

David Palm: Phantasmagoria Major

R. Sungenis: Below is my reply to Mr. Palm's latest slander.

Palm: Sungenis's pattern of deception through exaggeration was on display again during a radio interview he recently gave to Protestant pastor James Manning about geocentrism. Manning asked Sungenis to introduce himself to his listening audience and Sungenis set about trying to establish his scientific credibility by citing his scholastic credentials related to cosmology: "I was a physics major in college, so I'm pretty familiar with that end of things" ([here](#), starting at around 2:45.) This claim is not new. Sungenis has repeatedly insisted that he's credible in the field of cosmology because he was a "physics major"...Of course, people will logically conclude by such statements that Sungenis took a significant number of high-level physics courses in the process of successfully completing a degree in physics. It works.¹ Sungenis's claim to be a "physics major" gives a false impression of his actual academic achievements. No reputable scientist would advertise himself in such a way. Here is what has recently come to light according to George Washington University and Sungenis's own statements:

Palm: Sungenis only took the first two most basic prerequisite physics courses that didn't even involve calculus.

R. Sungenis: False. I stated that I took Pre-Calculus and Calculus

Palm: He didn't finish the four physics courses required to fulfill the prerequisites for a physics major.

R. Sungenis: I never said I did. I said I was a "declared" physics major and was on my way to fulfilling all the requirements for a pre-med curriculum. I then dropped pre-med, and thus the physics major, and became a religion major. Apparently, Mr. Palm has the same problem that Mr. Keating did, which is he doesn't want to accept that the statement "I was a physics major" does not necessarily mean I received a degree in physics, but that I was a physics major, period. Mr. Palm wants to make up his own rules and require that I cannot say I was a physics major unless I received a degree in physics. Wrong.

Palm: He inexplicably took two basic astronomy courses that would not contribute to the requirements for a physics major and were so basic as to be labeled "Primarily for nonscience majors".

R. Sungenis: "Primarily" does not mean the Astronomy courses could not be used as electives in the Physics major.

Palm: He took **none** of the undergraduate physics courses that are listed as "Required courses in the major". In short, Sungenis has materially exaggerated his academic accomplishments in the field of cosmology.

R. Sungenis: The only one exaggerating is Mr. Palm, since he wants to make it appear that I have little or no knowledge of physics or science in general. He wants to disallow me from saying I was a physics major when, in fact, the George Washington University did allow me to do so, since one declares his major long before he completes the curriculum to obtain the degree.

Palm: Sungenis’s Claims About His Academic Record at GWU: After recently being challenged, Sungenis produced some documentation that he thought would bolster his educational claims but which, when closely examined, seriously undercuts them. Specifically, he produced a report card for his first semester at George Washington University (GWU) in 1975, showing that he took two physics courses: Physics 1, “Foundations of Physics” and Physics 9, “Introduction to Astronomy 1”. He stated, I was a DECLARED Physics major at GWU, and I was given a list of courses I was to complete in my four years at GWU. “Foundations of Physics” (which is now apparently called “University Physics” was the first course I took. In the next semester I had Modern Physics and Calculus” ([link](#); NB: the original Facebook thread in which Sungenis posted his remarks was removed shortly after this article was posted. Screen shots of his comments are hosted on this site instead.) He said of “Foundations of Physics” that it was, “the first course of my major in Physics” and of “Introduction to Astronomy” that it was, “the second course I took for that major” ([link](#)). He also stated that, “GWU requires ‘two approved 100-level physics electives’” and that, “In this category the two electives I chose were Astronomy I and Astronomy II” ([link](#)). I immediately noticed some significant anomalies in Sungenis’s recent evidence. For example, “Foundations of Physics” could not be equivalent to GWU’s current “University Physics 1”, since the latter requires that calculus be taken either before or at the same time. Sungenis would not have been eligible to take “University Physics 1” in his first semester, since he had completed no calculus at that time (he stated that he took Calculus 1 his second semester at GWU).

R. Sungenis: Mr. Palm doesn’t know what he is talking about, since what is required in 2015 for “University Physics” is not what was required for “Foundations of Physics” in 1975. Foundations of Physics dealt with Newtonian mechanics, which, in that phase of the program, did not require Calculus.

Palm: Similarly, “Modern Physics” in the current GWU catalog requires a student to first complete **both** semesters of calculus-based University Physics, as well as **all three** semesters of calculus. This could not be the same course that Sungenis took.

