to Keating is beyond us, especially if Keating has been keeping up with the current scientific literature. It is just dripping with challenges to the Copernican Principle. We earlier saw two of these documents, one in which Lawrence Krauss admitted that the alignments of the cosmic microwave radiation seem to put Earth in the center of the universe, and one in which Ashok Singal says that “the Copernican Principle seems to be in jeopardy.” Naturally, this state of affairs begs the question from sincere film makers, namely, why wouldn’t someone want to make a film about one of the most astounding discoveries that modern science has made?! You’d have to be operating with a half-deck not to want to make such a film.
But, of course, that kind of sincere and worthwhile motive wouldn’t be good grist for Keating’s gossip mill. It was better for him to try to make *The Principle* into a movie either about geocentrism, or that pointed to geocentrism, so that he could then accuse the producers of being out-of-touch conspiracy theorists who hadn’t the first clue about anything scientific. Interestingly enough, when DeLano and I were discussing how we wanted to make the film, we both agreed that we would not promote or even deal with strong geocentrism because we knew it would be too easily dismissed by the theater-going public (not to mention our distributor), and we did not want to risk losing the main and more popular story (i.e., the significance or our galaxy or solar system being at or near the center of the universe) for an intensely idiosyncratic one (that Earth itself is motionless and the center of the universe). If and when we did the more idiosyncratic version, it would not be for the theaters. Rest assured, however, no amount of criticism or apple-cart-upsetting from Keating is going to deter us from telling the full story.

**104) Did I Mention Sungenis has “Animosity” Towards Jews?**

**Keating**: page 324: “Voris, with a chuckle, brought up the charge of anti-Semitism to Sungenis, who denied harboring animosity toward Jews. Neither made any reference to the tens of thousands of words Sungenis had written against Jews since 2002. Sungenis claimed that he had criticized Catholics twice as often as he criticized Jews. Voris threw him two slow pitches: ‘Are you a Holocaust denier?’ ‘No.’ ‘Do you hate Jews?’ ‘No.’ That was a probing as Voris got.”

**R. Sungenis**: Keating goes on to say that in the past I have questioned, based on Red Cross records, the number of Jews who died in Nazi Germany and that from this I suggest that many of them were not gassed but died of malnutrition. Let’s examine what Keating is trying to do here. There are two sentences of note: (1) “…the charge of anti-Semitism to Sungenis, who denied harboring animosity toward Jews,” and (2) “Neither made any reference to the tens of thousands of words Sungenis had written against Jews since 2002.” By juxtaposing these two sentences, Keating is making it appear that the “tens of thousands of words Sungenis had written against Jews” refutes Sungenis’ claim that he “denied harboring animosity
toward Jews.” In other words, Keating has crafted the equation such that “writing against Jews” automatically means one has “animosity toward Jews,” and thus can be convicted of “the charge of anti-Semitism.” This is the game Keating and his cronies have been playing for years. But it is wrong; completely false; not to mention a scurrilous and sinful act. If someone writes against a Jew because that Jew has done evil, it is not “anti-semitism” to write against that Jew. In fact, it would be shirking our responsibilities to humanity if we chose not to write against him, for he would continue to do his evil deeds. But since Keating idolizes the Jews as a race, it is his goal to make the difference between “being against a Jew” and “having animosity toward a Jew” non-existent. In his warped view, one is equal to the other, so that if you criticize a Jew, you have animosity toward that Jew, and in fact, you have animosity toward all Jews and therefore are an anti-semite. But Keating’s reasoning would be no more true than when I criticized Pope Francis a few weeks ago (for suggesting that hell doesn’t exist and evil people are annihilated) it means that I hate Pope Francis or had some personal animosity toward him. In the end, it is Keating that is fostering hate since he fails to make the distinction between criticism and animosity.

105) John Hartnett’s Universe: Galactogeo or Geogalacto?

Keating: page 338: “Hartnett said he agreed to be interviewed for The Principle because he ‘wanted to present a biblical creationist non-geocentric point of view, which still permits our planet Earth to be in a special place in the universe [his emphasis]. In the film he expresses his ‘galacto-centric or near galacto-centric worldview’: Earth is ‘somewhere near the local center of a spherically symmetric universe.’”….Harnett is not satisfied with the way his ideas were portrayed in The Principle. His words were preserved, but they were tied to animation sequences that were contrary to his argument. ‘The impression [the film] gives the viewer is that [his view] implies the Earth is at some absolute center. I did not say that. The impression is wrong.’ When, in the film, Hartnett discusses a large-scale structure that suggests that the Earth is near the center of a ‘massive superstructure of galaxies,’ the animation shows a
solitary Earth at the center of the image, not a galaxy or cluster of galaxies. This happens twice.”

**R. Sungenis:** Since Keating titled this chapter “Unprincipled,” with an obvious play on words with our movie title, *The Principle*, and with the express intent to imply that the producers are deceivers who made the movie into an absolute geocentric treatise, we will need to spend quite a few pages on this to expose Keating’s gossip mill.

Perhaps Dr. Hartnett doesn’t remember what he said in the film, but it was our job to put his exact words into a picture for the viewer to see. Below I have transcribed his words from this section of the film, (down to his very use of “um” several times). You will notice that at time slot 51:12 John says: “the galaxies preferred to lie at some periodic spacing out from the Earth.” Hence, at 50:02-50:13 and 50:57-51:06 and 51:12-51:18 we show the galaxies at periodic spacing “out from the Earth.”

**John Hartnett:** *The Principle*: Timing sequence: 50:26 to 51:32: “We looked at, um, of the order upward of 400,000 galaxies, and sort of posed the question, ‘well, um, how are these things arranged in the sky?’ These are three-dimensional map. And had a look at whether or not there was any structure in that. To my surprise, the mathematics bore out, and there is some very unusual structure. Now if you look at a picture of this map, when I first saw that, it looked to me there was like, um, concentric shells, as if, as if, the galaxies preferred to lie at some periodic spacing out from the Earth. [time: 51:12] This is sort of like saying that our galaxy is somewhere near the center of the universe, and when you look at the galaxies arrayed all around us, they’re on sort of like giant, um, shells; they prefer to lie on these concentric shells spaced out by about 250 million light years separation

**R. Sungenis:** The problem, I believe, is that at certain times Dr. Hartnett stresses the galacto-centric aspect of his findings, and at other times he speaks of the geo-centric. I can understand why there may be such an equivocation, since if the Earth is in the Milky Way galaxy, then if one says the Milky Way galaxy is in the center of the universe (which Dr.
Hartnett says in the very next sentence when he states: “This is sort of like saying that our galaxy is somewhere near the center of the universe”), then obviously Earth would, by proxy, also be considered in the center of the universe. There really is little difference between saying “the Earth is in the center of the universe” and “our galaxy is in the center of the universe,” except when we get down to the level of whether the Earth actually moves in space, but *The Principle* did not get down to that level.

106) I Protest. Stop Making the World Geocentric!

Keating: page 339: “Hartnett makes an additional complaint about Sungenis, who in the film says ‘the whole cosmic microwave background is pointing to us, this tiny little point in space, and this is where we live.’ Hartnett objects. He says the CMB ‘does not define a unique center. It does not, nor does it point to Earth. It defines an axis in the cosmos, and anisotropy axis. That is a special direction….But it does not point at the planet Earth. After that [in the film] the impression is given of a conspiracy at NASA. Oh well, then it must be true.”

R. Sungenis: Dr. Hartnett and I had discussions about this issue through email long before he seems to have turned sour on the *The Principle*. I can assure you the issue is not as one-sided as Keating makes it appear. So let’s clarify what the confusion is. The “axis in the cosmos” that the modern science community admits to is the quadrupole/octet pole axis that stems from the edges of the known universe and is aligned with our ecliptic plane. This is commonly known as the Axis of Evil. It is “evil” to them because it defies the Copernican Principle which says there should be no special directions or no special locations in outer space. We are all agreed on that. But there is more to the story, and Dr. Hartnett and I discussed the additional story by email.

The other story regards the dipole anisotropy, which is actually more significant that the quadrupole/octet pole anisotropy since it is 1000 times more intense. The dipole straddles the Earth like headphones straddle a head. Each pole of the dipole straddles the equinoxes of the Earth; or more commonly, the Earth’s equator. And since the equatorial plane extends to the edge of the universe, we can say that the CMB dipole fills all of outer
space but has anisotropies that line up with the universal equatorial plane with Earth in the center of it all.

Now, in order to get around this dipole alignment (since if it was an axis just like the quadrupole/octupole axis there would then be two axes) the science community has attributed the dipole anisotropy to the “movement of our solar system through the Milky Way.” Hence, it is said not to be “cosmological in origin” like the quadrupole/octupole axis is, but is said to be due to a Doppler shift, and therefore is not an Axis of Evil. But much recent evidence shows that this is not the case. It shows that the dipole is, indeed, an additional Axis of Evil, since the Doppler shift is four times greater than what the anisotropy is for a cosmological dipole; in addition to the fact that the cosmological dipole comes from different directions, where as the Doppler shift comes from only one direction.

The Indian astrophysicist, Rahul Kothari, and his co-investigators noted that in actuality the data “suggests a potential violation of the cosmological principle” and that “the Universe may be intrinsically anisotropic with the preferred axis approximately in the direction of the CMBR dipole.” In other words, if the universe is “intrinsically anisotropic” then there is no cause for the dipole except the makeup of the universe itself. That is, the universe has a built-in alignment with the Earth and solar motion plays no role in the dipole. Kothari’s team reiterates this point saying, “the data is not consistent with the cosmic microwave radiation dipole. It clearly indicates the presence of an intrinsic dipole anisotropy which cannot be explained in terms of local motion,” which result is confirmed, Kothari says, at a “4 – 5 sigma” level. This leads them to the conclusion that the “anisotropy we observe may have a physical origin.” In other words, the dipole energy must originate from an inherent microwave polarity in the composition of the Universe itself. This means the Universe is physically divided in two hemispheres along the Earth’s equator.

The study by Kothari was confirmed by Matthias Rubart and Dominik Schwarz in a paper of July, 2013, on the “Cosmic Radio Dipole.” They show that the amplitude of the radio dipole is “inconsistent with the assumption of a pure kinetic origin of the radio dipole at 99.6% confidence
level.”180 In other words, they are almost 100% certain that the Dipole is inherent in the universe, and is not an artifact of solar motion.

A non-kinetic dipole has also been confirmed by Ashok Singal in the paper of May, 2013, titled: “Is there a violation of the Copernican Principle in radio sky?” He states the following:

However the present anisotropies could not be caused by a motion of the solar system as it could not give rise to different anisotropies for different objects….Further, observer’s motion cannot in any case explain the very different radio size distributions of quasars and radio galaxies in the two regions. There is certainly cause for worry. Is there a breakdown of the Copernican principle as things seen in two regions of the sky divided purely by a coordinate system based on earth’s orientation in space shows a very large anisotropy in source distribution? Why should the equinox points and the North Celestial Pole have any bearing on the large scale distribution of matter in the universe?

While most of the science community was rather quiet about these startling discoveries, the University of Michigan did more detailed analysis of the WMAP data. In 2007, one of the members of the University of Michigan team, Dragan Huterer, published an article in Astronomy magazine with the title, “Why is the Solar System Cosmically Aligned?” The title shows that the alignment of the universe with our Earthly environment is accepted as a fact, not a question. Our tiny Earth-sun system, which is estimated to be only one quintillionth the size of the universe, is, according to the latest and best scientific evidence, the hub upon which the whole universe is aligned – a truly remarkable finding of modern cosmology, and perhaps the most important of all modern discoveries.

In 2010, the same University of Michigan team added:

“Our studies indicate that the observed alignments are with the ecliptic plane, with the equinox or with the cosmic microwave (CMB) dipole, and not with the Galactic plane.”

This last comment relates directly back to Dr. Hartnett’s stress on the Milky Way galaxy as opposed to our Earthly environment. It seems that even the CMB data shies away from the Milky Way galaxy and orients itself around our local Sun-Earth environment.

**Galactic and Quasar Alignments with the North Celestial Pole**

In addition to the cosmic microwave radiation aligning with the Earth’s equator and the ecliptic, it has been discovered that the anisotropies of extended quasars and radio galaxies are aligned with the Earth’s equator and the North Celestial Pole (NCP). The discoverer, Ashok K. Signal, is a heliocentrist, and thus he describes his shocking discovery in those terms:

What is intriguing even further is why such anisotropies should lie about a great circle decided purely by the

---


182 “Is there a violation of the Copernican principle in radio sky,” Ashok K. Singal, Astronomy and Astrophysics Division, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad, India, May 17, 2103, arXiv:1305.4134v1. Signal states: “We can rule out at a 99.995% confidence level the hypothesis that these asymmetries are merely due to statistical fluctuations.”
orientation of earth’s rotation axis and/or the axis of its revolution around the sun? It looks as if these axes have a preferential placement in the larger scheme of things, implying an apparent breakdown of the Copernican principle or its more generalization, cosmological principle, upon which all modern cosmological theories are based upon.

