More Palm Reading from David the "Not so Science" Guy

If you have a few minutes to spare, this encounter with David Palm is a must read. The twisting of history, the excuses for his failed science, the false accusations and his caustic attitude to boot are a sight to see.

Palm has been on this crusade to discredit geocentrism for about ten years running. He has been unable to prove his case, so the next best option is to attack personally with various and sundry accusations and give excuses why the science can't do what Palm wants it to do, and actually goes the other way.

Since Palm sends out notices of his new articles trying to discredit geocentrism every few months or so, and does do without sending a notice to me or allowing me to know to whom the notices are sent, I am forced to guess who is receiving them and you are one of them.

Just to let you know, not everyone on Palm's list agrees with Palm. Yesterday someone sent me Palm's latest with the caption: "Here's more junk from David Palm." Another wrote: "Here's the latest attack from your foes." Both of these gentlemen are well known Catholics, although I will keep their names private.

Let me remind everyone that David Palm is the guy who, upon our direct invitation, has specifically stated in a blog post that he declines to debate these issues in an oral, public and moderated debate, and our challenge for him to accept a debate has been on our website for almost two years. We usually call such people "paper tigers." After reading this most recent attempt to debunk geocentrism, you may figure out why Mr. Palm would not fare well in a public debate.

Despite Palm's efforts, this movement is going forward by leaps and bounds, and, ironically, we have David Palm to thank, for the more of his caustic objections we answer, the more geocentrism is made credible. Whereas prior to ten years ago hardly anyone was talking about this topic, our movie, books and lectures have reintroduced the topic and it is being talked about all over the world. If anything, we have changed the conversation as the world begins to reconsider what was once taboo.

So we can thank Mr. Palm. As Genesis 50:20 says, what he meant as an attack, God is using as a blessing – a blessing to all those who want to hear the truth.

By the way, in this paper you will see yet another clear example of Mr. Palm's calumny as he accuses me of plagiarizing the work of Dr. G. E. Smith, all the while failing to divulge the endnote in my book that not only references Dr. Smith's work, but shows the email exchanges between myself and Dr. Smith and the extended materials Dr. Smith sent me for my personal use.

Palm: "Equivocation, Thy Name is Geocentrism": At the heart of neo-geocentrism lies a deliberate equivocation -- the geocentrists have two usages of the word "geocentrism" and they switch back and forth between them, depending on their need at the moment. There is the "geocentrism", small g, of General Relativity wherein any point including the Earth may be treated "as if" it was an immobile center, while intrinsically excluding the very concepts of an absolute center and absolute motion. This view the geocentrists vociferously reject. Their view instead is strict Geocentrism, big G, wherein the Earth is considered to be the one, **absolute**, **central**, and **immobile** frame of reference for all motion in the entire universe. It should be obvious that these two views – strict Geocentrism and General Relativity – are fundamentally incompatible. Thus it is a deeply dishonest equivocation for the geocentrists to repeatedly claim that somehow scientists writing from the vantage of General Relativity "allow for" Geocentrism, when General Relativity inherently excludes Geocentrism's most fundamental premises. The geocentrists regularly balk when pressed to provide the most basic observational evidence in support of strict Geocentrism and deploy this equivocation instead.

R. Sungenis: "Twisting, Thy Name is David Palm":

There is no "deliberate equivocation." This is merely Palm's attempt to put the burden on the geocentrists for the fact that Einstein's General Relativity allows a geocentric universe, which means that Palm, by using his own science, has no way of disproving geocentrism.

The one who is "equivocating" is Palm, since the "as if" he is using for GRT's allowance of geocentrism must also be used for heliocentrism. That is, it is also the case that GRT must act "as if" heliocentrism could be true, since it cannot tell which, geocentrism or heliocentrism, is correct. But you'll never get that important fact from David Palm.

Palm's argument is akin to being in a court room wherein a lot of evidence has been presented that would seem to convict the defendant; yet a lot of evidence of reasonable doubt to exonerate him. This is the essence of General Relativity, that is, there is evidence that the Earth could be motionless in the center, but also evidence that it is moving around the sun. But that's as far as General Relativity can take us. It can't prove or disprove either system.

But in reality, we know only one can be true – the defendant is either guilty or not guilty. Likewise, either the earth moves or it doesn't. This is the reason that the geocentrist takes the next step—determining which one is correct, and he is obligated to do so, since truth, not relativity, must guide his life.

So, quite logically, the geocentrist says: "Of the two possibilities (geocentric or heliocentric), which one does the scientific evidence favor?

That's easy. It favors the geocentric. You can see this when you understand why Einstein invented the Special Theory of Relativity in 1905. By Einstein's own admission, it was the only answer he could think of as to why the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment showed the Earth was standing still in space.

But such empirical proof isn't going to be accepted by a die-hard Copernican such as Einstein. So, in order to make it appear as if the Earth is moving, Einstein altered the physics. He claimed that Michelson's apparatus shrunk just enough to make it appear as if the Earth was standing still.

Yes, you heard that correctly. No exaggeration.

Since he had no other way to refute Michelson's results, Einstein shortened the yardstick that was used to measure the result. How was the yardstick shortened? Einstein said it was because the Earth was moving around the sun. How's that for science?!

Not only was this answer begging the question (i.e., using as proof the very thing one is trying to prove), there was no evidence, much less proof for this ad hoc "shrinking" solution. The world accepted it because the alternative was kneeling in front of the pope and thanking him for condemning Galileo and his heliocentric universe.