R. Sungenis: Again, Mr. Palm is talking out of his hat. Modern Physics in 1975 did not require a completion of Calculus. One could take Modern Physics concurrently with Calculus, which is what I did.

Palm: The 1975 Academic Requirements at GWU vs. Sungenis’s Claims: Something wasn’t adding up. So I contacted George Washington University and obtained a scanned copy of the requirements for a physics major from the 1975 University Bulletin. Here’s what we find:

Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science with a major in Physics (Departmental).—
The following requirements must be fulfilled:
1. The general requirements as stated on pages 76–77, 83–89.
2. Prerequisite courses—Phys 1, 2, 31–32; Chem 11–12; Math 31, 32, 33.
3. Required course in related area—Stat 97 or EE 51.
4. Required courses in the major—Phys 151–52, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165–66, 167,
168.

This lays out clearly which courses are prerequisite for a physics major, that is, which courses had to be completed before the student could even begin to take courses that actually count in that major.

R. Sungenis: Notice how Mr. Palm makes up his own rules. The above “scan” does not say “these courses had to be completed *before* the student could even begin to take courses that actually count in that major.” All the courses COUNT toward the major. Some are prerequisite and some are not. But Mr. Palm wants everyone to think that unless I had all the upper level courses, I am not allowed to say I was a physics major. Wrong. I was a physics major that did not complete all the courses required to get the degree in physics. It happens to a lot of people who major in a certain field. Please notice that the title of the “scan” is “Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science with a major in Physics,” not, as Mr. Palm would have it, “All courses that must be taken in order to declare oneself a physics major.”

Palm: Thus, Sungenis’s claim that “Foundations of Physics” was “the first course of my major in Physics” is incorrect.

R. Sungenis: One mistake leads to another. Since Mr. Palm has it fixated in his head that a “prerequisite” does not “count” toward the Physics major, he has decided that he will eliminate Foundations of Physics as a fulfillment toward the major. Also relevant here is that Mr. Palm doesn’t have the slightest idea what course “Foundations of Physics” was at GWU in 1975, since they don’t have a course by that title any longer. So he is talking out of his ass on both issues.

Palm: Conspicuously absent even from the “Prerequisite courses” list are Physics 9 and 10, Astronomy I and II – courses that Sungenis claimed to have fulfilled a GWU requirement that physics majors take two approved “100-level physics electives”. Sungenis has two problems here. First, according to the University Bulletin in 1975 there were no electives listed that counted either towards prerequisites or required courses for a physics major; so his argument is an anachronism.

R. Sungenis: Notice how Palm mixes and matches. He takes Physics 9 and 10 from the 1975 curriculum and mixes it with the 2015 “100-level physics electives,” but has no idea what the rules were in 1975 regarding whether Physics 9 and 10 could be considered electives for the 1975 rules for physics majors. But in 1975, Physics 9 and 10 were both allowed toward a physics major. After all, they are called PHYSICS 9 and PHYSICS 10, so why wouldn’t they be allowed for a physics major? But Mr. Palm would rather guess against me, and conclude they were not allowed.

Palm: But even under current requirements Physics 9 and 10 would not count as electives because they are not 100-level courses.

R. Sungenis: But we aren’t dealing with what 2015 requires, only 1975, and in that area Mr. Palm is on a fishing expedition.

Palm: More importantly, according to the Bulletin, Physics 9 and 10 would not count toward even the *prerequisite* courses for a physics major, let alone within the major itself.

R. Sungenis: No, since the “scan” doesn’t say what the electives were for a physics major in 1975.

Palm: In fact, the course catalog explicitly states that these astronomy courses are, “Primarily for nonscience majors”:

FIRST GROUP

9-10 Introduction to Astronomy (3-3)

Hobbs

Lecture (2 hours), recitation (1 hour), laboratory (2 hours). Classical through modern astronomy with introduction to basic principles underlying astronomical systems and observations. Primarily for nonscience majors. Laboratory fee, \$11 a semester. (Academic year)

That deserves to be repeated: So *basic* were Sungenis's astronomy classes at GWU that the university found it necessary to explicitly state in their catalog that they were "**Primarily for nonscience majors.**"

R. Sungenis: Apparently, Mr. Palm thinks the word "Primarily" means "exclusively." Obviously, if the course was "primarily" for nonscience majors, it could also be "non-primarily" for science majors.