Copernican principle states that earth does not have any eminent or privileged position in the universe and therefore an observer’s choice of origin and/or orientation of his/her coordinate system should have no bearing on the appearance of the distant universe. Its natural generalization is the cosmological principle that the universe on a sufficiently large scale should appear homogeneous and isotropic, with no preferred directions, to all observers. However to us on earth the universe does show heterogeneous structures up to the scale of superclusters of galaxies and somewhat beyond, but it is assumed that it will all appear homogeneous and isotropic when observed on still larger scales, perhaps beyond a couple of hundreds of megaparsecs. Radio galaxies and quasars, the most distant discrete objects (at distances of many gigaparsecs or further) seen in the universe should trace the distribution of matter in the universe at that large scale and should therefore appear isotropically distributed from any vantage point in the universe including that on earth.\textsuperscript{183}

Hence, as far as we can look into space with our telescopes, we find that the universe is neither homogeneous nor isotropic, even to the most distant radio galaxies and quasars. In light of this, Singal asks the obvious question: “Why should the equinox points [Earth’s equator] and the NCP have any bearing on the large scale distribution of matter in the universe?” This is a very perplexing question for those who believe in the Big Bang, heliocentrism and relativity, since the celestial anisotropies defy them all. The only answer left is that the Earth is in the very center of the universe, and that the latter moves with respect to the former.

All in all, there are three basic alignments of the Earth with the universe:

\textsuperscript{183} Ibid., pp. 1-2.
The cosmic microwave radiation’s dipole is aligned with the Earth’s equator.

The cosmic microwave radiation’s quadrupole and octupole are aligned with the Earth-Sun ecliptic.

The distant quasars and radio galaxies are aligned with the Earth’s equator and the North Celestial Pole.

Essentially, these three alignments provide the X, Y and Z coordinates to place Earth in the very center of the known universe.
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107) John Hartnett Will Not Be Moved, Forever!

Keating: page 340: “Hartnett, the Catholic-turned-Fundamentalist, is not as literal in his beliefs as is Sungenis the Catholic. Writing to a third party, Hartnett said of Sungenis that
‘I know enough to know that he misapplies Scripture and interprets it contrary to the original intention….If you are going to apply Scripture which says, inter alia, ‘the Earth does not move’ as meaning it as an absolute anchor point in the universe, immovable, then you must also do that when Scripture speaks of the believer not being moved (Psalm 112:6: ‘Surely he shall not be moved for ever’). Scripture must be interpreted consistently in this case also.’"

R. Sungenis: Interestingly enough, Keating decided not to correct Dr. Hartnett’s obvious blunder on Scripture interpretation (since Keating moves on to another topic in the next paragraph), even though Keating wrote the definitive book on Protestant inconsistencies in Scripture interpretation, *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*. Since in this case, as the old adage says, ‘the enemy of my enemy is my friend,’ Keating thought it best to keep silent about Hartnett’s error.

The Hebrew of the English translation is as follows

See print version for photo on this page

The words “not moved” or “not shaken” are from the Hebrew נָבַז, which is pronounced mōḥt. The other important word is “forever,” which is the Hebrew עֲלָם, pronounced olam. Mōḥt can refer to things as simple as

---

184 Hebrew: נָבַז (mōḥt) appears 39 times in the Old Testament, 20 in the Psalms. The Qal form appears 13 times, 23 times in the Niphal, and one each in the Hiphil and Hithpael.
slipping with the foot (Dt 32:35; Ps 17:5; 38:16-17) to moving the earth (Ps 82:5; Is 24:19). Mōht, in the physical sense, refers to the transition from a state of rest to a state of movement; in the figurative sense, from a state of stability to a state of instability. Of all the words in Hebrew referring to movement, מֹּהַת (mōht) is used when any, even the slightest movement, is in view. Hence, it can refer to a shaking or vibration as well as a change of location. Olam can refer to either eternity (Gn 3:22; Dn 12:7); or to an indefinite, old or long time (Dt 32:7; Jr 6:16), and the context will determine which one is in view.

So, very simply, Psalm 112:6 can be teaching that the man of God will not be shaken, even a little, for an indefinite time or for eternity. Which one is in view depends on how one views the context. Both may actually be in view, since if the man is not shaken for his whole lifetime, he will go into eternity unshaken as well. If he is not shaken for a long time (that is, until he sins and falls from grace), then his unshaken state is not forever.

Passages speaking about the Earth not being moved (Psalm 93:1; 96:10; 104:5; 119:90) can be applied in a similar way. If olam is understood as a long or indefinite time, this applies to a fixed Earth that is presently non-moving, but will be moved at the end of time when this world comes to an end (cf. Is 13:13; 24:19; 2Pt 3:10-13). If olam is understood as forever, then the Earth that will be made into New Earth is in view (cf. 2Pt 3:10-13; Is 65:17; Ap 21:1). Hence, there is no contradiction between Psalm 112:6 and Psalm 93:1, and there is nothing in the former that would deny understanding the latter as teaching an unmovable Earth.

108) Our Equations are Too Complicated?

Keating: page 340-341: Hartnett’s reservations about Sungenis go beyond Scripture. They extend also to Sungenis’s claim that anything that can be expressed mathematically in terms of heliocentric coordinate system can be expressed with equal ease in terms of a geocentric coordinate system. Hartnett demurs. ‘Of course one can write equations of motion in geocentric coordinates. It is a matter of choice, but they are horribly

\[ \text{Keating: page 340-341: Hartnett’s reservations about Sungenis go beyond Scripture. They extend also to Sungenis’s claim that anything that can be expressed mathematically in terms of heliocentric coordinate system can be expressed with equal ease in terms of a geocentric coordinate system. Hartnett demurs. ‘Of course one can write equations of motion in geocentric coordinates. It is a matter of choice, but they are horribly} \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright 1999, 2003, 2007, 2013 by Charles Hartnett. All rights reserved.} \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright 1999, 2003, 2007, 2013 by Charles Hartnett. All rights reserved.} \]
complicated….In physics it has long been known that the choice of coordinates that simplifies the equations of motion the most gives the clearest description of the physics, which helps us understand what is going on. That is the best choice, and God led Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton to give us the best and clearest understanding of physics.”

**R. Sungenis**: First, since Hartnett has claimed that geocentric equations exist, and Mr. Keating is quoting Hartnett to prove a point, this means that Keating’s previous claim on page 96 that geocentrists do not have equations for their geocentric system is false. Second, we saw earlier that on page 166 of his book, Keating quoted Danny Faulkner’s appeal to Occam’s Razor, but we saw that the premise of Occam’s razor is an unproven one. Sometimes a simple system is the best one; sometimes a simple system is not able to account for all the variables. It is presumptuous, then, to make a rule that the simplest system is the true system. If not, then Copernicus’ first model of heliocentrism should have been the reality, since it was very simple – planets going around the sun in perfect circles. But Copernicus found out to his dismay that planetary orbits were not simple, and he ended up having to add 48 epicycles to even come close to the 40-epicycle system of Ptolemy. If we were judging by Occam’s Razor, Copernicus would have lost the contest.

As for equations we have two basic ones we use for the conversion from heliocentric to geocentric. There are easily found in Chapter 2 of Vol. 1 of *Galileo Was Wrong*.

The Force which keeps each celestial object in its designated place in a rotating Universe is:

\[
F = -m\omega^2 (\mathbf{R} - D\hat{\omega}\sin(\delta))
\]

We also use the following sequence of equations:

---

186 Keating says on page 96 of *The New Geocentrists*, “This raises the question why no geocentrist has taken the time to work out the equations for his system.”
The Universe is regarded as an \((N + 1)\)–particle system \((N\) celestial bodies plus planet Earth). From the point of a stationary Earth, one can write down the Lagrangian that describes the motions of celestial bodies:

\[
L = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i \dot{r}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{Gm_im_j}{r_{ij}} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{Gm_iM_\odot}{r_i} - U_{ps},
\]

where \(r_{ij} \equiv |r_i - r_j|\), \(U_{ps}\) stands for the pseudo-potential, satisfying \(F_{ps} = -\nabla U_{ps}\). \(F_{ps}\) is the pseudo-force given by

\[
F_{ps} = -m\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{cp,i},
\]

where \(a_{cp,i}\) is centripetal acceleration for given celestial body (with respect to the Earth) and \(m\) is a mass of the object that is subjected to this force. It’s easy to notice that the dominant contribution in these sums comes from the Sun. The close objects (planets, moons, etc.) are much less massive than the Sun, and massive objects are much farther distant. The same approximation is implicitly used in section 3.

In the Machian picture, the centripetal acceleration is a mere relative quantity, describing the rate of change of relative velocity. Therefore, centripetal acceleration of the Sun with respect to Earth is given by Equation 3.7, with \(r_{ES} = -r_{SE}\). All that considered, Equation 4.2 becomes

\[
F_{ps} = \frac{GM_{\odot}M_S}{r_{SE}^2} \hat{r}_{SE}
\]

where \(r_{SE}(t)\) describes the motion of the Sun around the Earth.

We can now finally write down the pseudo-potential which influences every body observed by the fixed observer on Earth:

\[
U_{ps}(r) = \frac{GM_{\odot}M_S}{r_{SE}^2} \hat{r}_{SE} \cdot r
\]

where \(r(t)\) describes motion of particle of mass \(m\) with respect to the Earth. Notice that this is not a central potential.

As one can see, these are very simple equations, contrary to what Hartnett had guessed they would be.
109) Geocentrists: Viewing the World Upside Down?

**Keating:** page 344: “Geocentrists argue that heliocentrism demoted man from his God-given status….Or did it? Is that really what happened, or is that just another Whig interpretation of history, a retrojection into the past of recent prejudices?”

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Keating also covered this topic in his radio interview on Catholic Answers Live on February 13, 2015. At 3:49 to 5:28, Keating states the following:

**Keating:** “These new geocentrists who are saying that the Earth is the center of our solar system and of the whole universe, they actually misunderstand the ancient understanding of Earth’s position. They think that the center is the best place to be. But actually, under the ancient cosmology, it was the worst place to be…In the “Discarded Image,” what Lewis points out is, Earth is at the center of everything. At the center of the Earth is hell, which is obviously the worst place to be. So this means mankind is not that far from hell….The empyrean is where God lives. So if you think of a big sphere, the center point is the worst place to be because it’s furthest from God. The exterior of the sphere is where God is, that’s where you want to go….that is where the angels are…the heavens. But under what the new geocentrists think, they’ve got this exactly backwards. They think the old way, that Earth was in the middle because it was the best place of all and to remove Earth from that center spot, even our solar system, to put the Sun there, is to demote the Earth. So they make a fundamental mistake right off.”

**R. Sungenis:** This is one of the most short-sighted and distorted arguments I have ever seen anyone give against a central Earth. Yes, the ancient world view, say, of Aristotle, was that the Earth was the sump or anus of the universe. But what Mr. Keating failed to reveal was that Aristotle’s notion was rejected by the Church. Thomas Aquinas had the unenviable job of cleaning out the pagan notions from Aristotle’s books. In the writings of the Church Fathers and Aquinas they rejected Aristotle’s demotion of Earth and instead upheld Scripture’s elevation of Earth as the
footstool of God’s throne, from such passages as Isaiah 66:1 and Matthew 5:35; and they saw Earth as the place where God comes to reign over mankind from such passages as Psalm 46. The worst Keating can find from Aquinas is: “Earth—that all the spheres encircle and that, as for place, lies at the center—is the most material and coursest \[ignobilissima\] of all bodies,” 187 and thus there is obviously no passage where Aquinas sees the Earth as the anus of the universe. Aristotle didn’t believe in a personal God, and therefore he would have had no concept of a God who would be so intimate with Earth that He would use it as a footrest, in addition to daily sending His angels, and lastly His own Son, to redeem it from sin.

In essence, Keating has made a fallacious connection between the Christian belief of Earth’s high significance with the pagan notion of Earth’s low significance. Keating fails to see that modern cosmologists have rejected Aristotle’s conception and now understand the center of the universe as very unique. As it stands, it is Keating who has surrendered to the pagan opponents; while it is I who am trying to wrest these pagan notions out of the hands of the atheists and restore the Earth to the glory God originally gave it.

I suggest Mr. Keating do a study of the Church Fathers. He will find something quite different than what he finds in C. S. Lewis who, by the way, was a Protestant who did not consider the Fathers of the Church as an authority on anything, much less authorities on biblical cosmology. In fact, Keating has left out the Church Fathers entirely from his argument, yet their views of the Earth’s position in the universe dominated the Christian consensus. Why would he leave out the most important evidence for his audience to consider?

I think it is also important to add that Keating ignores the fact that the universe of the first millennium and at least three-quarters of the second millennium, was hundreds of orders smaller than the universe of modern cosmology. Putting an object on the rim of the ancient world’s small and finite universe did not take it very far away, and more or less gave it a higher position, since it would be considered directly “above” the center.

But that is not the case with modern cosmology’s universe where there is no “higher position” or a place “above” the center. Whether it is the Steady State or the Big Bang/Multiverse, in the modern version, space and time are infinite, and there is no high or low, right or left, up or down. Consequently, the more vast the universe, the more special a center becomes since the center gives a definitive location and direction out of all the vastness. Conversely, uniqueness is precisely why modern cosmologists want an infinite universe, since it will allow a universe of time and chance instead of one designed by God with a center.

Speaking of the Church Fathers, let’s look at a few who said the Earth was in the center. See for yourself if at any time these Fathers state that the Earth is “insignificant” or is the sump or “anus” of the universe.