So here is the choice you have folks. You can continue to worship Albert Einstein and his cockamamie haunted house of mirrors in which lengths shrink, time expands and mass increases all by themselves without any verifiable cause, or you can accept that the Holy Spirit led the Church, as He always does, to condemn beliefs that were against Scripture and the Tradition.

Which leads me to the next obvious question:

Of the two possibilities, geocentrism or heliocentrism, which one do the Fathers of the Church, the Magisterium, the Catechism and the Tradition favor?

Another easy one.

According to St. Robert Bellarmine, who valiantly fought the Protestants in the "reformation," the Fathers were in unanimous consent concerning geocentrism.

As for the Magisterium, two popes separated by 17 years, both approved condemnations of heliocentrism as "formally heretical," and no pope afterward has ever rescinded that decision.

Likewise, Pius V's 1566 Tridentine catechism teaches geocentrism, not heliocentrism; and seven years prior in 1559, Copernicus' book was put on the Index.

The only negative event that is even remotely relevant is the taking of Galileo's name off the Index in 1835, but once you know the devious reason it was done, you'll understand it did nothing to upset the tradition. In 1821, Cardinal Olivieri and Cardinal Capallari had given false information to Pope Pius VII a few years earlier about the Galileo issue. Cardinal Capallari then became Gregory XVI in 1831 and carried the same error with him when he took Galileo off the Index in 1835. You can read all about it in my book, *Galileo Was Wrong*.

Of the two possibilities, geocentrism or heliocentrism, which one do atheists, agnostics, liberal Catholics and anti-Catholics favor?

That's easy, too.

The not only favor heliocentrism, they want it desperately, even though they know they can't prove it. If you read their books, they tell us that they abhor a motionless Earth in the center of the universe, since it smacks of design and the God behind it.

As for liberal Catholics, they have long rejected Scripture and Tradition, and most of them can't even be called Christian any longer. As for anti-Catholics, they know that if they accept geocentrism they will also have to acknowledge the Catholic Church's condemnation of heliocentrism against Galileo, which would then prove that the Holy Spirit was indeed guiding the Church against error, even the error of Protestantism.

Palm: "Sungenis Tries to Proposition His Readers": Unlike some geocentrists, Robert Sungenis does not limit his case for Geocentrism to General Relativity but goes so far as to claim that Newtonian mechanics too "allow for" strict Geocentrism. And he's recently tried to buttress this claim by appeal to an unpublished Proposition 43 from Sir Isaac Newton, the translation of which Sungenis has plagiarized from philosopher Dr. G. E. Smith. But after looking at what is snipped out by Sungenis's use of ellipses and carefully considering exactly what Newton says, we find that Geocentrism's appeal to Newtonian mechanics, especially to Newton's unpublished Proposition 43, relies on the existence of bizarre, unphysical, essentially magical forces for which there is not one shred of observational evidence. Sungenis's own suggestion that these forces are centrifugal is demonstrably wrong. Sir Isaac Newton was most certainly not saying the "same thing" as the new geocentrists, as Sungenis claims – not even close – and it's not surprising that he left this proposition unpublished.

R. Sungenis: David Palm tries to Prostitute His Readers

Indeed. Mr. Palm has already become a prostitute for Albert Einstein and modern atheistic science as he accepts all that they tell him, and he wants to make you a prostitute, too.

First, let's tackle Mr. Palm's calumny—claiming that I plagiarized Dr. G. E. Smith. Take note—this is the kind of person David Palm is. He makes wild accusations without the slightest evidence. He did the same thing about a year ago, accusing me of lying when I claimed to be a physics major in college, which then forced me to show a copy of my report card which revealed that I indeed took physics, and it also forced me to show that my alma mater required one to declare his major before all the required courses were completed. As is always the case, Palm never apologized. He just added more scurrilous charges onto his previous ones without any proof to his claims. One would expect a person who claims to be a Christian to be much more cautious and reticent to make such deleterious claims. We might expect a Christian to contact his opponent and verify his suspicions before he put them in public view. But not David Palm. He shoots first and asks questions later. So keep all this in mind as you read Palm's so-called "critiques" against geocentrism.

As for Dr. Smith, if Mr. Palm had bothered to look up endnote #22 in *Geocentrism 101* that I attach to the photo and translation provided by Dr. Smith, he would have seen this stipulation:

"My thanks to George E. Smith of Tufts University for the granting of his essay for my use, titled: *Newtonian Relativity: A Neglected Manuscript, an Understressed Corollary*, and the accompanying Power Point presentation, in email of August 8, 2015."

Obviously, Mr. Palm didn't bother to look up my endnote, or, if he did, he deliberately dismissed it since it didn't support his accusation. Either way, he's caught with his pants down, once again.

Normally I would not add more detail, but just to show you what a scoundrel Mr. Palm is, I am going to paste a copy of the original emails that Dr. Smith and I exchanged on this topic. As in most emails, the answer to me from Dr. Smith comes first, after which he signs off as "GES." Below his answer is

the header, and beneath that is my inquiry to Dr. Smith. As noted in Dr. Smith's answer to me, he attached the very presentation he gave on this subject in November 2014 so that I could use it:

> Attached is a presentation given last November at the PSA meeting in Chicago that presents the manuscript to which Weinberg was referring. A book is in preparation by myself, Rob DiSalle, Craig Fox, and Michael Friedman discussing this manuscript and other material covered in my presentation.
>
> GES
>
> _____
> From: CAIRomeo@aol.com [CAIRomeo@aol.com]
> Sent: Saturday, August 08, 2015 11:33 AM
> To: Smith, George E.
> Subject: Steven Weinberg's new book that mentions you
>
> Dear Dr. Smith,
>
> Greetings, sir. I am a follower of your works regarding Isaac Newton.
>
> I am writing to inquire of you concerning a statement that Steven Weinberg put in his new 2015 book, "To Explain the World."
>
> On pages 251-252, Dr. Weinberg says the following:
>
> "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."
>
> He has a footnote on this paragraph which says "G.E. Smith, to be published."
>
> I saw another footnote from an Internet search which says:
>
> "See G. E. Smith, 'The Origins of Book 2 of Newton's Principia,' forthcoming."
>
> Is this the book that Weinberg is referring to, and if so, have you completed it yet and is it published for purchase?
>
> If it is not published, can you reveal where this document of Newton's can be found for reading, or if you have a copy of it for public usage?
>
> Your response is very much anticipated and appreciated.
>
> Robert

Obviously, then, there is no plagiarism. Not only did I secure Dr. Smith's permission to use the material, Dr. Smith went over and above board and allowed me to use his whole presentation, which includes the translation of Newton's Proposition 43.

After I posted this paper to my recipients and included a copy to David Palm, a few hours later Palm "apologized" for his false accusation, saying:

> In my Geocentrism Debunked update sent out yesterday I mistakenly stated that Robert Sungenis did not document where he got the English translation of an unpublished proposition from Sir Isaac Newton. The end note number on the English translation in Geocentrism 101 takes one to an end note containing the Latin text but not a documenting reference, which led to my mistake. The next end note, however, does indeed contain reference to Dr. Smith's work and I missed it. This is my fault, I was not careful enough, and I apologize to Mr. Sungenis for the charge of plagiarism and to you readers for placing if before you. I have corrected the article and included this apology there as well.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> David Palm

This is a perfect example of the blindness and outright twisting that I've had to put up with from him for the last ten years. Mr. Palm's MO is to shoot first and ask questions later.

Now, let's look closer at Mr. Palm's attempt at "science" to refute Newton's Proposition 43.

> **Palm:** But after looking at what is snipped out by Sungenis's use of ellipses and carefully considering exactly what Newton says, we find that Geocentrism's appeal to Newtonian mechanics, especially to Newton's unpublished Proposition 43, relies on the existence of bizarre, unphysical, essentially magical forces for which there is not one shred of observational evidence. Sungenis's own suggestion that these forces are centrifugal is demonstrably wrong. Sir Isaac Newton was most certainly not saying the "same thing" as the new geocentrists, as Sungenis claims – not even close – and it's not surprising that he left this proposition unpublished.

This is what happens when someone who knows nothing about physics (NB: Mr. Palm has not had one physics course in his whole life) attempts to refute something he simply doesn't understand. Notice that he calls Newton's Proposition "bizarre, unphysical and magical forces" yet it was Newton himself that proposed it. Go figure.

What Mr. Palm apparently doesn't understand is that Newton was not claiming that such forces existed and that he had evidence for them, but IF such forces existed then the geocentric system would work. This means that if someday such forces were found outside the solar system, it would spell the demise of the heliocentric system.

Unfortunately for Mr. Palm who doesn't know the history nor seems interested in uncovering it, this is precisely what happened—the forces outside the solar system were discovered by Mach and Einstein, and those forces were incorporated into the modern understanding of physics. Mr. Palm could have easily discovered this if he had read the book I reference by Nobel laureate Steven Weinberg which is the only book that introduced Newton's Proposition 43 as a new and significant finding in Newton's writings. Weinberg's explanation was in the same book (*Geocentrism 101*) that Mr. Palm failed to read to find the endnote regarding Dr. Smith, which failure then led him to falsely accuse me of plagiarism. Here is what Weinberg says about Newton's Prop. 43:

> The success of Newton's treatment of the motion of the planets and comets shows that the inertial frames in the neighborhood of the solar system are those in which the Sun rather than the Earth is

> at rest (or moving with constant velocity). According to general relativity, this is because that is the frame of reference in which the matter of distant galaxies is not revolving around the solar system. In this sense, Newton's theory provided a solid basis for preferring the Copernican theory to that of Tycho. But in general relativity we can use any frame of reference we like, not just inertial frames.[1]

Apparently, Mr. Palm didn't do his due diligence and read this paragraph from Weinberg. So let's educate him. Basically, what Weinberg, via Einstein's general relativity, is revealing is that since Newton's system confined itself to the solar system, it was only dealing with an inertial frame of reference—when the Sun is considered at rest. (NB: an "inertial frame" is one at rest or moving at uniform velocity).

As such, Newton chose to exclude other frames of reference, namely, non-inertial frames, such as "the matter of distant galaxies revolving around the solar system." Indeed, Newton tried to make the non-inertial galaxies an inertial frame by claiming that it constituted "absolute space" (i.e., a space that didn't move).

But, as Weinberg says, if Newton had included the non-inertial frame of the distant galaxies, then it would have automatically superseded his Sun-centered inertial frame and thus Tycho's geocentric model with the Earth at rest and the sun and stars revolving around it instead of the Sun at rest would certainly be possible.

Weinberg goes on to explain the ramifications of the model in physics that uses all frames of reference:

> 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.[2]

I couldn't have said it better myself. Notice how Weinberg is trying to save Newton from the fault of only dealing with inertial frames of reference by noting that Newton himself states in Prop. 43 that if there were non-gravitational forces outside the solar system (i.e., the same non-gravitational force that Einstein proposed in General Relativity), Newton would have to agree that Tycho's geocentric system is valid.