Palm: Based on the information that Sungenis himself has provided, combined with the documentation from GWU from 1975, here's what we now know: Sungenis only took the first two most basic prerequisite physics courses, basic enough that they didn't require calculus.

R. Sungenis: Since he doesn't know physics, Mr. Palm wouldn't know that a significant portion of physics does not require calculus, but does require basic math, algebra and trig. Calculus came in handy when there were more complex problems to solve. But, of course, the issue here is not whether I completed all the courses, but whether I had the right to call myself a physics major and whether I know the basic physics I claim to know. On both counts, I am right and Mr. Palm is wrong.

Palm: Thus, he didn't even finish the four physics courses required to fulfill the prerequisites for a physics major.

R. Sungenis: I never said I did. The fact remains, I had enough physics to know what basic physics was all about, and that is the physics I use today, in addition to my subsequent personal study in physics after I graduated from GWU. My learning in physics has never ceased. But, of course, Mr. Palm, since he is desperately trying to discredit me so that the public is dissuaded from geocentrism by default, wants to make it appear as if I know no physics. Yet Mr. Palm, to my knowledge, hasn't even taken a basic physics course his whole life, yet sets himself up as the judge of whether I know my physics. Sounds to me like the pot is calling the kettle black.

Palm: Although he claims that, "I was given a list of courses I was to complete in my four years at GWU", he inexplicably took two basic astronomy courses that, according to the 1975 GWU catalog itself, would not contribute to the requirements for a physics major and were so basic as to be labeled "Primarily for nonscience majors".

R. Sungenis: As noted above, Mr. Palm has no way of knowing this, since he doesn't have the complete course allowances that were given in 1975.

Palm: Factoring in his entry-level chemistry courses and one semester of calculus, Sungenis only completed about half of the **prerequisite** courses toward a physics major – the courses required by GWU to be completed *before* he could even begin to take courses within the actual physics major itself.

R. Sungenis: Again, Mr. Palm has the same misunderstanding. He wants everyone to think that the prerequisite don't count toward the physics major, but they do. At GWU, and with most colleges, one declares his major in physics, and THEN he seeks to fulfill the prerequisites and the requirements. This whole brouhaha began when Mr. Keating and Mr. Palm claimed I could not call myself a physics major at GWU unless I completed all the required courses. They are wrong.

Palm: Of these prerequisites, only two were actual courses in physics, the two most basic courses offered.

R. Sungenis: Notice that Mr. Palm tries to belittle my course work in physics at every turn. Since obviously it has come to light that I wasn't lying to the public when I said I knew physics and was a physics major at GWU, the only way Mr. Palm can try to win this battle is to ridicule my course work in physics and to claim that I cannot claim to have been a physics major unless I completed all the required courses. He is wrong on all counts, of course.

Palm: He took **none** of the undergraduate physics courses that are listed as "Required courses in the major".

R. Sungenis: Never said I did. I said I was a physics major at GWU (which is true) and I said I had some physics courses in fulfillment of the major (which I did). Anything else is just Mr. Palm trying to make unknowns into knowns, and make up his own rules.

Palm: Sungenis's whole claim to expertise in terms of his academic credentials in physics amounts to the two most basic undergraduate physics courses, along with two astronomy courses taught at a level appropriate for non-science majors. That's it. To insist that these basic courses render an individual academically qualified to take on the entire world of physics and astrophysics is dishonest, delusional, or both. This information provided by Sungenis himself and GWU definitively establishes that, contrary to his claims, he never received the education at GWU necessary to achieve any significant comprehension or mastery of the subjects central to the study of cosmology.

R. Sungenis: Ah, so now Mr. Palm finally admits why he went down this rabbit trail. He doesn't like the fact that I'm challenging the world with what appears to be only a basic knowledge of physics. So let's set the record straight.

First, many men before me with Ph.D.s in Physics have already blazed the trail of geocentrism long before I came along. I'm just picking up where they left off, but they gave me all I needed to know. Fortunately, I have a working knowledge of physics from my undergraduate major in physics and my subsequent studies in physics to the present day, in order to understand what these PhDs in physics are saying about geocentrism. If I didn't have the basic knowledge of physics, I would be lost and would have handed the torch to someone else. As it stands, I understand the issues, and have the ability to communicate them to those who don't have a background in physics. If there is something I do not understand, these same men are in regular communication with me to solve any problems that occur. These men include, Robert Bennett, my co-author for *Galileo Was Wrong*, who has a PhD in Physics with an emphasis on General Relativity; Gerhardus Bouw, who has a PhD in Astronomy and has written several books and hundreds of articles on geocentrism; Luka Popov, who has a PhD in physics, and who wrote an article on geocentrism that was published by the *European Journal of Physics* in 2013; Milenko Bernadic, who has a PhD in mathematics, and who has published a book in Spain on geocentrism, and who has made national news with his acceptance of geocentrism. So, there is no "dishonesty" or "delusion" on my part. If I were doing this alone, there