**Athanasius**: For the Sun is carried round along with, and is contained in, the whole heaven, and can never go beyond his own orbit, while the moon and other stars testify to the assistance given them by the Sun…But the earth is not supported upon itself, but is set upon the realm of the waters, while this again is kept in its place, being bound fast at the center of the universe.

**Athenagoras**: To Him is for us to know who stretched out and vaulted the heavens, and fixed the earth in its place like a center.

**Augustine**: Let not the philosophers, then, think to upset our faith with arguments from the weight of bodies; for I don’t care to inquire why they cannot believe an earthly body can be in heaven, while the whole earth is suspended on nothing. For perhaps the world keeps its central place by the same law that attracts to its center all heavy bodies.

**Basil**: In the midst of the covering and veil, where the priests were allowed to enter, was situated the altar of incense, the symbol of the earth placed in the middle of this universe; and from it came the fumes of incense.

**Chrysostom**: “For they who are mad imagine that nothing stands still, yet this arises not from the objects that are seen, but from the eyes that see. Because they are unsteady and giddy, they think that the Earth turns round with them, which yet turns not, but stands firm. The derangement is of their own state, not from any affection of the element.”
“And again, the earth is fixed, but the waters are continually in motion; and not the waters only, but the clouds, and the frequent and successive showers, which return at their proper season.”

**Clement of Rome**: the Creator, long-suffering, merciful, the sustainer, the benefactor, ordaining love of men, counseling purity, immortal and making immortal, incomparable, dwelling in the souls of the good, that cannot be contained and yet is contained, who has fixed the great world as a centre in space, who has spread out the heavens and solidified the earth.

**Cyril of Jerusalem**: The earth, which bears the same proportion to the heaven as the center to the whole circumference of a wheel, for the earth is no more than this in comparison with the heaven: consider then that this first heaven which is seen is less than the second, and the second than the third, for so far Scripture has named them...”

**Gregory Nanzianzus**: There have been in the whole period of the duration of the world two conspicuous changes of men's lives, which are also called two Testaments, (a) or, on account of the wide fame of the matter, two Earthquakes; the one from idols to the Law, the other from the Law to the Gospel. And we are taught in the Gospel of a third earthquake, namely, from this Earth to that which cannot be shaken or moved.

**Gregory of Nyssa**: “This is the book of the generation of heaven and earth,” saith the Scripture, when all that is seen was finished, and each of the things that are betook itself to its own separate place, when the body of heaven compassed all things round, and those bodies which are heavy and of downward tendency, the earth and the water, holding each other in, took the middle place of the universe; ….for neither is the earth shifted from its own base, nor does the heaven ever relax in its vehemence, or slacken its motion.

Not only did Mr. Keating not give us evidence of early Christians who believed that the Earth was the anus or “sump” of the universe, he also never mentioned that Scripture holds Earth as the place where God reigns over man (Psalm 46) and is his unmoving footstool (Isaiah 66:1).

Mr. Keating also never mentioned that Scripture holds the Earth’s immobility (and thus centrality) as the perfect analogy to God’s
immutability, as David describes it in Psalms 75, 93, and 96. The only thing Mr. Keating did was refer to the ancient pagans. He then referred to C. S. Lewis, a Protestant who has a special dislike for the Catholic Church as his authority on this subject. Mr. Keating gave us pagans and Protestant but did not give us even one reference to Scripture, Church Fathers, medievals, popes, saints, doctors or theologians who said the Earth was the anus of the universe.

110) Is Keating Preparing for Change? Probably Not

**Keating:** page 349: “Today’s cosmologists admit that their field is in flux. Theories are changing as telescopes and satellites gather ever more precise data. Physicist and astronomers find themselves unable to provide answer to some questions that are put to them. In some areas their ideas are more unsettled today than at any time since the Special Theory of Relativity was formulated in 1905. This gives geocentrists an opening. They are able to suggest that scientists’ present inability to explain certain phenomena and their reliance on theoretical constructs that as yet have not been proved (such as the existence of dark matter) mean that mainstream science is at a dead end. Dead ends are reached when one has taken the wrong route. The solution is to go back and rejoin the correct route that goes by way of geocentrism.”

**R. Sungenis:** Keating goes on to talk about the Cosmic Microwave Radiation as the thing on which the new geocentrists “hang their claim of a wrong turn.” Not quite. There were many wrong turns prior to the Big Bang and the CMB.

1) the first wrong turn was when, after Kepler put his orbits into ellipses, everyone was convinced that the heliocentric model was the true model, but few, like Riccioli, did the same to Tycho’s orbits and thereby showed that geocentrism was just as viable.

2) the second wrong turn was when, after Isaac Newton formulated his equations for motion but confined them to the solar system instead of
expanding them to the whole universe, everyone claimed that the Earth had to revolve around the Sun.

3) the third wrong turn was when science claimed that stellar parallax and stellar aberration proved heliocentrism. No one was astute enough to show that the neo-Tychonic model of geocentrism easily discredited that claim.

4) the fourth wrong turn was when Pius VII, deceived by Cardinal Olivieri, approved an imprimatur for Canon Settele based on the idea that elliptical orbits showed heliocentrism was true; and when Gregory XVI took Galileo off the Index a decade or so later based on the false claim that stellar parallax proved heliocentrism.

5) the fifth wrong turn occurred when Foucault swung his pendulum and everyone concluded that the only way that could occur was if the Earth was rotating underneath it, but no one was astute enough to understand the principle of dynamic relativity in which a rotating star field against a fixed Earth can also rotate the pendulum.

6) the sixth wrong turn occurred when Lorentz decided to interpret the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment as evidence that aether compressed matter and made lengths shorten as opposed to interpreting it to mean that the Earth wasn’t moving through the aether.

7) the seventh wrong turn occurred when Einstein decided to interpret the Michelson-Morley experiment as evidence that the aether did not exist and only relative motion shortened lengths, as opposed to interpreting it to mean that the Earth wasn’t moving through aether. This was the pinnacle of all wrong turns, for it trapped modern science in the maze of “relativity” out of which there was no escape. “Relativity” led Einstein to then invent his second theory, General Relativity, and the two theories, the Special and the General, became the two bookends, the two scientific boundaries, within which every single cosmological theory had to fit, otherwise it would be ignored. Einstein has thus ruled physics, astrophysics and astronomy for the last 100 years and counting. Unfortunately, the confinement to “relativity” has led modern science to the very “dead end” about which Mr. Keating complains. Consequently, modern science will not progress until Einstein is dethroned.
111) The Collaborators, the Chosen People, and 911

Keating: page 357: Acknowledgements: I wish to thank Michael Forrest, Alex MacAndrew, and David Palm for reviewing a draft of The New Geocentrists. Their corrections and suggestions made the text better than it otherwise would have been. Any remaining errors and imprecision are mine, not theirs.”

R. Sungenis: Except for MacAndrew, who is an avowed atheist and who probably helped Keating with the “science” in his book; Keating, Forrest and Palm are joined at the hip against me because of their mutual idolization of the Jews. (In an email to me, Keith Wasser, their colleague, actually said it can best be described as “worship of the Jews”). For the most part, they simply detest my refusal to treat the Jewish race as a “chosen” or “special” people above the Gentile races, and equally despise it when I implicate various Jews in crimes against humanity. The most convenient way they have found to curtail me is to label me an “anti-semite” and incite other people to do the same, thereby creating a mob mentality. As we have seen, however, teaching Jews that they are no longer the Chosen People, and implicating some of their number in sociopathic and criminal activity, displays my love and concern for them, and certainly not animosity.

Indeed, one evil in which I have steadfastly implicated various Jews (and various Gentiles as their co-conspirators) is the most horrendous mass murder ever perpetrated against humanity. It happened on September 11, 2001 when 3000 people went to their untimely deaths. These people suffered the horrors of being blown to bits, burned alive, splattered on the sidewalk, and asphyxiated by micro-fine dust particles. Most of them were Gentiles and only a few were Jewish, and only one was Israeli. In fact, I have a close friend who told me that his daughter, who lives in New York City and has a Jewish male friend who worked at the Twin Towers, called him the day after 911 because she was worried about him. He replied with something that left her aghast. He told her that he knew 911 was going to occur and that they were told not to be at the WTC complex on September 11, 2001.
A Jewish-run company named, Odigo, which had offices two blocks from the Twin Towers, admitted that two of its employees received instant messages warning of a large-scale attack two hours before the planes hit the Twin Towers. The news story is even carried by the Israeli paper *Haaretz* so we know it is not a fabrication, but there have been attempts to minimize its relevance. Two weeks after 911, the vice president of Odigo, Alex Diamandis, stated: “The messages said something big was going to happen in a certain amount of time, and it did — almost to the minute.” Oddly enough, other than *Haaretz* the only other news outlet to pick up the Odigo story was *Newsbytes* on Sept. 27, 2001. Additionally, the *Jerusalem Post* reported that Israel’s foreign ministry had the names of 4,000 Israelis believed to have been in the areas of the Twin Towers and the Pentagon at the time of the attacks, yet only one Israeli is known to have died. Bollyn asks the fair question: “how did the Jews know not to be there?” This anomaly is similar to that of another Israeli company named *ZIM*, 49% of it owned by the Israeli government. It vacated its 10,000 sq ft. office space in the North
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189 In the interview Bollyn had with Paula Zahn on CNN in 2007 (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bB6nDk_FEBs) Zahn highlights a Jew named Jason Sekzer who was killed on 911. The father, Wilton Sekzer, is interviewed and says, “Give me the names of the four thousand Jews who stayed home. Show me something. There is nothing to show. This is a total, ridiculous, asinine rumor that was started by anti-Semites.” I interviewed Bollyn on this issue and he clarified it, stating: “The 4,000 number came from the Israeli foreign ministry. This was reported by the *Jerusalem Post* online. It was then picked up by others and wrongly called anti-Semitic propaganda, which is wasn’t. What CNN did was mix up the poor man who lost his son Jason, by telling him that 4,000 Jews (not Israelis) had been warned. His son was an American Jew and was NOT on the Odigo warning list. The people who were warned to stay away were Hebrew speaking Israelis, not simply Jews. The message was most likely sent in Hebrew and sent only to Israelis.”
Twin Tower only a few days before 911 even though its lease ran to the end of 2001, losing $50,000 in the process. When the FBI’s Michael Dick began an investigation of this suspicious activity, Michael Chertoff removed him from the case. Bollyn cannot help but conclude from Chertoff’s maneuvering that he “gave the Israelis the operational security to carry out this massive crime without fear of exposure or prosecution.”

There are three more interesting pieces of information: (1) Odigo has offices in New York and Herzliya, Israel, the latter being the headquarters of the Mossad; (2) Odigo was later bought by Comverse Infosys, another Israeli company, which specializes in phone tapping and was mentioned in the FOX news story; (3) Michael Chertoff’s 25-year old cousin, Benjamin Chertoff, wrote the infamous article for Popular Mechanics that attempted to support the US government’s position on 911 and debunk alternative theories. Bollyn wrote an article about the Chertoff connection in March 2005 for the American Free Press. He also tells us that Michael Chertoff’s mother, Livia Eisen, was “one of the first Mossad agents” and that Chertoff “also played a key role in the prosecution of the 1993 false-flag terror bombing at the World Trade Center.”

Bollyn became familiar with this apparent Israeli protection program when he began working as a journalist for Spotlight in Washington, DC. He went to the NTSB’s presentation regarding TWA flight 800 that mysteriously crashed off the coast of New York in 1996. He noticed that the three
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190 Titled: “Chertoff’s Cousin Penned Popular Mechanics 9/11 Hit Piece.” Bollyn states in the article: “Because the manager of public relations for Popular Mechanics didn’t respond to repeated calls from American Free Press, I called Benjamin Chertoff, the magazine’s ‘senior researcher,’ directly. Chertoff said he was the ‘senior researcher’ of the piece. When asked if he was related to Michael Chertoff, he said, ‘I don’t know.’ Clearly uncomfortable about discussing the matter further, he told me that all questions about the article should be put to the publicist? the one who never answers the phone. Benjamin’s mother in Pelham, New York, however, was more willing to talk. Asked if Benjamin was related to the new Secretary of Homeland Security, Judy said, ‘Yes, of course, he is a cousin.’”http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/march2005/070305chertoffscousin.htm. Also significant is the paper written by Cass Sunstein, a Zionist Jew of the University of Chicago and Harvard, titled “Conspiracies: Causes and Cures,” which advocates that the government infiltrate 911 activist groups and derail their efforts, stating that such groups are dangerous, especially the “anti-semitic” ones (http://middleeastatemporal.wordpress.com)
Jewish members of the board dominated the presentation, capped off by an “outrageous dismissal of the testimonies of more than one hundred eyewitnesses who testified of seeing an object streaking toward the plane and hitting it in mid-air.” Similar to the accusation Peter and the Apostles received when they spoke in tongues to the Jews on Pentecost, the Jewish members of the NTSB claimed that the one hundred witnesses were either drunk or hallucinating. The meeting was adjourned and no questions were allowed.