Now, before we get to what the "non-gravitational forces" or "non-inertial forces" might be, I am going to quote from another passage in Einstein's work via a famous physicist by the name of Hans Thirring who saw the same problem with Newton's system. He writes:

> Let K [the universe] be a Galilean-Newtonian coordinate system [a system of three dimensions extending to the edge of the universe], and let K′ [the Earth] be a coordinate system rotating uniformly relative to K [the universe]. Then centrifugal forces would be in effect for masses at rest in the K′ coordinate system [the Earth], while no such forces would be present for objects at rest in K [the universe].

[1] Steven Weinberg, *To Explain the World: The Discovery of Modern Science*, HarperCollins, 2015, pp. 251.
[2] Ibid., pp. 251-252.

> Already Newton viewed this as proof that the rotation of K′ [the Earth] had to be considered as "absolute," and that K′ [the Earth] could not then be treated as the "resting" frame of K [the universe].
>
> Yet, as E. Mach has shown, this argument is not sound. One need not view the existence of such centrifugal forces as originating from the motion of K′ [the Earth]; one could just as well account for them as resulting from the average rotational effect of distant, detectable masses as evidenced in the vicinity of K′ [the Earth], whereby K′ [the Earth] is treated as being at rest.
>
> If Newtonian mechanics disallow such a view, then this could very well be the foundation for the defects of that theory…[3]

Hence, Einstein and Mach say that Newton has no right to confine the mechanics to the solar system and leave out the rest of the universe. If he does, then it is a "defect of that theory"!

Well, isn't that a hoot!

For three centuries after Newton's *Principia* the world had been convinced that Copernicanism was the correct model, only to find out later that Newton inadvertently cheated by excluding alternate reference frames. His only salvation came about 200 years later from those who found his "defect" and corrected his model.

Here's another General Relativist that found the same "defect" in Newton's system. His name is Christian Møller:

> …if we consider a purely mechanical system consisting of a number of material particles acted upon by given forces…Newton's fundamental equations of mechanics may be applied with good approximation in the description of the system. On the other hand, if we wish to describe the system in an accelerated system of reference, we must introduce, as is well known, so-called fictitious forces (centrifugal forces, Coriolis forces, *etc*.) which have no connexion (sic) whatever with the physical properties of the mechanical system itself….It was just for this reason that Newton introduced the concept of absolute space which should represent the system of reference where the laws of nature assume the simplest and most natural form….
>
> Therefore Einstein advocated a new interpretation of the fictitious forces in accelerated systems of reference: instead of regarding them as an expression of a difference in principle between the fundamental equations in uniformly moving and accelerated systems he considered both kinds of systems of reference to be completely equivalent as regards the form of the fundamental equations; and the 'fictitious' forces were treated as real forces on the same footing as any other force of nature.
>
> The reason for the occurrence in accelerated systems of reference of such peculiar forces should, according to this new idea, be sought in the circumstance that the distant masses of fixed stars are accelerated relative to these systems of reference. The 'fictitious forces' are thus treated as a kind of gravitational force, the acceleration of the distant masses causing a 'field of gravitation' in the system of reference considered….
>
> Previously the effect of the celestial masses had been considered to be negligible; now, however, we must include the distant masses in the physical systems considered….It can, however, be assumed

[3] Hans Thirring, "Über die Wirkung rotierender ferner Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie," *Physikalische Zeitschrift* 19, 33, 1918, translated: "On the Effect of Rotating Distant Masses in Einstein's Theory of Gravitation."

> that all systems of reference are equivalent with respect to the formulation of the fundamental laws of physics. This is the so-called general principle of relativity.[4]

Next, Mr. Palm puts his foot in his mouth once again by saying: "Sungenis's own suggestion that these forces are centrifugal is demonstrably wrong."

And just how is Mr. Palm going to "demonstrate" it for us when Mach, Einstein, Weinberg and Møller have all told us that the additional non-gravitational and non-inertial forces are centrifugal?!

Let's point it out to the stubborn Mr. Palm. Here are Einstein's words:

> One need not view the existence of such centrifugal forces as originating from the motion of K′ [the Earth]; one could just as well account for them as resulting from the average rotational effect of distant, detectable masses [stars] as evidenced in the vicinity of K′ [the Earth], whereby K′ [the Earth] is treated as being at rest.

Now let's see it from 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'…

Anyone who has studied physics knows that "the forces akin to gravitation" are the centrifugal, Coriolis and Euler forces that appear in rotating frames.

Weinberg then tells us that Newton may have had a "hint" of this new and better system when he referred to the non-gravitation forces that, if they were outside the solar system, would allow for the Tychonic system of an earth motionless in the center of the universe with the universe rotating around it.

The upshot of this is that David Palm doesn't have the slightest idea what he is talking about. If he had actually read the material, he might have come to a different conclusion.

Palm: "Dark Matter Illuminates Geocentric Double Standards": Perhaps nothing provokes as much derision and scoffing from the new geocentrists as the scientific discussion about dark matter. Geocentrists take this discussion as a prime example of their contention that many physicists are basically frauds, duping an unsuspecting public by simply making up whatever details they happen to need to prop up theories which they know in their hearts are really in shambles. As this article shows, that's not what astrophysicists are doing when they theorize about something like dark matter. But their derisive treatment of the theory of dark matter provides an excellent illustration of the extent to which the new geocentrists themselves turn the process of true scientific endeavor on its head. Indeed, they regularly do the very thing they decry, invoking such things as "aether" and a "Planck medium" to which they arbitrarily assign made-up properties, in order to make their system seem more plausible and sciency. Thus the double standards of the new geocentrists come boldly into relief when illuminated by the discussion on dark matter.

[4] *The General Theory of Relativity*, Christian Møller, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952, pp. 219-220.