would certainly be a question of my capability, but that is not the case. The only delusion here is when Mr. Palm thinks that I can't understand the issues, and yet he has no knowledge of physics to make such judgments against me. Rather, he depends on an atheist, Alec MacAndrew, to do his bidding but who he cannot determine is telling the truth, since Mr. Palm has no knowledge of physics to judge what MacAndrew says. I, at least, can bounce my ideas and conclusions against the four physics PhDs noted above. Mr. Palm has no one but an avowed atheist who admits he has no love for biblical science.

Second, my greatest sources of authority are the very scientists that laid the foundations for classical and modern physics, Newton, Mach and Einstein. All three of them allow for a geocentric universe. So, much of my work is merely quoting what experts like them have to say. In regards to the CMB issue, all I need to do is quote from the experts who all agree that there is a special direction in the universe and that the Sun-Earth ecliptic and the Earth's equator are aligned with it. I don't need a PhD in physics to do so. If Mr. Palm thinks otherwise, then he is a phantasmagoria major.

MacAndrew: As others have stated, Robert's report card in no way supports his claim that he was a physics major.

R. Sungenis: Of course it doesn't, but it does show I have knowledge of physics to be able to understand the issues. But it doesn't matter anyway, since Palm and MacAndrew make up their own rules that state that I cannot claim to have been a physics major unless I completed all the course work for the degree, but that is not what GWU said.

MacAndrew: It's clear that in making that claim he is seeking some legitimacy for his arguments; he is making a claim that he understands classical and modern physics to validate his position and to avoid being brushed off as a scientific ignoramus.

R. Sungenis: Why would I expect someone to accept my arguments of physics if I had no experience or knowledge of physics? If I am talking about geocentrism and the physics behind it, then it behooves me to tell the person that I have a working knowledge of physics that allows me to understand the issues and explain them to people who don't know the physics. I don't know a better way to do that than tell the person I was a physics major in college before I became a religion major. I also tell them that I've studied physics long after my time at GWU and thus am current with what I need to know.

MacAndrew: Now, other than the report card (which I have never seen before this thread) and his own claims, there is no direct evidence to support the idea that he repeatedly tries to put in people's heads that he was a physics major in college. He might have taken a course or two in physics at college – I don't know.

R. Sungenis: So if MacAndrew doesn't know, why is he making such baseless claims? That's because he has the wrong notion of what a physics major is. A declared physics major is someone whose course work concentrates on the subject at hand to the exclusion of other subjects. That is what I did at AU and GWU for four semesters. But then I decided to drop that major and concentrate on another subject, Religion, and thus I majored in Religion, to the exclusion of all other subjects. As such, I can safely state to those I communicate with that, for a time I was a physics major in college, and then I replaced that major with a major in religion, which is what I've been saying for the last 25 years to the public. But since Palm and MacAndrew are desperately trying to find some

discrepancy in my story so that they can discredit me, they will take the slightest mole hill and try to make it into a mountain.

Palm: But there are some things that I do know. I know that he has made contradictory and incompatible statements about his education.

R. Sungenis: There is no contradiction in my education. There is only Palm's and MacAndrew's willful misconstruing of it.

Palm: I know that his current knowledge of physics and mathematics is insufficient to earn a pass in freshman physics, never mind to earn a Bachelor's degree in physics.

R. Sungenis: MacAndrew doesn't know my "current knowledge of physics and mathematics." All he knows is that I interpret the data differently than he does. That's because I'm a theist and he is an atheist.

MacAndrew: And I know that far from being brilliant, he is an obtuse and close-minded student of physics

R. Sungenis: Yes, in MacAndrew's world where only evolution, a non-designed universe, and Big Bangism is propped up as the answer to the data, I can see why he would feel I'm "obtuse and close-minded." But he is only projecting on me what he see in himself.

MacAndrew: – not only does he not know, but he is unable or unwilling to learn, repeating the same gaff over and over even after he has been patiently corrected.