The same kind of denials occurred with eyewitness testimony concerning explosions at the Twin Towers after the planes hit. Bollyn lists dozens of people who are on record describing these explosions, including some NYFD firemen, but of all the news coverage on 911 the explosions were
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191 Kevin Murray, Firefighter (FDNY), Ladder 18: “When the tower started, there was a big explosion that I heard and someone screamed that it was coming down and I looked away and I saw all the windows domino”; Janice Olszewski, Captain (E.M.S.): “I thought it was an explosion or a secondary device, a bomb, the jet plane exploding, whatever”; Daniel Rivera, Paramedic (EMS.), Battalion 31: “At first I thought it was – do you ever see professional demolition where they set the charges on certain floors and then you hear ‘Pop, pop, pop, pop, pop’? That's exactly what – because I thought it was that”; Angel Rivera, Firefighter (FDNY): “That's when hell came down. It was like a huge, enormous explosion. I still can hear it. Everything shook”; Kenneth Rogers, Firefighter (FDNY): “I figured it was a bomb, because it looked like a synchronized deliberate kind of thing. I was there in ’93”; Patrick Scaringello, Lieutenant (EMS): “I started to treat patients on my own when I heard the explosion from up above”; Mark Steffens, Division Chief (EMS): “Then there was another it sounded like an explosion and heavy white powder...”; John Sudnik, Battalion Chief (FDNY): “Then we heard a loud explosion or what sounded like a loud explosion and looked up and I saw tower two start coming down. Crazy”; Jay Swithers, Captain (EMS): “I took a quick glance at the building and while I didn't see it falling, I saw a large section of it blasting out, which led me to believe it was just an explosion. I thought it was a secondary device, but I knew that we had to go”; David Timothy, EMT (EMS): “The next thing I knew, you started hearing more explosions. I guess this is when the second tower started coming down”; Albert Turi, Deputy Assistant Chief (FDNY): “And as my eyes traveled up the building, and I was looking at the south tower, somewhere about halfway up, my initial reaction was there was a secondary explosion, and the entire floor area, a ring right around the building blew out”; Thomas Turilli, Firefighter (FDNY): “... it almost actually that day sounded like bombs going off, like boom, boom, boom, like seven or eight, and then just a huge wind gust just came”; Stephen Viola, Firefighter (FDNY): “... that's when the south tower collapsed, and it sounded like a bunch of explosions”;

211
reported once, and only by the BBC, and then never again. One scientist, Van Romero, stated on 911 that the WTC buildings came down by planted explosives, but ten days later changed his mind. News reports show that Romero and his institution were suddenly showered with good fortune. Obviously, the explosions are very important since, if true, it means the buildings were brought down by demolition, not jet fuel fire melting steel girders.

The obfuscation was so blatant, as Bollyn notes, “Not only did the BBC censor Evans’ reports of explosions at the World Trade Center, it also reported that the building known as WTC 7 had collapsed about 30 minutes before the 47-story tower mysteriously fell into its foundation. Jane Standley, a BBC World television reporter in New York City on 911 reported at about 4:54 p.m. (21:54 GMT) that the Salomon Brother’s building owned by Larry Silverstein (WTC 7) had collapsed. Silverstein’s building, however, (which he later admitted had been ‘pulled’), did not collapse until 5:20 p.m. (22:20 GMT). BBC news editor Richard Porter subsequently wrote on the BBC website in February 2007: ‘We no longer have the original tapes of our 911 coverage.’ But why would the BBC destroy its original tapes of 911?”

Bollyn’s conclusion after years of investigation is:

At every critical point where the events and circumstances of 911 should have been investigated and discussed, there has been a Zionist, a dedicated devotee of the State of Israel, occupying a key position and acting as the controller and censor of evidence – the gatekeeper of information….Logically, there can be no reason for dedicated Zionists to obstruct the investigation of 911 other than to conceal evidence of Israeli and Zionist involvement in the crimes.

One of the better examples supporting this conclusion is Michael Chertoff. Like many Jews in the US government, Chertoff is also a citizen of Israel and hence his loyalties are divided. Chertoff, as the Assistant Attorney

William Wall, Lieutenant (FDNY), Engine 47: “At that time, we heard an explosion. We looked up and the building was coming down right on top of us…”

General, was assigned the investigation of the aftermath of 911. It was Chertoff who, even though 911 was the largest crime scene in history, had the final authority on the removal of the steel girders from ground zero. When Bollyn wrote to Chertoff and asked him if he had authorized the destruction of the steel, Chertoff wrote back saying, “no.” When asked if he knew who had, Chertoff said “no idea.” For a man who is so involved in every other aspect of 911, his claim of ignorance regarding the steel is preposterous. The first thing he would seek to do in order to get to the truth is have the steel girders examined for bomb residue. When Kenneth Holden was asked by the 911 Commission on April 1, 2003 about the steel, he said he received “verbal permission” to send the steel to scrap yards in New Jersey, but did not name the person who gave the permission and the 911 Commission didn’t ask him for the identity.

Be that as it may, the leads on this issue point to where every other lead points – right to Israel. As Bollyn puts it, “When I discovered that the scrapyard that managed the destruction of most of the steel had employed a team of metal traders sent by a high-level agent of the Mossad to dispose of the steel by sending it to Asian smelters, I was not surprised because it was consistent with what I had expected.” Both the scrapyards and the junkyards that housed the steel were “Zionist-owned operations.” Two of the junkyards were Hugo Neu Schnitzer East and Metals Management Northeast. Hugo Neu is a Jewish immigrant. He invests Israeli venture capital with Nir Belzer who is the senior manager of Israel’s Millennium Materials Technologies Funds with Oren Gafri, and Gafri served as an executive with Israeli Aircraft Industries Ltd, Bedek division, which, as we will see later, specialized in aircraft conversion (like the type suspected for use in 911). Gafri also trained in Israel’s nuclear program, including explosive coatings of super-thermite (the kind found in the dust of 911). As for Metals Management, Daniel Dienst, a known Zionist, became its director in June 2001, but was also the director of CIBC World Markets.

193 Bollyn quotes Bill Manning in the article “Selling Out the Investigation” from *Fire Engineering* of January 2002, saying, “For more than three months, structural steel from the World Trade Center has been and continues to be cut up and sold for scrap. Crucial evidence that could answer many questions about high-rise building design practices and performance under fire conditions is on the slow boat to China, perhaps never to be seen again in America until you buy your next car…The destruction and removal of evidence must stop immediately.”
where he worked under two other Zionists, David Kassie and Lior Bregman. Alan Ratner, another Zionist, merged Metals Management with the Sims Group and Hugo Neu Schnitzer East.

Chertoff was later made head of the Department of Homeland Security from which he used the Sensitive Security Information program to confiscate evidence to forestall investigation into 911. One of his most egregious acts was the confiscation of the three private video tapes of the attack on the Pentagon.\textsuperscript{194} The tapes have never been released and no demand for them from the president or the US Congress has been forthcoming. A few years ago the FBI released one tape which came from a camera on the Pentagon grounds, but it appears that several frames of that tape were edited since it doesn’t show what hit the Pentagon.\textsuperscript{195} This editing process dovetails with other incidents of fake footage, such as the “Dulles Airport” video released by the Associated Press in 2004 to promote the release of the 911 Commission Report and to frame five Arabs.\textsuperscript{196} Chertoff’s other obstructions of justice include the confiscation of all the parts of the airplanes. Each part has a serial number to identify the plane from which it originated. The FBI refuses to release any of it. Obviously, the serial numbers would determine whether these were actual commercial jet liners or remotely controlled tankers camouflaged to look like commercial jet liners. When Chertoff was asked on CSPAN’s \textit{Washington Journal} show what he thought about people who think the US government was involved in 911, he stated, with a smile on his face: “I

\textsuperscript{194} FBI agents confiscated the film at the Sheraton National Hotel from a security camera that some hotel employees were watching. The FBI also confiscated the film from the CITGO gas station security camera under the flight path of the attack aircraft.

\textsuperscript{195} See http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/analysis/ videoframes.html; The Pentagon did report a few plane parts (e.g., a wheel that appears to be from a commercial plane, and a very small piece of fuselage, see http://911review.com/errors/pentagon/nodebris.html) but if such things survived, then other more hard to destroy parts, such as the two engines, should also have survived.

\textsuperscript{196} See the report by Stephen M. St. John at www.show-the-house.com/id107.html. The surveillance video allegedly shows five Arab hijackers passing through the security checkpoint on their way to boarding American Airlines Flight 77 on the morning of 911. St. John shows beyond reasonable doubt that the whole video is a fake and designed to frame the Arabs for 911.
think that is in the same category as holocaust denial and the same as people who think President Obama was not born in Hawaii – a conspiracy theory that doesn’t warrant investigation.”197 John Cole, board member of Architects and Engineers for 911 Truth in “The Great Thermate Debate,” showed in his own backyard that even a nominal amount of Thermate could separate steel columns.198

Although Chertoff failed to do any investigation, many private citizens did. In the weeks following 911, molten metal was found at the base of the Towers and Building 7 that glowed for five weeks after the rubble was removed, producing a bluish-white smoke. Peter Tully of Tully Construction of Flushing, involved in removing the rubble from 911, told Bollyn in 2002 that he had seen pools of “literally molten steel” at the base. Mark Loizeaux of Controlled Demolition, Inc. told Bollyn there were “hot spots of molten steel in the basements, at the bottom of the elevator shafts of the main towers, down seven levels.”

Witnesses say they saw something like molten metal pouring out from the 81st floor of the South Tower. Steven Jones of Brigham Young University obtained some fragments and found that they were primarily iron. Jones presented photographic and scientific evidence indicating that an aluminothermic reaction using a form of thermite, producing temperatures above 4,500 °F, had been used to cut the 47 massive core columns that held up each tower.199 The thermite also produces nano-particles in the air. The particles were discovered in the smoke that rose from ground zero by Thomas Cahill of University of California and were most likely caused by a form of thermite.

197 At the 3:33 mark at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9XnGk9fz8gM&feature=relmfu
198 See at the 12:01 mark at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PG3uaQxc8uQ&feature=related
199 A second paper written by Jones and eight other scientists is titled, “Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe” and published in Open Chemical Physics Journal of March 2009. Jones says: “Based on these observations, we conclude that the red layer of the red/gray chips we have discovered in the WTC dust is active, unreacted thermitic material, incorporating nanotechnology, and is a highly energetic pyrotechnic or explosive material.”
Thermite is a combination of finely ground aluminum and iron oxide that, as Jones puts it, “cuts through steel like a warm knife through butter,” especially when mixed with 2% sulfur, which is then called thermate and known colloquially as “super-thermite.” The iron oxide reduces to iron, which melts at 2,777 °F. The oxide component combines with the aluminum to form aluminum oxide, producing the bluish-white smoke seen by the ground crews. The reason the thermite glowed for five weeks and continued to burn for three months under the rubble of the Twin Towers is due to the huge amount that had been put into the buildings to make sure they came down. Much was left over and it continued to react under the rubble. Being so hot, it cooked off the nano-particles found in the smoke. It could cook for so long because thermite does not need air to burn since it gets oxygen from the oxide component. One possible reason the collapse of the Twin Towers was so thorough is that super-thermite, according to a Lawrence Livermore lab paper, “can be sprayed or even painted onto surfaces, effectively forming an energetic or even explosive paint.”

A graphic video shows how the thermite would have been placed in order to have the Twin Towers come down precisely how they appear to come down on television. Once detonated, the thermite causes extreme heat and forms pyroclastic clouds (the ones seen traveling through the streets of Manhattan, and similar to those formed by NASA rockets or volcanoes) which severely scar every metal object in its path, which explains why cars several blocks away from the Towers were burned up.

Falling steel and concrete, by themselves, do not form pyroclastic clouds. More importantly, if the steel did not melt, there would have been no collapse.

As noted, steel melts only at 2,777 °F. Jet fuel burns no hotter than 1,517 °F, and there was nothing in the WTC buildings, barring explosives and thermite, that could burn hotter than jet fuel. This alone should close the
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201 See the graphic video at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jazdG3-ZETM&feature=g-vrec beginning at the 1:32 mark for the sequence.
case on the government’s theory – fire being one of only five separate theories they have offered in the last eleven years (e.g., pancaking floors, pile driving, shockwaves, shoddy construction), none of which include planted explosives. From this Bollyn logically concludes, “It is now evident that a sophisticated form of super-thermite had been applied to large sections of the World Trade Center. It may have been applied as a spray coating inside the wire ducts that ran through the floors or to the undersides of the floor pans under the guise of fire-proofing or some other form of building maintenance. Super-thermite is safe to handle and only becomes dangerous when it is dry.” He adds: “When the explosive thermitic coating was detonated it pulverized the 4-inch thick concrete floors and the steel pans that held them. The intense heat released by the alumino-thermic reaction melted the steel pans, creating billions of tiny molten iron droplets that fell like burning hail from the apocalyptic clouds that rolled across lower Manhattan on 911….The abundance of iron-rich spheroids in the dust of the destroyed towers is not explained in the US Geological Survey’s published study or by the government-funded research that concluded that burning jet fuel caused the towers to collapse. A fire of burning jet fuel does not produce temperatures anywhere near the melting point of steel and cannot explain the extremely large amount of molten iron found in the dust and rubble.” He then asks the obvious question, “If Osama bin Laden and Al Qaida did not spray super-thermite in the Twin Towers, who did?” Interestingly enough, the NIST study by the US government on 911 doesn’t even mention the presence of thermite.202 As to how it may have secretly been installed, Susan Lindauer, a former CIA asset, reveals that video cameras show trucks arriving at the WTC complex every night from August 23 until September 2 at 3:00am when no one was in the buildings. As a CIA asset, she was told by the CIA to stay out of the WTC area during that time because there would be “hijacking of planes and an attack on the World Trade Center.”203

As for the source of the thermite, one possibility was a US military connection, since it “is the main user and developer of super-thermite.”