R. Sungenis: Dark Matter Illuminates the Dark Mind of David Palm

If there is anyone who uses a "double-standard" it is David Palm. We showed above how Palm avoids the geocentric implications of Einstein's General theory by claiming that geocentrists have no right to use the General theory because geocentrists don't believe in General Relativity, yet all we are doing is what Mr. Palm should be doing himself, namely, showing that his own science opens the door wide open for geocentrism. But don't expect any such admission from David Palm.

We also saw the same double-standard when, on the one hand, Palm wants to use Newton's theory to support heliocentrism, but, on the other hand, won't use the correction to Newton's theory that is afforded by Einstein's General theory that supports the geocentric system.

In effect, David Palm's "physics" is stuck in the 1680s and refuses to budge for fear of having to admit that modern physics found a flaw in Newton's theory—the flaw that showed Newton had no right to make it appear that heliocentrism was a proven fact.

As for Dark Matter and Dark Energy, allow me to give you the history to understand this issue.

In 1929, Edwin Hubble noticed that all the galaxies surrounding the Earth were producing a redshift. This was bad news for the heliocentrists since if a redshift is seen in every quadrant of the sky, it means, *prima facie*, that the Earth is in the center of it all. If Earth wasn't in the center, Hubble would have seen a proportionate amount of blueshifts from the galaxies, but there were none except in our local area, which doesn't count.

But Hubble didn't want a central Earth. He said in his 1937 book that a central Earth was "intolerable" and "had to be rejected." Why? Because he was just like David Palm. He was married to his presupposition that the Earth had to be in the remote recesses of space and could have no distinction among the celestial bodies.

So, to alleviate the problem, Hubble invented a whole new universe (just like Einstein invented a whole new physics to answer the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment which showed the Earth wasn't moving in space). Hubble dreamed up the "balloon" universe as his answer. In this universe, Hubble could place all the galaxies (including our Milky Way galaxy) on the surface of a balloon universe so that when the balloon expanded it would show a redshift from whichever direction one looked.

Oh how brilliant a solution this was!

There was only one problem, however. It had no basis in fact. Redshift might occur if the object emitting the light recedes from the observer, but redshift might also occur if the light lost energy as it traveled to the observer. In fact, today there are over 60 different explanations for why redshift takes place.

But at that time, Hubble had only two choices. Obviously, he chose the solution to redshift that would allow him to make the universe into a balloon with no center. If there is no center, then no object can occupy the center, especially the Earth which Hubble wanted to remove from the center at all costs since it was "intolerable."

So, ever since the 1930s, we all grew up with Hubble's dream that the universe was expanding like a balloon and we on Earth were on the balloon and included in the expansion.

But a funny thing happened on the way to the Ritz.

Modern scientists found that if they believed in the expanding universe, they didn't have enough mass and energy in the universe to propel the expansion. They only had about 4% of what was needed.

So what is a scientist dedicated to the Copernican Principle to do?

That's easy. You just make up the other 96% of mass and energy you need and pretend as if it really exists! Voila! Dark Matter and Dark Energy are born! That was the first step.

The second step is that you need to construct some experiments that search for the Dark Matter and Dark Energy in order to give some semblance of credibility that you are abiding by the expectation that science just can't dream up things they need, but must have empirical evidence to construct a theory, much less a fact.

The third step is that, even though your experiments haven't found the Dark Matter and Dark Energy, you just keep telling the public that someday you WILL find them and all will be hunky dory. The public doesn't know any better since they put their trust in the scientist. Other mainstream scientists aren't going to question this duplicity either, since it is the government that funds all their projects and puts the sheepskins on their university walls.

It is only scientific vigilantes who are going to tell you the truth of what is going on. The mainstream scientist can feel safe that the vigilantes I won't make too many waves since, after all, who is going to believe someone who thinks that the Sun and stars go around the Earth every day?

This is precisely the MO of David Palm. He tries his best to make geocentrists appear as certified nuts so that he can win the war at the personal level. All he has to do is provide some half-baked argumentation (or accuse them of plagiarism) and all his cronies will be happy.

It wouldn't be so bad if Mr. Palm would at least admit that Dark Matter and Dark Energy were invented because they were needed for the Big Bang universe, and also admit that the alternative was a motionless Earth in the center of the universe, as even Hubble admitted such an alternative was "intolerable."

If Palm did concede those points on even a hypothetical basis we could then respect him as a fair and unbiased scientist and theologian. But Mr. Palm shows his true colors when he won't even consider the alternatives, much less be polite and acknowledge their scientific possibility. In this way it is rather easy to expose an agenda-driven ideologue, and that is precisely what David Palm is.

So, instead of admitting the scientific alternative, Mr. Palm tries to make it appear that the geocentrists are the guilty party. He does so by claiming that our analysis of the situation is nothing but a "derisive treatment of the theory of dark matter" that "provides an excellent illustration of the extent to which the new geocentrists themselves turn the process of true scientific endeavor on its head."

In other words, we are accused of "turning the scientific endeavor on its head" because we decry using a theory to produce solutions to problems in which the theory has no empirical evidence upon which to substantiate its theory!

Go figure. Mr. Palm has become an expert at the shell game.

This reminds me of the scene in a movie in which a man's wife catches him sleeping with a woman. While she is complaining that she saw him committing adultery with her own eyes, he quickly scuttles the woman out of the bedroom and subsequently makes the bed as if no one had used it. When he is done dressing, he turns to his wife and says, "What are you talking about? There is no woman here and no one was in the bed and I did not commit adultery on you. It's all in your head. Let me give you a sedative to calm your nerves." The wife then begins to wonder whether what she saw actually took place.