R. Sungenis: Yes, I won't succumb to MacAndrew's atheistic foundation to interpret the cosmological data.

MacAndrew: People have talked in this thread about physics courses taken early in one's undergraduate career by physics majors. Of course, they have different titles in different institutions, but it is common for these first year courses to include classical or Newtonian mechanics, and something called Vibrations and Waves or Harmonic Motion or some such.

R. Sungenis: "Some such"? So, Mr. MacAndrew doesn't know what I took. So let me enlighten him. At GWU we took Newtonian physics first. Then we took Modern Physics, namely, Einstein and introductory Quantum Mechanics, which included "vibrations" and "waves."

MacAndrew: In addition, physics majors would take mathematics: differential and integral calculus, vector algebra, matrix algebra, set theory, series expansions of functions and so on. In every case, Sungenis shows absolutely no sign of understanding even the most basic concepts in classical mechanics, and shows every sign of misunderstanding. In mathematics, his knowledge is demonstrably poorer than a bright 8th grader.

R. Sungenis: You can always tell when someone wants to paint a bad picture even when he knows it isn't true. He will resort to superlatives such as "Sungenis shows absolutely no sign of understanding even the most basic concepts in classical mechanics," which MacAndrew knows is a croc of crap, but it sounds good to the itching ears he wants to get it to.

MacAndrew: Regarding his failure to understand elementary classical mechanics I have documented the following, in some cases more than once. He doesn't understand: 1) That the

centre of mass of body or a set of bodies does not generally coincide with a point where the gravitational field is zero

R. Sungenis: MacAndrew is famous for hedging his bets when it comes to physics. Since he can't commit himself, he says "does not generally coincide." Can the center of mass coincide with a zero gravitational field or not? MacAndrew won't commit himself since he knows that sometimes the center of mass can coincide with a zero gravitational field. So what we have is MacAndrew's equivocation on the issue, not that I am wrong about how to understand the center of mass, when I say, for example, that the Earth is the center of mass for the universe. Nevertheless, allow me to quote from some sources that state that the center of mass can be equivalent to a zero gravitational field.

1) Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Center_of_mass. Center of gravity is the point in a body around which the resultant torque due to gravity forces vanishes. Where a gravity field can be considered to be uniform, the mass-center and the center-of-gravity will be the same.

2) Is the value of gravity both infinite and zero at the center of gravity of a mass? When I studied Physics, we viewed that in the center ($x/0$) the value of gravity was infinite. But now I see that you say it's 0 (null), because all the force vectors cancel each other, in the exact center. Is near the center near infinite? (http://www.researchgate.net/post/Is_the_value_of_gravity_infinite_and_zero_both_in_the_center_of_gravity_of_a_mass)

3) So there's no force at all at the center of the Earth—as we would expect, the masses are attracting equally in all directions. (<http://galileo.phys.virginia.edu/classes/152.mf1i.spring02/GravField.htm>)

4) For a uniform symmetric body in all directions the center of mass and center of gravity are the same point. Comment: I would say this happens when the force of gravity is the same at all points on a body. That means there are no variations in the gravitational field. (http://www.answers.com/Q/When_center_of_mass_and_center_of_gravity_are_equal)

MacAndrew: 2) That the Sun's gravitational field at the Earth is, by a vast degree, the biggest contribution to the total gravitational field at the Earth, and it is not zero

R. Sungenis: Of course, if you live in a physics world (as MacAndrew does) where the only possibility is a confined system of a sun, Earth and planets, then the sun's gravitational pull on the Earth will make the Earth go around the sun. MacAndrew, even though he knows that modern physics steps outside that system, refuses to do so, since he knows that once he does, a sun going around a fixed Earth will be possible, since the sun's gravity will be counterbalanced by the gravity and inertial forces of the universe, and the Earth can be the undisturbed center of mass for the whole system. Again, it's not just me saying so. It comes from the experts in physics.

Here's Newton (via Steven Weinberg): "If we were to adopt a frame of reference like Tycho's in which the Earth is at rest, then the distant galaxies would seem to be executing circular turns once a year, and in general relativity this enormous motion would create forces akin to gravitation, which would act on the Sun and planets and give them the motions of the Tychonic theory. Newton seems to have had a hint of this. In an unpublished 'Proposition 43' that did not make it into the Principia, Newton acknowledges that Tycho's theory could be true if some other force besides ordinary gravitation acted on the Sun and planets." (Steven Weinberg, *To Explain the World: The Discovery of Modern Science*, HarperCollins, 2015, pp. 251-252).