203 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=68LUHa__OlA&feature=related
Bollyn mentions one very likely suspect along those lines – a demolition company named LVI who, according to a September 13, 2001 article by Debra Rubin, had done “asbestos abatement” in the Twin Towers. LVI Group, Inc. had previously done multi-million dollar contracts of research and development for the Department of Defense. LVI also worked closely with Controlled Demolition, Inc. on large demolition projects, with LVI’s specific role being “to prepare the structure for demolition prior to the placement of charges.” Yet when Burton Fried of LVI was approached by Bollyn concerning the information in Rubin’s article, he denied he was involved, which, Bollyn says, “increased my suspicions.” Bollyn then quiered Rubin, and she affirmed that Fried was the source for her information.

An even more interesting connection between 911 and thermite is the company called Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC). SAIC provided all the experts who wrote papers for the NIST investigation of 911.\(^{204}\) SAIC headed the investigation of the 1993 WTC bombing, and had warned seven years earlier that a bomb set in the basement of the WTC would do much damage. SAIC also makes nanothermites through their subsidiary, Applied Ordinance Technology. One of the more interesting facets of SAIC operations is intelligence. Essentially, it is hired by the CIA to spy on the CIA employees. SAIC also provided intelligence concluding that Iraq needed to be invaded and that Kalek Sheik Mohammad needed to be captured. It employs Robert Gates and John Deutch, both former directors of the CIA. As Kevin Ryan concludes, “They are basically the CIA,” and thus the CIA was behind the conclusion that no nanothermites were used on 911, which is a complete denial of what was found at 911.

Bollyn’s suspicions were also increased when he considered the role of Ehud Barak, prime minister of Israel until March 2001, in the super-thermite scheme. Barak’s involvement didn’t surprise Bollyn since his history is quite sordid. A report by the UN Fact Finding Mission on the

\(^{204}\) Among them are Hratch Semerjian and Michael Zachariah who were the world’s leading experts on nanothermites, having written ten papers on the subject.
Gaza conflict, written by Jewish author Justice Richard Goldstone, says Barak is legally responsible for a host of war crimes. Olmert and Barak are both accused of bribery and corruption in Israel. Barak came to America after March 2001 ostensibly to work as a special advisor for Electronic Data Systems and as a consultant with SCP Partners, a Mossad-run private equity company focused on ‘security-related’ work, but Bollyn believes this was merely his cover, with his real assignment being to oversee the 911 attacks. In 2001, SCP Partners did business with Metallurg Holding, Inc., as well as Advanced Metallurgical Group, N.V. (AMG), both sharing the same Wayne, PA address. AMG specializes in the production of “atomized aluminum, a component of super-thermite, and others which manufacture specialized coatings of nano-composites.” Bollyn notes that “There are very few companies or countries in the world that had the capability to manufacture super-thermite in 2001, but Ehud Barak and his SCP Partners did…and Osama bin Laden…did not.”

The findings of Jones and Cahill were in stark contrast to the total absence in the US government’s “official version” to explain why the core columns collapsed and virtually disappeared within ten seconds. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), whose lead investigator was Stephen Cauffman, a Zionist Jew, whitewashed the whole affair. For example, the NIST and FEMA reports mention nothing about the molten steel. The media, silenced as it is by the powers-that-be, had no interest in pursuing the question. When presented with the evidence of Thermite, FEMA refused to investigate it and opted to play dumb, stating: “The specifics of the fires in WTC 7 and how they caused the building to collapse remain unknown,” but admitted that the fire-induced-collapse hypothesis “has only a low probability of occurrence.” Cahill discovered that the EPA took no air samples to measure the air quality of New York City after 911, yet the administrator of the EPA, Christine Todd Whitman, told everyone the air was fine to breathe. Cahill concluded that it wasn’t fine to breathe. It was highly contaminated. When Cahill told the EPA he was taking air samples, they were not interested in his findings, only who authorized it. Jones concludes that the official 911 report is “pathological science” that sets out to ignore all the evidence that contradicts the explanation already established. Bollyn contacted three scientists who

205 http://911review.com/coverup/nist.html
support the official version. The first, Thomas Eagar of MIT, refused to read Jones’ 52-page paper and hung up the phone on Bollyn. Zdenek Bazant of Northwestern University, who submitted his fire-induced collapse theory two days after 911 and thus without examining the ground and air evidence, called Jones’ paper “a fiction…it is nothing but sensationalism.” When Bollyn asked him to look at Jones’ photos of molten metal, Bazant said, “I do not have time.” Abolhassan Astaneh-Asl from Berkeley and a member of the FEMA-funded team studying the collapse, said, “I will not be able to find time to review the material that you have sent me.” It appears that the words of the FBI agent to FOX news’ correspondent Carl Cameron come true once again – it would be “career suicide” to suggest anything deviating from the US official story, even for a tenured professor. Bollyn is forced to conclude: “With the discovery of large amounts of super-thermite in the dust of the World Trade Center the government version has been exposed as a pack of lies designed to start a pre-planned war of aggression.”

Some people, such as Dr. Judy Wood, believe that some type of free-energy pulse was used since the particle debris was in micron dimensions. Others believe that some type of mini-nuclear device was used. Jim Fetzer questions whether nano-thermite could do the job by itself. These alternatives are the natural outcome of investigations that seek to piece together a very intricate web of deceit. 206 In the end it really makes little difference. The US and Israel have the technology to use any of them, either singly or in combination. In the end, we need only be concerned with two main facts: (a) the buildings could not have come down by planes that caused fire since fire has never brought down any steel-girded building, and (b) neither Osama bin Laden nor his alleged accomplices had either superthermite, free energy, nuclear or aviation history or capability. Some also believe that some or all of the planes during 911 were not real but holograms projected into the sky. 207 Whether or not these have any truth to them will be something that needs investigation, but the

---

206 http://jamesfetzer.blogspot.com/2011/05/has-nanothermite-been-oversold-to-911.html. Regarding the issue of additional explosives, Bollyn noted to me: “Super-thermite certainly does a lot of damage, but there were certainly other explosives used. No doubt about it.”

207 http://www.veteranstoday.com/2012/02/20/911-planesno-planes-and-video-fakery/
preponderant evidence is that real planes hit the Towers. Many cameras were trained on the Towers after the North Tower was hit, and all, from many different angles, record a plane hitting the South Tower. On the other hand, it is much more doubtful that planes hit the Pentagon or crashed in Shanksville, PA, since there is no film showing a commercial plane (the three available films were confiscated by the FBI and never released) and no debris resembling a commercial plane was present at either site. What is most important is who did it, which is the focus of Bollyn’s book. Along those lines, the perpetrators have a vested interest in encouraging a number of competing theories because this increases the confusion and lessens the certainty of who the real criminals are, especially when we know for a fact that Israelis Mossad agents already had their cameras pointing to the Twin Towers before the planes hit.

That Israel would have the capability to camouflage such planes is evident in the network of aviation facilities it maintains. There are a number of Israeli-controlled aviation companies operating in the United States which were all started by Israel Aircraft Industries (IAI), now called Israel Aerospace Industries. IAI is as wholly owned subsidiary of the Israeli Defense Ministry. It advertises itself as a “world leader in aircraft conversion.” There is also the International Consultants on Targeted Security (ICTS), which is an Israeli airport security company that is a prime suspect in 911. Bollyn notes that “ICTS was a key defendant in the 911 tort litigation until Judge Alvin K. Hellerstein [a known Zionist whose son, Joseph Hellerstein, is a lawyer in Israel] dismissed the Mossad-linked company from the case in May 2011.” Guess who was in charge of security and screening at Boston’s Logan airport on 911? ICTS. Additionally, Hellerstein is under great suspicion due to the fact that he vigorously sought to have all 96 wrongful death claims settled out of court so that none of them could go to trail and expose the evidence leading to the real perpetrators of 911. Kenneth Feinberg set up a very attractive victim’s compensation fund of 7 billion and Hellerstein used it unsparingly, having said at one time “money is the universal lubricant” and “We have to get past 9-11. Let it go. Life is beautiful. Life is short.

208 http://www.911conspiracy.tv/2nd_hit.html
Live out your years. Take the award.” By 2011, there was only one case left Hellerstein could not settle, so he placed a limit of one month for a trial and dismissed ICTS from having to testify. The plaintiff gave up hope and dropped the lawsuit. The lawsuit had implicated Feinberg since he attempted to bribe the lawyer for the plaintiff into accepting an out-of-court settlement and convincing her (Ellen Mariani) that she was clinically insane. Helping Hellerstein was Sheila Birnbaum, another Zionist Jew, who was appointed as a “special mediator” to the victims’ families. Birnbaum is a lawyer for the firm Skadden, Arps, et al. Its website portrays itself as catering to Israeli interests.

Hellerstein’s real motivation, of course, is the same for why the US refused to have Khalid Sheikh Mohammad go on trial in a public US court or why they allegedly killed Osama bin Ladin in an ambush and threw his body out to sea. If any of these people testified in open US court what the real story behind 911 was, it would be all over for Israel and the US. It’s the same reason that many 911 witnesses have been mysteriously dying since 2001, including Barry Jennings, the NY Housing Authority Emergency Coordinator, who reported of explosions at Building 7 before it came down; and Beverly Eckert who sued the US over 911 and refused to take a cash settlement; and Ken Johannemann, the janitor at the Twin Towers, who reported seeing massive explosions at the base and upper floors.

There is also the Israeli aircraft leasing company ATASCO begun by the Israeli military in 1971 and connected to the Mossad and owned by Israeli “entrepreneur” Shaul Eisenberg. Bollyn notes that it was just after he had a conversation with its chairman, Shalom Yoran, that the goon squad of undercover policemen came to his property and gave him a taste of TASAR. He found out that Yoran was originally in the Israeli air force in

---

209 One father, Mike Lowe, of his daughter Sara who was a stewardess on Flight 11, said: “He can’t understand our loss. He sees the solution in a very cold and pragmatic way – dollars and cents. He thinks everybody should take the money and go away.”

210 http://www.skadden.com/Index.cfm?contentID=42&itemID=1156
http://www.skadden.com/Index.cfm?contentID=47&practiceID=38&focusID=1

211 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bvay28lZiHU&feature=related; See Jennings’ testimony at the 5:48 mark of this video http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jazdG3-ZETM&feature=g-vrec
1948 and was the founder of IAI, and its parent Bedek in 1953, who converted its first Boeing 767 to a cargo jet in 2000. On April 4, 2000 the Jerusalem Post noted Bedek as “one of the world’s leaders in plane conversions,” and thus it would be easy for the company to convert a passenger plane to a remote controlled drone to hit the Twin Towers. There is also Bedek’s Commodore Aviation in Miami, which, like ATASCO, has been funded by the US taxpayer as part of the 3 billion sent by the US to Israel each year. As such, we could be funding our own home grown terrorists right here in the USA. As Bollyn puts it: “Israelis like Yoran don’t usually come to America as immigrants – they are sent on a mission.” Bollyn goes on to list the clandestine activity of these Israeli enterprises (including international drug smuggling as reported by the Israeli paper Haaretz in 2003) and notes that except for one article in the Washington Post about Eisenberg and the Mossad in 1978, the stories were never followed by any news outlet.

Bollyn reports an eerie conversation in September 1980 between Michael D. Evans, an American Zionist and former Mossad chief Isser Harel, which was reported in the Jerusalem Post in the article “America the Target” just a few weeks after 911. When Evans asked Harel if he thought terrorism would come to America, Harel responded: “I fear it will come to you in America…New York City is the symbol of freedom and capitalism. It’s likely they will strike the Empire State Building, your tallest building and a symbol of your power.” Evans later added that Harel said “…it will come to New York and your tallest building, which is a symbol of your fertility.” In a subsequent interview titled “Is America in Bible Prophecy?” Evans said Harel explained the “symbol of your fertility” as referring to “Islamic theology…the phallic symbol is very important. Your biggest phallic symbol is New York City and your tallest building will be the phallic symbol they will hit,” with Evans concluding, “Isser Harel prophesied that the tallest building in New York would be the first building hit by Islamic fundamentalists 21 years ago.” Bollyn concludes: “Think about this for a minute. The founder of Israeli intelligence tells an American Zionist in 1980 that Arab terrorism will come to America and that the terrorists will strike the tallest building in

---

212 Bollyn notes that the interview is published on-line at Beliefnet, a Zionist propaganda network disguised as a religious website.
New York City. His bizarre prediction…then comes to pass…So, how did Isser Harel know what Arab terrorists had planned more than two decades before 911?” Good question. Here is a good case to apply the axiom: a fox smells his own hole.