Unfortunately for Mr. Palm, true science doesn't work that way. In order to make a theory one must have at least some credible evidence to propose a theory. Even then, a true scientist can't call it a fact until he has proven that the evidence he found indisputably proves the theory. But that's not what we see in the mainstream literature today. Dark Matter and Dark Energy are considered FACT, yet not one drop of either has been found after decades of exhaustive research.

Science can't use as proof the very thing it is trying to prove. It hasn't proven the Big Bang either. It is just a theory. That being the case, one can't use something needed for the Big Bang (Dark Matter and Dark Energy) as proof of the Big Bang when, in fact, neither Dark Matter nor Dark Energy nor the Big Bang have been proven as fact.

Yet we geocentrists are the ones who are accused of "turning science on its head" if we point out these contradictions and anomalies. Go figure.

In the end, theories made without evidence are going to lead to what Thomas Kuhn calls "a gigantic paradigm shift," that is, a point in which no more ad hoc inventions can be added to the reigning theory without making the whole house of cards come tumbling down. I predict this will happen to the Big Bang theory and its "Dark" components within our lifetimes, but you can depend upon David Palm to sing their tune until then.

Mr. Palm then says:

> "Indeed, they regularly do the very thing they decry, invoking such things as 'aether' and a 'Planck medium' to which they arbitrarily assign made-up properties, in order to make their system seem more plausible and sciency."

So we see the corner into which Mr. Palm has put himself. Instead of showing us evidence of Dark Matter and Dark Energy, he tries to put the onus on the geocentrist for believing in things like ether and Planck mediums.

But we won't be like David Palm. I'll show you the evidence.

Let's begin with ether. It was found in the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment. Let me go right to Michelson's own words:

> Considering the motion of the Earth in its orbit only, this displacement should be $2D\ v^2/V^2 = 2D \times 10^{-8}$. The distance D was about eleven meters, or 2×10^7 wavelengths of yellow light; hence, the displacement to be expected was 0.4 fringe. The actual displacement was certainly less than the twentieth part of this, and probably less than the fortieth part.[5] But since the displacement is proportional to the square of the velocity, the relative velocity of the Earth and the ether is probably less than one-sixth the Earth's orbital velocity, and certainly less than one-fourth.[6]

There you have it. The light beam was displaced by ether, but it was much too small a result to support the idea that the Earth traveled around the sun. They needed 0.4 but only got 0.02. On the one hand, it told them that ether existed; on the other hand, it told them that the Earth could not be traveling through the ether.

Einstein didn't like this result since it suggested that the Earth wasn't moving around the sun. So Einstein claimed in his Special Relativity Theory that the experiment found no ether, which then led him to try to fix the lacuna by claiming that Michelson's apparatus shrunk when it moved with the Earth around the sun – another clear example of *petitio principii*, that is, using as proof (a moving Earth) for the very thing one is trying to prove (a moving Earth). That's not science. It's biased thinking based on philosophical presuppositions.

Let's look at another example. In 1913, Georges Sagnac performed a similar experiment that was quite successful. It was so successful that that the "Sagnac Effect" is used in numerous applications today, and without it they would not function. Here is what Sagnac says about his own experiment:

> In clear conception, it ought to be regarded as a direct manifestation of the luminiferous ether. In a system moving as a whole with respect to the ether, the elapsed time of propagation between any two points of the system should be altered as though the system were immobile and subject to the action of an *ether wind* which would blow away the light waves in the manner of atmospheric wind blowing away sound waves. The observation of the optical effect of such a relative wind of ether would constitute *evidence for the ether*, just as the observation of the influence of the relative wind of the atmosphere on the speed of sound in a system in motion would (in the absence of a better explanation) constitute evidence of the existence of the atmosphere around the system in movement.[7]

---

[5] In the 1904 experiment of Morley and Dayton Miller, they state: "In 1887 Michelson and one of the present writers made an experiment….We found that, if there were any effect, it was not sensibly larger than one-fortieth of the amount expected" ("On the Theory of Experiments to detect Aberrations of the Second Degree," *Philosophical Magazine*, S. 6, Vol. 9. No. 53, May 1904, pp. 669-680).

[6] A. A. Michelson and E. W. Morley, "On the Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether," Art. xxxvi, *The American Journal of Science*, eds. James D and Edward S. Dana, No. 203, vol. xxxiv, November 1887, p. 341. As one textbook calculates it: "$\Delta t - \Delta t' = (l_1 + l_2)\ v^2/c^3$. Now we take $v = 3.0 \times 10^4$ m/s, the speed of the Earth in its orbit around the Sun. In Michelson and Morley's experiment, the arms l_1 and l_2 were about 11 m long. The time difference would then be about $(22\text{m})(3.0 \times 10^4\ \text{m/s})^2/(3.0 \times 10^8\ \text{m/s})^3 \approx 7.0 \times 10^{-16}$ s. For visible light of wavelength $\lambda = 5.5 \times 10^{-7}$ m, say, the frequency would be $f = c/\lambda = (3.0 \times 10^8\ \text{m/s})/(5.5 \times 10^{-7}\ \text{m}) = 5.5 \times 10^{14}$ Hz, which means that wave crests pass by a point every $1/(5.5 \times 10^{14}\ \text{Hz}) = 1.8 \times 10^{-15}$ s. Thus, with a time difference of 7.0×10^{-16} s, Michelson and Morley should have noted a movement in the interference pattern of $(7.0 \times 10^{-16}\ \text{s})/(1.8 \times 10^{-15}\ \text{s}) = 0.4$ fringe. They could easily have detected this, since their apparatus was capable of observing a fringe shift as small as 0.01 fringe. But they found no significant fringe shift whatever….Never did they observe a significant fringe shift. This 'null' result was one of the great puzzles of physics at the end of the nineteenth century" (*Physics: Principles with Applications*, Fourth Edition, Douglas C. Giancoli, 1995, p. 749). Notice that the author does not say there was no fringe shift, but that there was no "significant fringe shift."