Einstein (via Max Born): "...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" (Max Born, Einstein's Theory of Relativity, 1962, 1965, pp. 344-345.)

So, the problem is that MacAndrew doesn't want to accept this outcome because it goes against his Copernicanism and atheism. For all his learning in physics, it does him no good, because MacAndrew can't get past his own prejudices.

MacAndrew: 3) That his oft-repeated statement that the Earth can be the centre of mass for the Universe conflates a body with a point in space and is meaningless.

R. Sungenis: This is typical of MacAndrew's sophistry. He knows that I know that the center of mass is an abstract point, but he wants to make it look like the center of the Earth cannot occupy that abstract point so he opts to call it "conflating a body with a point in space." As such, MacAndrew is a pseudo-scientist trying to hide facts from the public.

MacAndrew: 4) That a system of free-falling bodies do not necessarily orbit their centre of mass, and that the rotation of an extended set of bodies around an axis with an angular velocity independent of distance from the axis (as he imagines the Universe to do) is not a viable Newtonian system.

R. Sungenis: First, notice that MacAndrew did not say that it "is not a viable Einsteinian system," since he knows it is. Hence, MacAndrew tries to make his argument based on the Newtonian system, but we already saw above that world-renowned physicist, Steven Weinberg, says Newton can support an Earth at rest around which the rest of the universe rotates. MacAndrew is the odd man out.

MacAndrew: 5) The difference between dynamics and kinematics in classical mechanics

R. Sungenis: I know the difference very well, but the problem for MacAndrew is that the geocentric system, both kinematically and dynamically, is a viable system Let's let world-renowned astronomer and physicist, Fred Hoyle, explain it to us:

"...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" (Fred Hoyle, Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on his Life and Work, p. 1).

MacAndrew: 6) The meaning of such foundational terms as: inertial frame of reference; orthogonal.

R. Sungenis: He wishes. The problem stems from the same problem above – MacAndrew refuses to accept that the Earth can occupy the center of mass for the universe, and as such he refuses to believe that it can be at rest and therefore serve as an inertial frame.

MacAndrew: I have documented his many failures in elementary mathematics (at a level in the subject that is way below that which would be needed as freshman physics major) on David Palm’s website. Amongst other things, he appears not to understand the need for expressions in physics to be dimensionally balanced, he clearly doesn’t know any vector algebra, and he is even confused about scientific notation of numbers. He constantly bungles simple arithmetic.

R. Sungenis: Hardly. The only thing MacAndrew “documented” was that I put the wrong units into my answer in one paper I wrote. From that MacAndrew makes his grandiose conclusion that I don’t know how to do math. Typical of a blowhard.

MacAndrew: So on the evidence of his current knowledge, Sungenis never was a physics major, or at least not long enough to learn any elementary university level physics and mathematics. [NB: Dr. MacAndrew is right. University physics requires calculus and Sungenis took no calculus-based physics courses.]

R. Sungenis: How would MacAndrew of Palm know how much physics I learned? They don’t. They just make it up as they go along. As for advanced physics or calculus, how do they know what I did after my time at GWU? They don’t. By the looks of it, it is MacAndrew who came out on the short end of the stick, since he has never learned how to apply the physics he claims to know. One can see his ineptness from the above 6 points he claims to know.

MacAndrew: As I said in my last article on David’s website: “There is no shame in not knowing about a subject, but there should be shame in not knowing and yet pretending that you do, especially when you use your counterfeit knowledge to bamboozle others.”

R. Sungenis: That’s funny. I was going to say the same thing about MacAndrew. ☺

Palm: A Meaningless Declaration: While Sungenis may have technically declared himself a “physics major” while at GWU, that’s a meaningless declaration in the context of trying to establish his academic qualifications in the field of cosmology. A [declaration](#) is basically just a formal statement a student makes to the university indicating that he has decided to attempt to complete the academic requirements for a particular major. According to Sungenis himself, he declared a major before even completing a single course at GWU – and that major was in *chemistry*. It was so simple to declare and switch majors that he did so twice more: first to physics (the very next semester) and then to religion. He abandoned his chemistry major after a single semester.² Even so, according to Sungenis’s current standards, it would also be perfectly legitimate for him to publicly tout his credentials as a “chemistry major.” That’s how silly it is.³