Another question Bollyn raises concerns “how the most modern and expensive air force in the world failed to intercept four airliners, three of which roamed wild for hundreds of miles before striking landmark buildings in New York and Washington” especially when “these crucial questions have never been raised by the government-appointed commissions or the media”? Who can believe that the US, with the most state-of-the-art defense system in the world and under the vigilance of such formidable names as NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense) or NEADS (Northeast Air Defense Sector) could allow slow-moving planes to hit their targets? Again, deception and confusion is the name of the game. Bollyn notes that someone in the high chain of command conveniently organized war games for both NORAD and NEADS on the day of 911. Since the only thing different between a war-game computer screen and an actual-war computer screen is that the latter is real, those who man those stations could be kept in the dark on the actual events occurring in the sky until someone decided to declare that what they were seeing was no drill.213 After it is all done, you keep it all quiet so that, as Bollyn notes “the confusion among the critical military radar operators at NEADS was never published or referenced by any national newspaper in the United States. The New York Times, for example, has never even mentioned ‘Vigilant Guardian,’ the air defense exercise that contributed to the confusion behind the military’s failure to protect New York City on 9-11.”

See print version for photo on this page

213 The US was conducting drills of planes hitting the Pentagon and the World Trade Center beginning a full two years before 911. See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Iw_XDxnciGs&feature=related
Bollyn concentrates a lot on the possibility that 911 “was a sophisticated computer crime carried out through long-term foreign infiltration of the most sensitive US military and government computer networks” which on 911 “gave the people behind the terrorist attacks the ability to thwart a military response to the emergency as it developed.” In his crosshairs is a company named Ptech, mainly because a whistleblower named Indira Singh said the company “played a key role in the events of 911.” A front page article in the Boston Globe of Dec. 7, 2002 titled, “FBI reportedly didn’t act on Ptech tips” cites an interview Singh did with WBZ-TV, in which she states that “she was shocked and frustrated to learn that the FBI still had not alerted any of the government agencies using Ptech software that there were questions about the company’s ties to suspected terrorist fund-raisers.” In another interview she did on April 27, 2005 titled, “The Story of Indira Singh” published by Our World in Balance, she states: “I took it all the way up to the FBI. I took it everywhere. The reality of the situation is proven by the response I got there; more telling than the actual deed itself. Their response to that is really what indicts them all.” Questioner: “What was that response?” Singh: “‘Shut up and go away, or you will be killed,’ basically. I got that response from JP Morgan. I got that response from Ptech. I got that warning from people within the FBI. Mostly the FBI…” On September 9, 2004, Singh stated that “Ptech was with Mitre [Corporation] in the basement of the FAA for two years prior to 911. Their specific job is to look at interoperability issues the FAA had with NORAD and the Air Force in the case of an emergency. If anyone was in a position to know that the FAA, that there was a window of opportunity or to insert software or to change anything, it would have been Ptech along with Mitre.” In the 2005 interview Singh also revealed that Ptech software “is utilized at the highest levels of almost every government and military and defense organization in this country, including the Secret Service, the FBI, the Department of Defense, the House of Representative, the Treasury Department, the IRS, the US Navy, the US Air Force, and, last but not least, the Federal Aviation Administration.” She adds: “Now, if anyone was in a position to know where the holes were, Ptech was…If anyone was in a position to write software to take advantage of those holes, it would have been Ptech…you need some kind of blueprint to keep this altogether and that’s what Ptech was so good at….Yes, it was the perfect day, and yes, you needed inside
knowledge, and yes, Ptech with all its myriad associations would have had the inside knowledge, and yes, Ptech was a CIA front, and yes, Ptech was protected.” After the chief auditor of JP Morgan told her, ‘Look, look, this is about 911…I put it in a folder named 911,’ Singh said, “he needed to be sure that I would never mention Ptech again.” She was also quite blunt about the connection she saw between the financial crisis and 911: “All of this stuff took money to fund. And it was funded through major financial crimes, money laundering, and looting, looting of the SNL’s, looting of the banking system, what we’re in the middle of now which is the looting of Social Security. And this is all being done, the looting of HUD, it’s all being done systematically to keep the slush funds up for the game at play…And it isn’t just going to be America, it is going to be global.”

Singh did a series of interviews with Jamey Hecht, editor of *From the Wilderness* (FTW). In one article written by FTW’s Michael Kane concerning Ptech, Dick Cheney is implicated. He writes: “Ptech was working with Mitre Corp. in the FAA….This was the perfect marriage to ensure that the capacity to covertly intervene in FAA operations on 911 existed – in the middle of simulated war games. It is also the perfect marriage to ensure that the command and control of these capabilities was readily available to Dick Cheney via Secret Service Ptech software in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center, the bunker to which Cheney was ‘rushed’ by the Secret Service.” Hecht himself added: “The human side of Ptech is where the thievery and murder come in: among the financiers and programmers of Ptech are apparent members of an international network of organized criminals involved in decades of narcotraffic, gunrunning, money laundering, and terrorism. Their personal and professional connections reach up into the highest levels of the American government, and their activities are still underway.” For the record, Cheney’s hands are all over the implementation and cover-up of 911. From his PNAC membership, to his “stand down” order and unprecedented takeover of NORAD,214 to his warning to 911 investigators

214 Norman Pinetta, the Transportation Secretary, witnessed Cheney maintaining “stand down” orders on the plane coming toward the Pentagon. See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QlM8Sui6-X0; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Iw_XDxnciGs&feature=related;
“not to probe too deeply,” he is high up on the list of suspected criminals.215

After raiding Ptech in late 2002, the US government concluded that it was “no threat to national security,” but the Jewish-owned news media in the US, notably CBS, did an independent investigation and concluded that Ptech was a Saudi-based organization run by Oussama Ziade, a Lebanese immigrant, and financed by Yasin Al Qadi from Saudi Arabia whom “President Bush named as a financial backer of Osama bin Laden.”216 This appeared all too convenient for Bollyn’s liking. Having already discovered numerous times that Israelis consistently set up their own clandestine activities in the US by posing as Arab or Muslim businesses, Bollyn’s investigation went beyond the investigation of Ptech provided by Singh, Hecht, and CBS, and he found the same trail he had seen over and over again – one leading directly to Israel. It was so obvious that he wondered how Singh could have missed it. Bollyn notes that the records indeed show Ptech was started by Oussama Ziade in 1994, but found it hard to believe that half the US government and military ran on the software produced by this obscure Lebanese immigrant. So, with a little snooping, he discovered

---

215 “In March 2010, through a FOIA request, the ACLU obtained 42 pages of illuminating documents exposing further the Bush administration’s duplicity regarding the facts of the 9-11 attacks, Guantanamo detainees and other matters. Buried on page 26 of these is a letter revealing that senior Bush administration officials sternly cautioned the 9-11 Commission against probing too deeply into the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001. The notification came in a letter dated Jan. 16, 2004 that was addressed by Attorney General John Ashcroft, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld and CIA Director George J. Tenet. The key document indicates once more the behind-the-scenes charade that went on—and continues to go on—with those high-ranking officials attempting to cover-up the facts and truth of the 9-11 attacks. The ACLU described it as a fax sent by David Addington, then-counsel to former Vice President Dick Cheney. See http://americanfreepress.net/html/whitewash_9-11_218.html

216 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hmXkFMIEGWg. The CBS news reporter states: “Ptech’s CEO is Oussama Ziade. This is him three years ago in Saudi Arabia. He is pictured with a man named Yasin Al Qadi, a Saudi named by President Bush of a financial backer of Osama bin Laden…who believe in an finance radical Islamic extremist groups worldwide.” The reported noted to Singh about Ptech’s power, stating, “And that gives you tremendous opportunity, if you are so inclined, to examine, manipulate, download all of the most sensitive information of whoever it is you’ve contracted with,” with Singh replying, “Absolutely, absolutely.”
that Ptech’s development was handled by a Zionist named Michael S. Goff since 1994, who was also working for a “Mossad-funded database security company” named Guardium that was financed by “three Israeli venture capital firms,” whose “key personnel were manned by high-level agents of Israeli military intelligence.” Bollyn found that “Goff’s father and grandfather were highest-level Masons in the Worcester lodge of B’nai B’rith.” One of the directors at Guardium is Gill Zaphrir, an Israeli colonel who ‘headed the research and development department of the Israel Air Force.’ Another director is Amit Yoran, who became the manager of computer network security for the Pentagon and the Secretary of Defense, and then for cyber security for the US Dept. of Homeland Security. Dr. Yoran specializes in “Intrusion Detection Technologies.” In an article titled “Welcome to the Art of Electronic Warfare” Yoran boasted of hacking into the computer networks of dozens of energy companies.\textsuperscript{217} He also helped design the Pentagon’s computer security architecture.\textsuperscript{218} Yoran went on to found Riptech with Elad Yoran and Tim Belcher whose specialty is “security management and monitoring of corporate computer networks,”\textsuperscript{219} with Elad noting, “The threat changes every day. There has always and always will be a criminal element out there,” with Bollyn commenting, “He should know since he was Riptech’s chief marketing officer…at the time of 911.” Elad Yoran is also the CEO of Security Growth Partners (SGP), whose website says that it does “information technology (IT) security, Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP), homeland security and their related markets.” Security Growth Partners also employs Ilan Juran who is the director of the US-Israel Civil Infrastructure Security Program which “fosters collaboration…between the US and Israel governments and critical infrastructure organizations.” Belcher deals with very critical infrastructure components, “including the Federal Aviation Administration’s Air Traffic Control Network, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Reconnaissance Office, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and Space and Naval Warfare Command.”

\textsuperscript{217} As reported by the \textit{Los Angeles Times}, August 20, 2001.
\textsuperscript{218} As reported by the \textit{Washington Times}, Dec. 11, 2000.
\textsuperscript{219} Ibid.
The most interesting connection is between Elad Yoran and Jeremy Kroll who is on Yoran’s advisory board. Jeremy Kroll is on the board of the Israel-based Challenge Fund, which raises money through the Bronfman (Seagrams) and Andreas (Archer, Daniels, Midland farming) families to fund Mossad companies. Also on the Challenge Fund board is David Ivry, a former commander in the Israeli Air Force and director general of the Israeli Ministry of Defense. Bollyn notes that “Ivry was either personally involved in the criminal attack on the USS Liberty…or commanded those who were.” Jeremy Kroll is the son of Jules Kroll of Kroll Associates, the latter responsible for “revamping security at the World Trade Center after the 1993 terrorist bombing,” as reported by Douglas Frantz of the New York Times in 1994. Bollyn notes that “this is a crucial point because those who controlled security at the WTC are prime suspects in the demolition of the Twin Towers,” especially since “Kroll evidently continued to manage security for the WTC complex from 1993 until 911.” A very informative Wikileaks video shows the connection between Kroll and other cohorts who had intimate connections with the Twin Towers (but were absent on 911), such as the insurance company Marsh & McClellen, Craig Stapleton (married to Bush’s cousin), Paul Bremer (the first to blame bin Laden, on WRC4, on the very day of 911 and who became the Iraq occupation governor), and the Japanese company Komatsu (who patented a thermite demolition device in 1996), and Morrison/Knudsen (who did demolition contracts for the US Army), and various others.

Bollyn adds that “Getting the security contract at the WTC was something the Mossad had actively sought since at least 1987 when they received the security contract, under the name of Atwell Security based in Tel Aviv, Israel, from the Port Authority of New York. Lo and behold, Atwell Security is a subsidiary of the Eisenberg Group under Shaul Eisenberg of the Mossad. Another Mossad connection was Peter Zvi Malkin who was the New York representative for Atwell. Malkin joined Haganah at age twelve and gained fame as the agent who nabbed Adolf Eichmann in 1960.

---

220 In a September 1, 1994 article the NYT reports that Kroll was given $2.5 million to overhaul security at the World Trade Center and evaluate procedures at the agency’s bridges, tunnels and airports.
221 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PG3uaQxc8uQ&feature=related
He was an explosives specialist and known as “a master of disguises,” his favorite being to pose as an artist.\textsuperscript{222} Working with Malkin was Rafael ‘Dirty Rafi’ Eitan, the senior Mossad agent who, working out of the Israeli embassy in Washington, ran Jonathan Pollard’s espionage operation in the 1980s that stole top secret nuclear information. Bollyn adds that Eitan once stated to an Israeli newspaper in 1997 that the “United States is the enemy,” and “I failed in the Pollard affair…but there is nothing you can do about it.”\textsuperscript{223} So much for Pollard being merely a “rogue element,” which was Israel’s original claim when Pollard got caught. The \textit{Washington Post} also revealed in 1986 that Eitan, posing as a chemist, secretly diverted several hundred kilograms of weapons-grade uranium to Israel in 1968. The revelations of Eitan are a perfect example of what Israel has been doing to the United States for many decades, and 911 is the climax.

The executive director of the Port Authority that had given the contract to Atwell was Stephen Berger, a Zionist on the board of New York’s Citizens Budget Commission with Larry Silverstein. Also involved was Philip Kaltenbacher, another Zionist. His father, Joseph Kaltenbacher, was on the board of the American Jewish Congress. Also involved was Stanley Brezenoff, another Zionist, who was known as “the acting mayor in Koch’s absence.” Despite these apparent maneuverings, the Port Authority became suspicious. They cancelled Atwell’s contract when it was discovered that it was run by Avraham Shalom Ben-Dor, the former head of Shin Bet who had a notorious reputation, including espionage and murder and working with ‘Dirty Rafi,’ as reported by the \textit{Washington Post}. A declassified FBI document names Ben-Dor (aka: Bendor) with Malkin and Eitan, with Bollyn noting that they “had been working together on secret Mossad missions for decades when they obtained the security contract for the Twin Towers.”\textsuperscript{224}

---

\textsuperscript{222} As reported by the \textit{New York Sun}, March 3, 2005 obituary. Bollyn notes that “Malkin’s artist disguise may very well be the inspiration for the ‘art student’ operation to infiltrate DEA offices. It is interesting to note that Michael Chertoff’s mother, Livia Eisen, one of the first Mossad agents, owned an art gallery in Elizabeth, New Jersey, when Malkin was posing as a painter in nearby New York.