[7] *Comptes Rendus*, *ibid*., emphasis added.

But, of course, Einstein ignored this experiment and never mentioned it in any of his papers, but it was one of the most important experiments of the 20th century.

But let's look at a third example.

In 1925 Michelson did another ether-based experiment, this time looking for a daily rotation between Earth and space. Unlike his 1887 experiment that found only 5% of the expected ether for an Earth traveling around the sun, in 1925 Michelson near 100% of the ether he was looking for to prove a daily rotation.

Even the *New York Times* (which by this time had heavily favored Einstein) agreed with Michelson's discovery of ether when it said in its January 25, 1925 headlines: "Ether Drift is Confirmed." Little did they know, however, that Michelson's confirmation of the ether drift automatically falsified Einstein's Special Relativity theory—a theory which claimed there was no ether anywhere in the universe.

By the way, whereas Einstein claimed there was no ether in Special Relativity, he took back the ether in his General Relativity theory which gave space a discrete "medium," all without a lick of contradiction admitted by either him or mainstream science. Go figure.

Now let's go to the Planck medium. Ironically, we can get there by riding on the back of Einstein's horse.Contrary to Mr. Palm's contention, I didn't dream it up. It is a product of empirical evidence from quantum mechanics, such as the fact that studies of radioactivity show that space has spectroscopic structure similar to that of ordinary quantum solids and fluids. For this evidence let's go to the 1993 Nobel laureate Robert Laughlin.

> 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.
>
> In the early days of relativity the conviction that light must be waves of something ran so strong that Einstein was widely dismissed. Even when Michelson and Morley demonstrated that the earth's orbital motion through the ether could not be detected, opponents argued that the earth must be dragging an envelope of ether along with it because relativity was lunacy and could not possibly be right…. Relativity actually says nothing about the existence or nonexistence of matter pervading the universe, only that such matter must have relativistic symmetry.

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.[8]

So there you have it – the empirical evidence for the Planck medium discovered when we weren't even looking for it to prove a pet theory. This is quite the opposite of the claim for Dark Matter and Dark Energy which were invented to support the Big Bang but had absolutely no empirical evidence, and still doesn't.

And some of you smart guys out there may be wondering whether the quantum ether that Laughlin describes could be Dark Matter or Dark Energy. The answer is no, since the quantum ether contains 10^{120} too much energy for the alleged Big Bang expansion. This is why in our movie, *The Principle*, Michio Kaku says that modern science "is off by ten to the one hundred and twentieth power, the biggest mismatch in the entire history of science!"

Suffice it to say, you'll never get any of this from David Palm.

Palm: "St. Basil 'Dogmatic' on Geocentrism? Nope": Exaggeration, to the point of falsehood is a central characteristic of the new geocentrism. It occurs in the geocentrists' treatment of science. It permeates their handling of the Bible. It's part and parcel of their theological case. This tendency toward fanciful exaggeration even pervades Robert Sungenis's treatment of the Church Fathers. Sungenis has presented a specific citation from Church Father St. Basil the Great as the single most important patristic witness in support of geocentrism, calling it a "dogmatic assertion of geocentrism". It's anything but that – in this article we'll see that this is yet another of Sungenis's exaggerations to the point of falsehood.

R. Sungenis: I'll take Basil Any Day of the Week to Palm's Rosemary, Parsley and Thyme

Understandably, Mr. Palm doesn't like the fact that all the Fathers were in agreement that the Earth did not move and was thus the center of the universe.

Mr. Palm doesn't like the fact that one of our greatest theologians, St. Robert Bellarmine, used the consensus of the Fathers in his condemnation of Galileo as he cited the Council of Trent's edict that a consensus of the Fathers on doctrinal issues requires our acceptance of their consensus, including their consensus on geocentrism.

Mr. Palm doesn't like the fact that, if he relies on his "the Fathers were merely following Aristotle" argument, he must then explain why none of the Fathers chose to follow an equally prevalent philosopher in Greek times who believed in heliocentrism, such as Pythagoras (d. 495 BC), Philolaus (d. 385 BC), Hiketas (d. 450 BC), and Ekphantus (d. 450 BC) or Aristarchus (d. 230 BC). In fact, Pythagorus was the very individual who was condemned by name at Galileo's confrontation with the Church in 1616 and 1633 as the originator of the heliocentric view.

---

[8] 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.

Mr. Palm doesn't like the fact that when the Church was arguing against Galileo, it didn't once make the argument that the Fathers' view was either weak or irrelevant because some of them had the same geocentric view as Aristotle, and it never once made the argument that the Fathers were devoid of Scriptural evidence for their view.

Mr. Palm doesn't like the fact that the Church, despite the competing views from the Greeks and Indians who were promoting heliocentrism from 600 BC to 900 AD, never deviated from its geocentric understanding of the universe.

Within this vacuum, Mr. Palm tries to make the argument that the Fathers arrived at their conclusion only because they blindly adopted Aristotle's view of the universe but had no citations of Scripture and no reliance on Tradition to support their view.

This is patently false, but it doesn't surprise me that a desperado like David Palm would stoop to using such a frivolous argument.