R. Sungenis: What’s “silly” is watching a grown man who claims to be a Christian spend hours and hours, and years and years, writing papers which include stupid little gossip-statements like: “it would also be perfectly legitimate for him to publicly tout his credentials as a chemistry major.” Doesn’t this man have anything better to do? As someone wrote to me yesterday, “Why doesn’t David Palm get a life?” Indeed. And here’s the rub. Keating and Palm were chomping at the bit a few

days ago, hoping that they could catch me in a lie. In fact, Keating stated on his blog that I was a “liar” in saying I was a physics major. But then I did an exposé on Keating and showed that HE was the liar, since I not only gave a piece of evidence from my report card that I took physics at GWU, but that I was also correct in referring to myself as a physics major since GWU allowed one to “declare” one was a physics major prior to completion of all the course to get the degree. So, since Keating and Palm got caught in their own lie, they doubled-down and tried to make hey about the particular courses I took for the declared physics major – trying to make a case that they were mere elementary courses that gave little knowledge of physics. But not only do they not know what these courses contained and what I learned in physics (which makes them both false prophets for spreading lies and gossip), their so-called expert in physics, Alex MacAndrew, has turned out to be a pseudo-scientist, since both Newton and Einstein allow the very geocentric universe that MacAndrew will not allow. The battle has been won a long time ago, but Palm, Keating and MacAndrew just have too much pride to accept the outcome.

Palm: Interestingly, [*The Chronicle of Higher Education*](#) recommends that students not declare a major early in their college careers because they tend to make bad choices based on “poor information or in response to parental pressure.” This seems to have been true in Sungenis’s case, as in addition to changing his declared major twice, he stated in his autobiographical conversion story that all the way through his early semesters at GWU he was a “jack-of-all-trades, master-at-none kind of guy” who was “floundering with no sense of direction” while trying to measure up to his father’s medical success by choosing to be a “pre-med major...and become a doctor” (*Surprised by Truth*; pp 104 -105.)

R. Sungenis: “*This seems to be have been true in Sungenis’ case...*”! Can you believe this guy? Have you ever seen anyone so obsessed with another person? I think Mr. Palm is in the wrong profession. He should audition for TMZ. They would love his gossip mill. But here’s the rub. Notice again that Mr. Palm plays the guessing game by saying “this seems to have been true.” Do we really care what David Palm’s opinion is? Hardly. Second, perhaps Mr. Palm forgot about the requirement I already mentioned in my reply to Mr. Keating that at GWU transfer students were required to declare their major in the first or second semester at GWU, and I was a transfer student. Tsk, tsk.

Palm: Distorting the Truth in Order to Appear Credible: But now, as he recently admitted, it has become personally advantageous for him to claim expertise in physics: Science didn’t become a part of my daily contemplation until about 2003 or so when I began my studies on Geocentrism. Since Geocentrism requires a knowledge of Physics and Astronomy, and since an unpopular subject like Geocentrism requires its adherent to have knowledge of both, it was to my advantage to advertise my major in Physics at GWU for the sake of credibility ([link](#)). It’s worth noting that Sungenis said basically the same thing about his [illegitimate “Ph.D.” from a degree mill in the South Pacific](#): The only thing [my PhD degree from Calamus] does is allow me to show the world, in a glance, that I have the same academic credentials as those who receive a Ph.D. in Religion from a United States accredited institution.” (Sungenis, “My Ph.D. From Calamus International University”, p. 26; cited in [“Just What the Doctor Ordered?”](#)). There you have in a nutshell the reason Sungenis continues to mislead people by exaggerating his scholastic accomplishments and credentials – it’s because he knows full well that [credibility matters](#). He’s willing to materially exaggerate his accomplishments and credentials in order to appropriate for himself credibility that he has not legitimately earned. No reputable person would refer to himself as a “physics major”, let alone as a credible scientific authority, based on the paltry study that Sungenis completed at GWU. Of course, neither would a reputable scholar tout a “Ph.D.” from a degree mill.