\textsuperscript{223} As reported in \textit{Yediot Aharonot}, June 1997.

\textsuperscript{224} As reported by the \textit{Washington Post}, April 12, 1987.
As Bollyn concludes, “The Atwell company appears to have been created only for the purpose of obtaining the security contract for the Port Authority and the World Trade Center….Had the contract with Atwell Security not been terminated in 1987 it is very likely that the false-flag terror attacks would have been carried out years earlier. The cancellation of the Atwell contract forced the Mossad to find other ways to get control of the security at the World Trade Center.” This would lead them to Zionist helpers Jules Kroll and Maurice Greenberg, the latter being the CEO of AIG, which was recently bailed out with 180 billion dollars after playing roulette with credit default swaps and collateralized debt obligations. Greenberg is very close to Henry Kissenger, another Zionist, which made deals with China, from which Greenberg became close to Shaul Eisenberg, the leader of the Asian sector of the Mossad. Bollyn concludes: “It was through this complex network of connections with Kroll and Greenberg that Mossad finally gained control of security at the World Trade Center and was able to carry out 911, as Isser Harel had predicted in 1979.”

Other Israeli companies linked to Guardium are Amdocs, ViryaNet, Nice Systems and CreoScitex, which are run by senior officers of Israeli military intelligence. Amdocs was mentioned in the four-part FOX series as having the ability to wiretap any US phone. Along with Nice Systems, who was run by Israeli Brigadeir General Shlomo Shamir beginning April 2001, Amdocs was also involved in the espionage network of computer programmers and demolition experts from the Israeli military who posed as art students and tried to infiltrate the offices of the DEA in 2000. Some of the “art students” have been linked to high-ranking officials in the Israeli military. For example, one was Lt. Peer Segalovitz, a platoon leader with Israeli special forces who was an expert in demolition, boasting that he could “blow up buildings, bridges, cars, and anything else that he needed to.” It is Bollyn’s belief that Michael Goff’s relationship with the Israelis at Guardium was the channel through which Israeli spy software was provided to Ptech, and consequently, the connection between the Israeli military programmers and the crucial computer networks of the US military.
At this point Bollyn was quickly connecting all the dots. It seemed more than likely that Ptech was responsible for the non-reaction of both NEADS and NORAD on 911. After all, these US computers were upgraded with Ptech software just prior to 911. The upgrade was handled by a Monte Belger, deputy administrator for the FAA. Belger then became the Vice President of a small Israeli-run company called US Aviation Technology, which was founded by a fellow Jew named Ehud ‘Udi’ Mendelson who also served in the Israeli Defense Force. Mendelson’s company “promoted a remote-control system that allows a ‘ground pilot’ to monitor and adjust the computer flight systems on aircraft.” In effect, this “gives the ground pilot all of the data and the visuals that the pilot in the aircraft has.” The company logo is “We put the ground pilot in the cockpit.” As such Bollyn can’t help but conclude, “The possibility to remotely hijack a plane with this system is obvious.” As Bollyn had interviewed Goff, he also interviewed Belger, but Belger lied about even knowing Ehud Mendelson, much less working for him.

Bollyn then discovered that a Peter Goelz was a vice-president of Ehud’s US Aviation Technology. Goelz was formerly the managing director of the NTSB and supervised the investigations of TWA Flight 800 and a few other suspicious crashes. When Bollyn interviewed him, Goelz admitted that he knew Mendelson but was hesitant to give further information. Prior to the interviews with Belger and Goelz, Bollyn checked US Aviation Technology’s website and found it extolling the remote-control system. But after the interviews “the incriminating webpages were taken down” along with “the removal of the US Aviation Technology documents.”

Bollyn also discovered that Ehud Olmert, then mayor of Jerusalem and later prime minister of Israel, made a secret visit to New York City on the eve of 911, as disclosed three years later by the Jerusalem Post in an obscure sports article on July 23, 2004. As Bollyn notes, “Olmert was raised in the Betar militia in a founding family of the Irgun (the Zionist terror group of the 1930s and 40s which later became the Likud party).” Obviously, Olmert’s visit had been kept out of all US news media, which means that Rudy Giuliani was also involved in the silence. Incidentally, Giuliani was not so silent when he was caught saying in an interview with Peter Jennings on 911 that he was told the South Tower was going to
The obvious question is, how would he or anyone know such an unpredictable event? Be that as it may, Olmert was met by two Israelis on that day, Shaul and Meir Levy. The Levy’s own a chain of stores, L&L Wings, on the east and west coasts, particularly in Florida, that ostensibly sells beach paraphernalia, but according to residents Bollyn interviewed, the stores were always empty of buyers and few people besides young men were seen coming and going. In other words, it’s a high probability that these stores are Mossad fronts just as Urban Moving Systems was. Many other businesses, such as Next Graphics and The Big Apple Corp. have the same MO – they pose as Arab or Muslim business but are run by Israelis. Regarding the former, one of the residents told Bollyn that he walked into the back of one of the store fronts and happened to walk into a room in which he “saw 10-12 Israelis sitting around this very large conference table. I engaged some of them in conversation, because some spoke Russian, the language I speak fluently…but I soon discovered that they knew nothing about graphics.” Inside the store front area there was “an Islamic prayer on the wall...a small table with a gold trimmed Holy Quran on it,” but, he added, “I am a Muslim…but we are not that showy, and very few Muslims have things hanging on their walls...so this also made me suspicious...It was an obvious attempt at flaunting their nonexistent Islamism.” Shortly after 911, Next Graphics went out of business. The Big Apple Corp., which purported to sell garments and art, was run by a Dror Levy whose bio reveals as a graduate of the Amal Institute of Engineering in Israel and who served four years in the Israeli military as a computer systems analyst. He is also a business partner with Shaul and Meir Levy.

Bollyn is also quite candid about his belief that the Israeli orchestration of 911 is not in a vacuum. Toward the middle of the book he writes of Thomas Paine’s warning in 1802 of a revolution by “a faction, acting in disguise, rising in America; they had lost sight of first principles. They were beginning to contemplate government as a profitable monopoly, and the people as hereditary property.” Bollyn then adds, “The rising faction I noticed taking control in the 1980s was primarily Jewish by ethnicity, and Zionist by ideology.” Having spent some time in Europe and the Middle East, he “returned to the United States in the late 1970s and found the discourse in the media about Zionism to be extremely one-sided and

225 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6vCg8Fp8aw8 at the 1:50 mark.
distorted. Zionism, a nationalist ideology based on race, was misrepresented in the US media as being a progressive and democratic movement while the state of Israel was depicted as being a kosher slice of America...Honest and unbiased coverage of Israel and the Middle East became increasingly difficult to find in the US in the 1980s and 1990s. The sale of Ted Turner’s progressive Cable News Network (CNN) to Gerald M. Levin of AOL Time Warner, and the transformation of the previously informative Christian Science Monitor marked the end of the two independent unbiased news outlets. An ethnic minority with a foreign agenda – Zionism – was gaining a monopoly control over the US media while the United States was being drawn more deeply into the Arab-Israeli conflict as the primary supporter, financier, and political ally of Israel.” He adds that “Through the media, a distinctly foreign and anti-Christian culture of pornography, perversion, and violence was being promoted. A diet of perverse entertainment and un-American values was being pushed onto the unsuspecting American population through the mass media. Concurrent with the rise of the Zionist faction in the US media there was a significant increase of Zionist influence in the government. This could be seen in the way the US government and federal courts unfairly prosecuted innocent people...while more recent crimes committed by Jews in the United States and the international arena went completely unpunished.”

Bollyn is also aware of the fact that the Zionist influence obtains its power from being a unique combination of religion, politics and money. He understands the basic foundation, which is that Zionism is “a religious fraud that equates the modern Zionist state with Israel of the Bible.” This can be seen quite easily by reflecting on the original aims of those who established the state of Israel in 1948, among them David ben Gurion who believed that Israel was destined by divine mandate to “restore the Kingdom of David and Solomon to its biblical borders.” Bollyn notes that in “May of 1993, Ariel Sharon formally proposed in the Likud Convention that Israel should adopt the ‘biblical borders’ concept as its official policy,” concluding that “This misrepresentation elevates modern-day Israelis...to being the rightful heirs of the Promised Land...it is believed by millions of naïve and misled Christian Zionists.”
Politically, Bollyn notes “the second fundamental deception is that Israel is a ‘sister democracy’ of the United States and that Israelis and Americans share the same democratic values,” which he believes is a “lie…quickly exposed by reading Palestinian history or visiting Israeli-occupied Palestine,” concluding that only those who believe in “Jewish supremacism, the central pillar of Zionism” share Israeli values. The New York Times is one such institution. It is run by the Ochs-Sulzburger family who began the B’nai B’rith organization that now runs the ADL.226 As one glaring example, Bollyn cites that fact that the New York Times refused to publish a recent article written by the “highly-regarded Israeli historian Avi Shlaim” titled “Is Zionism today the real enemy of the Jews?” Shlaim’s article was published in the newspapers of 180 nations (almost the entire world) but not in the United States, forcing Bollyn to conclude: “When one understands that the primary function of the Zionist-controlled media is to keep Americans in the dark about the Middle East and Zionism, it becomes clear why Shlaim’s article was not published in the New York Times.”227

When one contemplates the enormity of the event that occurred on September 11, 2001, and most of all who might be responsible for it, Bollyn extracts from Ian Fleming’s 1961 book, Thunderball: “A plot of this magnitude and audacity could only have been conceived under faultless cover and down to the smallest detail.” Some of those details involve these questions: Who had the power to pull it off without a hitch? Who had the most pressing motive? Who had the money to pay for it all? Who had control of the military and NORAD to force it to stand down while four passenger planes went to their designated targets? Who knew the intricacies of US commercial flights to get around the FAA air traffic control? Who had the power, if needed, to operate planes by remote control? Who had control of the courts to make sure that no wrongful death claims went to trial? Who had control of disposal so that all the steel girders of the Twin Towers were shipped to China before they could be chemically analyzed? Who had the power to corral the NYPD and NYFD?

227 The New York Times and the Washington Post, both Jewish-owned, have recently called for the unprovoked bombing of Iran in Op-Ed pieces. See https://consortiumnews.com/2015/03/28/nyt-publishes-call-to-bomb-iran/
Who had the power to allow dozens of suspects to escape to foreign countries? Who had the technology to bring down steel-girded buildings built to withstand forces much greater than aberrant planes and nominal fires? Who had the advanced computer knowledge to coordinate the attacks? Who had state of the art knowledge about explosives and detonators? Who had control of the press and media to curtail investigations? Who is most familiar with and has political control over the city at which the attacks took place? Who has a history of unprovoked attacks or even false-flag operations? Who has a network of spies operating in the US that could facilitate the attacks? Who has personnel in almost every sector of the federal government to create a massive cover up? Lastly, as any detective would ask, who benefits from the attacks?

But, of course, Keating, Forrest and Palm just whistle in the dark and fight this information by smearing as “anti-semites” and “conspiracy theorists” those who dare tell this side of the story. In fact, most of the energy and motivation to fight geocentrism comes from the animosity that Keating, Forrest and Palm have against me for my refusal to bow to their idolization of the Jews. It is no coincidence that in his book, The New Geocentrists, and invariably on his blog, Keating has made an intimate connection between calling me an anti-semite and an anti-Copernican, concluding that someone who engages in “Jewish conspiracy theories” (which Keating assumes you will accept as false charges against the Jews) cannot be trusted to give you scientific or historical information about cosmology and cosmogony.

One of their favorite Jews is Albert Einstein. Hence, when I exposed the sordid personal life of Einstein several years ago in Volume 2 of Galileo Was Wrong, this was met with a malicious attack on my personal and academic life. They have even admitted on their blogs that since I attacked Einstein, they were going to attack me. Never mind that Einstein is dead and his executors, as of 1987, have released most of the information on his private life to the whole world. Keating, Forrest and Palm resolved to ruin my reputation as best they could and make my life a living hell just because I dared to be the messenger boy of such salacious information. You can imagine how much more incensed they became against me when
I proposed that the very person who schemed to keep the Earth moving in 1905 when all the empirical evidence showed that it wasn’t moving, was, in fact, Albert Einstein. And they resent it further when I then show that Einstein’s 1915 theory contradicted the 1905 theory and allowed the Earth to, once again, be motionless and the center of the universe. All of this makes them mad as dogs against me.