The quotation of Basil's that is in question is the following:

> There are inquirers into nature who with a great display of words give reasons for the immobility of the earth...It is not, they go on, without reason or by chance that the earth occupies the center of the universe...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. If there is anything in this system which might appear probable to you, keep your admiration for the source of such perfect order, for the wisdom of God. Grand phenomena do not strike us the less when we have discovered something of their wonderful mechanism. Is it otherwise here? At all events let us prefer the simplicity of faith to the demonstrations of reason.[9]

Mr. Palm claims that Basil is merely arguing from philosophy. His exact words are:

> "Notice that there is no citation of biblical texts, no appeal to an unbroken lineage of apostolic Tradition, no appeal to any ecclesiastical authority. Rather, the support for all of this is a natural philosophical argument…"

Ah, yes. I can see why Mr. Palm would make such a conclusion when, in fact, he ignored half the passage from Basil. Here is Mr. Palm's biased rendition of Basil's quote:

> "There are inquirers into nature who with a great display of words give reasons for the immobility of the earth. Placed, they say, in the middle of the universe and not being able to incline more to one side than the other because its centre is everywhere the same distance from the surface, it necessarily rests upon itself; since a weight which is everywhere equal cannot lean to either side."

What Mr. Palm ignores is Basil's references to "the wisdom of God" and the "simplicity of faith" over against the "demonstrations of reason."

Mr. Palm forgot to ask the decisive question of how Basil could ask his hearers to depend more on the "simplicity of faith" than the "demonstrations of reason" if, as Palm argues, Basil is giving no

[9] *Nine Homilies on the Hexameron*, 10.

recourse to Scripture or Church teaching. Mr. Palm's "natural philosophical argument" is not "simplicity of faith"; rather, it is a "demonstration of reason." In other words, Basil believes the Earth is immobile and in the center because he believes by faith what Scripture and the Church have taught him. Only then does he use "demonstration by reason" to complete his arguments. Mr. Palm missed this because, well, he wants to miss it.

So, when Basil gives us his "demonstration by reason" in his other passages, we know that he first arrived at his position of geocentrism by "the simplicity of faith" that he got from his devotion to Scripture and the Church. Hence when we read other passages of Basil's that also appeal to "demonstrations of reason," we know that reason is his secondary source of verification, not his first, such as the following:

> **Basil**: If the sun, subject to corruption, is so beautiful, so grand, so rapid in its movement, so invariable in its course…[10]
>
> **Basil**: From thence the sun, returning to the summer solstice, in the direction of the North, gives us the longest days. And, as it travels farther in the air, it burns that which is over our heads, dries up the earth, ripens the grains and hastens the maturity of the fruits of the trees.[11]
>
> **Basil**: It will not lead me to give less importance to the creation of the universe, that the servant of God, Moses, is silent as to shapes; he has not said that the earth is a hundred and eighty thousand furlongs in circumference; he has not measured into what extent of air its shadow projects itself whilst the sun revolves around it, nor stated how this shadow, casting itself upon the moon, produces eclipses.[12]
>
> **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.[13]
>
> **Basil**: In the Beginning God made the Heaven and the Earth. **3.** Do not then imagine, O man! that the visible world is without a beginning; and because the celestial bodies move in a circular course, and it is difficult for our senses to define the point where the circle begins, do not believe that bodies impelled by a circular movement are, from their nature, without a beginning. Without doubt the circle (I mean the plane figure described by a single line) is beyond our perception, and it is impossible for us to find out where it begins or where it ends; but we ought not on this account to believe it to be without a beginning. Although we are not sensible of it, it really begins at some point where the draughtsman has begun to draw it at a certain radius from the center. Thus seeing that figures which move in a circle always return upon themselves, without for a single instant interrupting the regularity of their course, do not vainly imagine to yourselves that the world has neither beginning nor end.
>
> **8.** If I ask you to leave these vain questions, I will not expect you to try and find out the earth's point of support. The mind would reel on beholding its reasonings losing themselves without end. Do you say that the earth reposes on a bed of air? How, then, can this soft substance, without consistency,

[10] *Homilies*, 6.
[11] *Homilies*, 6, 8.
[12] *Homilies*, IX.
[13] *The Mystic Meaning of the Tabernacle*, Bk V, Ch VI; Clement of Rome, *Stromata*, Bk V.

> resist the enormous weight which presses upon it? How is it that it does not slip away in all directions, to avoid the sinking weight, and to spread itself over the mass which overwhelms it? Do you suppose that water is the foundation of the earth? You will then always have to ask yourself how it is that so heavy and opaque a body does not pass through the water; how a mass of such a weight is held up by a nature weaker than itself. Then you must seek a base for the waters, and you will be in much difficulty to say upon what the water itself rests.

Interestingly enough, contrary to what Palm says, Basil does consider this doctrine as "infallible." Note the following words when Basil explains how the Earth in the center can support the weight of the world:

> **9**. You do not reflect that the idea of the earth suspended by itself throws your reason into a like but even greater difficulty, since from its nature it is heavier. But let us admit that the earth rests upon itself, or let us say that it rides the waters, we must still remain faithful to thought of true religion and recognize that all is sustained by the Creator's power. Let us then reply to ourselves, and let us reply to those who ask us upon what support this enormous mass rests, "In His hands are the ends of the earth." It is a doctrine as infallible for our own information as profitable for our hearers.[14]

Robert Sungenis
Chairman: Stellar Motion Pictures, LLC
Executive Producer: *The Principle* and *Journey to the Center of the Universe*

November 11, 2016

[14] *Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron*, Homily I.