R. Sungenis: Rest assured, throughout this paper Mr. Palm has committed libel that someday he will pay for dearly. But let's deal with Calamus International University. It is not a "diploma mill" and the degree is not "illegitimate." Mr. Palm is a liar on both counts. The degree from Calamus is legitimate because it is authorized by the governmental authority of the Republic of Vanuatu, which republic was established in 1980 when it broke away from France and England. It has a unitary parliamentary government whose president is Baldwin Lonsdale (see Wikipedia <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vanuatu>). As such, the Republic of Vanuatu has the authority to grant degree-conferring authority on Calamus International University, which university is domiciled in Vanuatu and has been since 2007. Hence, the degrees that Calamus issues are legal and thus legitimate. Now, some may object that the degrees granted by Calamus are not accredited by other countries, such as the United States, and therefore it makes the degree "illegitimate." No, that is not the case. "Illegitimacy," which refers to legal status, would only be the case if Calamus received no authority to issue degrees from the Republic of Vanuatu.

Now, let's address the accusation that Calamus is a "diploma mill." According to Wikipedia: "A diploma mill (also known as a degree mill) is an unaccredited higher education institution that offers illegitimate academic degrees and diplomas for a fee" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diploma_mill).

I have already noted that Calamus is not "illegitimate" since it is authorized by a legitimate and recognized country to offer academic degrees. Second, Calamus does not issue "degrees or diplomas for a fee." The Ph.D. degree from Calamus takes at least two years or longer to obtain, and that is because Calamus requires the writing of a high-quality dissertation, and one can only enter the Ph.D. program if he has the prerequisite BA and MA from an accredited institution. The only real difference between Calamus and George Washington University is that Calamus is not accredited by an outside institution designated to accredit academic institutions. But that doesn't make Calamus "illegitimate," rather, Calamus is simply abiding by the legal stipulations of the Republic of Vanuatu, as the website of Calamus states: "In the Republic of Vanuatu, no government approval or accreditation is necessary in order for a private university entity to award its own degrees. A similar situation exists in various other countries, including Denmark and the Turks and Caicos Islands."

So, as one can clearly see, Calamus has obeyed all the rules required of it for an academic institution that grants degrees, and therefore it is not a "diploma mill" or "illegitimate." The only one who is illegitimately making such statements is David Palm.

Now, after saying all that, would I recommend that someone get a degree from Calamus? No, I would actually discourage it, unless there was a good reason to do so. I went to Calamus because it was the only Ph.D.-granting institution I could find that would allow me to do a dissertation on geocentrism. My former accredited institution, Maryvale Institute, in England would not allow me to do a dissertation on geocentrism. Unless one is studying and plans on teaching such an esoteric topic like geocentrism, I would recommend that one get his degrees from an accredited institution.

Palm: But perhaps even more importantly, far from having any demonstrated competence through legitimate academic accomplishments, Sungenis repeatedly demonstrates his **incompetence** in the field of physics. His writings on geocentrism are shot through with mathematical errors and scientific misunderstandings.

R. Sungenis: Hardly, and this is easy to prove. Just look above and compare MacAndrew's conclusions about the non-possibility of an Earth-at-rest, Earth-centered universe with the

allowances of Newton, Einstein, Born and Hoyle above. Who are you going to believe, MacAndrew the atheist who can't even comprehend the center of the Earth sharing a center of mass with the universe, or the world-renowned physicists who say it is possible?

Palm: Likewise, his fellow geocentrists have not fared well when challenged to demonstrate their competence by producing their own, real mathematics or science.

R. Sungenis: Is that why Dr. Luka Popov, a physicist from Croatia, had an article published in the *European Journal of Physics* on why both Newtonian and Machian physics supports geocentrism? While Mr. Palm and Mr. MacAndrew are busy in their gossip sessions producing dubious accusations of plagiarism so as to discredit their rivals in the public's eye, Dr. Popov was busy disproving their whole thesis in a peer-reviewed physics journal, and his peers agreed with him.

Palm: As remarkable as that is, it seems even more remarkable that some people see all of this deception and incompetence repeatedly demonstrated in front of their eyes and still conclude, "Yes, these geocentrists are honest, competent, trustworthy experts and I should trust them instead of virtually the entire world of astrophysics."

R. Sungenis: Well, that's because the "entire world of astrophysics" has already agreed with our conclusions, even if they don't like to admit so. We saw above formidable examples of this consensus in Newton, Hoyle, Born and Einstein who cannot discredit a geocentric universe. Likewise, Tegmark, Krauss, Longo, Copi, Starkman, and Huterer cannot deny that the CMB axis is aligned with our Earth-Sun ecliptic and the Earth's equator, making us the virtual center of the universe. It is only false prophets and pseudo-scientists like Palm and MacAndrew who refuse to come to the party.

October 15, 2015