At one point in his book, *The New Geocentrists*, Mr. Keating remarks that Mr. Forrest is waiting to “flick the switch” and put his “SungenisandtheJews” website back in operation. It was taken down about two years ago when I told Mr. Forrest I was no longer dealing with Jewish issues. Mr. Palm also took down his “SungenisandtheJews” website. Essentially, there was a truce among us. But then Mr. Keating began to incite the controversy again. One later instance occurred when he stated on his blog in early 2014 that he was going to enlist the services of B’nai B’rith to help stop *The Principle*; and David Palm suddenly reposted his “SungenisandtheJews” website, neither of them notifying me of their sudden change of heart. So they broke the truce, yet I wasn’t dealing with any Jewish issues, and, in fact, I was issuing press releases to confirm that resolve. My efforts didn’t faze Keating at all. He continued accusing me of anti-semitism on his blog and inciting all his patrons against me. So the threat in Mr. Keating’s book that Mr. Forrest will “flick the switch” is empty since Mr. Keating has already flicked his own switch. So what am I to conclude? I have concluded that they are on a crusade to destroy me come hell or high water, and Mr. Forrest is waiting in the wings to do the same. So I have no choice but to defend myself, which is the reason why I have dealt with these issues in this book. If they are going to attack my credibility based on what I have declared about the Jews, then I have no choice but to protect my credibility by divulging the facts and my sources.

112) Parting Words from a Dying Breed

**Keating:** page 351: “This means *The Principle* is based on a misapprehension. It goes wrong from its very premise, and it goes wrong when it tries to read into uncertainties in cosmological theory a necessity to return to geocentrism. To whatever extent the film succeeds, its success will be a function not of the scientific acumen of its producers but of the capacity
of its audience to be swayed by assertions that seem true but are in fact false.”

R. Sungenis: That Keating has witnessed mainstream scientists confirming the CMB alignments with the Earth’s equator and the ecliptic; that he sees from Einstein’s own theory that modern science can’t tell the difference or even decide between geocentrism and heliocentrism; that galaxies and quasars are not only in concentric spheres around us but create additional geo-oriented axes; that he sees all the previous “proofs” of heliocentrism (stellar parallax, stellar aberration, etc.) now have a simple disproof from geocentrism; that he sees how the tradition of the Church upheld geocentrism and that no official Church document has ever rescinded the Church’s teaching; can be so cock-sure of his position is rather amazing to watch. He will not give an inch. In fact, whereas scientists in the mainstream, who have written books on this subject, admit they have no scientific proof that the Earth moves, Karl Keating stamps his feet and claims he alone has a foolproof proof, which he thought up all by himself. In fact, he is so sure of his proof that he decided to write a book and center his thesis around it. (Of course, it was neutralized within a few days of its debut by those who applied Einsteinian and Newtonian physics, and Mr. Keating afterward declined to debate the evidence).

Unfortunately, the stubborn attitude of Karl Keating represents the majority of the Catholic mentality today. They have made their bed with modern atheistic science (NB: the intimate friendship between Keating and MacAndrew) and no traditional Catholics are invited to the nuptial. This attitude is not so hard to understand when we realize that most of modern Catholicism itself is almost as godless as their scientific counterparts. To be sure, modern Catholics come in many varieties, from the ultra liberal to the ultra conservative. But the one who wrote the book, The New Geocentrists, and happened to run a Catholic apologetics organization for several decades and create a following of like-minded patrons, is much closer to the liberal end of the spectrum. He is the type of person who makes it a practice to whistle in the dark at most of the things wrong with the Roman Catholic Church. It is a religion in which Muslims and Arabs become the enemy of choice; in which Jews who reject Christ are nevertheless favored and idolized and told they have their own covenant
with God, while Fundamentalists who accept Christ are ostracized and debated (not to mention bringing in a lot of money for “apologetics”). It is a religion in which mainstream atheistic science has the last word on all things material; in which popes are blessed or sainted despite their horrible record and heretical doctrines; while other popes, who have even a hint of failing to cater to the Jews are shunned; in which Americanism is the other side of the coin to Catholicism, and where the mutual relationship is protected by stigmatizing anyone as a “conspiracy theorist” who points out corruption in either sector; in which making a lot of money is a sign of success and a doorway to the inner sanctum of polite society; in which banking scandals and money laundering is commonplace and whose watchdogs in both institutions turn the other way; in which homosexuality, contraception, abortion, divorce are given slaps on the wrist; in which priests often speak with a lisp from the pulpit yet are surprised when vocations are practically nil; in which estimates of 30% to 50% of clerics are gay, including the Vatican itself; in which women rule by proxy and priests have become mere functionaries, and some even useful idiots; in which men act like women, and women act like men, and the average 2.3 children of each family spends most their time behind iphones; in which the Mass is served by clowns, gays and women and girls, while the congregations sing Kumbaya; in which sin is hardly ever heard from the pulpit; in which former heretics are now restored to the Church’s graces and their books honored in Catholic universities; in which the quickest way to have your child lose his faith is to send him to a Catholic university; in which Catholic seminaries hardly believe the Bible is inspired, much less inerrant, and go by names such as The Pink Palace and the Lavender Mafia; in which transsexuals are invited to the Vatican and their feet are kissed while mom’s of eight are compared to over-productive rabbits; in which hell no longer exists and we can’t judge homosexuals as sinners; in which everyone gets along and accepts each other’s beliefs no matter how aberrant they are; in which pagans and heretics are asked to pray to their false gods for world peace; in which adulterers may once again receive communion. The list goes on and on.

These Catholics love the lifestyle they have attained in modern society, and the thought of returning to the past, even a tiny bit, scares them to death. They are much too comfortable where they are and the trappings of
old Catholicism are not only embarrassing but they simply get in the way of the new society they have cultivated. To them, a restoring of creationism and geocentrism to the doctrines of Catholicism is acutely symbolic of such a return, and thus they fight it with vigor unparalleled in recent times. The same is true of secular society. Its knee jerk reaction to creationism and geocentrism is caused by the same fear of having to give up its modern customs and comforts for a more austere world in which God is directly overhead of a fixed and central Earth. That kind of deity is much too close for comfort. He’s the same deity that ran the Old Testament and was constantly chastising the people for their aberrant ways. That kind of deity certainly limits one’s lifestyle options, and creationism and geocentrism smacks of that kind of deity.

Let me close with a Letter to the Editor of *The Remnant* that I wrote in reference to Karl Keating:

Mr. Geo Responds:

First, I want to thank Mr. Ferrara for his brilliant defense of “Mr. Geo.” His comparison of Karl Keating’s tabloid tactics to the inimical Saul Alinsky was priceless. I also thank him for exposing Mr. Keating’s turpitude with vivid courtroom drama. It was refreshing to see how our culture has developed a protocol for how human beings are supposed to gather evidence and judge one another, that is, fairly and without prejudice. Mr. Ferrara, an experienced attorney, showed quite easily that Mr. Keating, once an attorney himself, not only failed legal etiquette but, more sadly, utterly failed as a Christian.

Allow me to add a few things to round out Mr. Ferrara’s perspective.

In the 1980s, Mr. Keating started his “apologetics” organization by focusing on the easiest and most convenient enemy – the Protestant Fundamentalists. When I reverted to the Catholic faith in the 1990s, I was also caught up in that narrow-minded “get the Fundamentalists” fervor. In fact, Mr. Keating had me on his radio program and endorsed one of my books, *Not By Faith Alone*, from which I also did an 18-part series on EWTN in 1998.
Then the bottom fell out, but not by my choosing. In the same year *Not By Faith Alone* was published, the Catholic Church signed an agreement with Lutherans stating that “man was justified by faith alone,” thereby ignoring the Council of Trent and 2000 years of tradition. In 2002, John Paul II, after failing to consecrate Russia in 1984 for world peace, organized yet another Assisi interreligious prayer meeting asking pagans and heretics to pray for the very world peace that was promised by Our Lady of Fatima if he had done a proper consecration in 1984. Interestingly enough, John Paul II saw nothing but wars and rumors of wars in his whole 26-year pontificate – 52 in all. Then, in 2003, the avalanche of clerical pedophilia and homosexuality cases hit the press and became the worst scandal in the Church’s history. In all this, there was the typical ‘look the other way’ reaction from Karl Keating. Just business as usual – against the Protestant Fundamentalists, of course.

Around the same time, Jewish infiltration into the Church came to a head, although it had already introduced itself quite strongly at Vatican II. Soon popes were praying in synagogues and cardinals were teaching that the Jews no longer needed to be proselytized, since, as one Jewish convert scolded us, after “a mistaken belief...for much of the past two thousand years” we now realize that the Jews still have their old covenant with God. In fact, the 2006 United States Adult catechism endorsed the novelty with a heretical statement on page 131 – “the covenant that God made with the Jewish people through Moses remains eternally valid for them.” From Keating? The typical ‘look the other way’ reaction. It was business as usual, except, of course, to castigate those Catholics who might point out these grave problems.

Then the religion of Scientism accosted us. It told us that Genesis is a myth and that the Bible is full of mistakes. It led our pope to suggest that monkeys may, in fact, be our uncles; and to blame the Fathers and the traditional Church for condemning Galileo’s universe. Carl Sagan added that we were lost among the billions and billions of stars and are the product of a big explosion from another universe; and Stephen Hawking now adds that the universe can make itself and God is not needed. From Keating? This time a flood of words – but all in support of Darwin and
Galileo; and not a word against Sagan or Hawking; but a total rejection of Catholic patristics and tradition on biblical cosmology and cosmogony.

And who can leave out the dire state of culture and politics in the land of the ‘purple mountains majesty’? While “Catholic” institutions continue to push unbridled Capitalism and military expansion, the former has divided rich and poor more than ever before, and the latter seems to have a death-wish to bring us to World War III with lies about WMDs and “terrorists” around every corner. Mr. Keating has little criticism for this political establishment, but he wastes no time turning concerned citizens into “conspiracy nuts” for showing evidence that yet another lie may have been told to us – this one concerning the Twin Towers. Meanwhile, homosexual marriage is now legal in 75% of our country; abortion shows no signs of abating; drugs, divorce, disease and atheism run rampant, yet Mr. Keating singles out Mr. Geo as his piñata because, well, Mr. Geo dares to show scientific evidence that, maybe, just maybe, Pope Urban VIII was right in 1633 for condemning Galileo and holding on to his Catholic patrimony. What a crime.

Seeing all this hypocrisy, it didn’t take much more for me to begin to despise Mr. Keating’s brand of “apologetics” – spawned by his 1980 book “Catholicism and Fundamentalism.” While the Catholic Church, our country, and our culture were falling apart before his very eyes, we heard yet another sermon about Sola Scriptura from Keating’s microphone. Protestant fundamentalists were still the best enemy money could buy, amassing about 6 million dollars per year for Catholic Answers, with over $250,000 of it going directly to Keating, according to their current 990s. And any Catholics (the Remnant being a prime example) who dared to point Mr. Keating in the other direction by holding up a mirror to the Church’s diseased face, he couldn’t denounce fast enough. Exposing the underbelly of modern Catholicism, Judaism, Scientism and Neoconism is, according to Karl Keating, nothing but the work of a “conspiracy theorist.” Fundamentalists who, ironically, believe more of the Bible than Karl Keating, are the only enemy on his radar screen.

So ask yourself. Is an apologetics organization that refuses to even recognize, much less address, the problems in its own backyard worthy to present itself as the “Catholic answer” to Protestants? Sounds pretty
Pharisaical, if you ask me. If I were a Protestant and saw the huge glass house that Mr. Keating lives in, I would just laugh in his face. In short, Mr. Keating’s brand of apologetics helps no one. It’s nothing but a façade to mask the cancer raging in his own body.

On the one hand, Mr. Keating’s approach ignores the very heart of the problem (in the modern Church) and seeks for convenient scapegoats (Protestant fundamentalists). On the other hand, Mr. Keating is squeezed by Pope Francis who, for all intents and purposes, stuck a knife into the heart of Catholic Answers on January 25, 2015 when he said, “So many past controversies between Christians can be overcome when we put aside all polemical or apologetic approaches….Christian unity, we are convinced, will not be the fruit of subtle theoretical discussions in which each party tries to convince the other of the soundness of their opinion.”

The pope’s words are shocking, to be sure. But if Mr. Keating, who denounces every other Catholic who does not give unswerving obedience to the pope, really wants to practice what he preaches and follow Francis, then he should seek to close Catholic Answers tomorrow. There should be no more “polemics” and no more “apologetics” against Protestant fundamentalists, that is, if Karl Keating really wants to follow the pope as much as he wants the Remnant to.

So, how did we get to this terrible place? It is Mr. Geo’s contention that it started about two hundred years ago when Canon Settele was surreptitiously given an imprimatur for his book on heliocentrism by some devious clerics in the reign of Pius VII. It was the first sign that the Church was beginning to cave in to the modern mindset. This might come as a surprise to you, but according to Pope Benedict’s farewell address of February 2013, it was this very “mistake with Galileo” that became one of the main reasons for the initiation of Vatican II. He wrote:

“So we went to the Council not only with joy, but with enthusiasm. There was an incredible anticipation. We hoped that everything would be renewed, that a new Pentecost would truly come, a new era of the Church….And we knew that the relationship between the Church and the modern period was a bit in conflict, beginning with the error of the Church in the case of
Galileo Galilei; we thought we could correct this wrong beginning and find the union between the Church and the best forces in the world in order to open up the future of humanity, to open true progress. So we were full of hope, of enthusiasm, and of the will to do our part for this thing.” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, February 14, 2013, p. 4, para. #5)

And now you see why I am hot on the trail. God be with you.

Mr. Geo