Science Writer, Kitty Ferguson: "It is possible to describe the entire universe using any chosen point as the unmoving center-the Earth will do very well-and no one can prove that choice is wrong....no one can prove that the Earth moves."23

Astronomer, Phil Plait: "I have two things to say that might surprise you: first, geocentrism is a valid frame of reference, and second, heliocentrism is not any more or less correct."24

Physicist, *Timothy Clifton*: "To entertain the notion that we may, in fact, have a special location in the universe is, for many, unthinkable. Nevertheless, that is exactly what some small groups of physicists have recently been considering."25

Physicist. 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. Ptolemv and Copernicus are equally right. What point of view is chosen is a matter of expediency.26

3 The Grand Design, Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, NY, Ban tam, 2010, p. 41.

4 Fred Hoyle, Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on his Life and Work, p. 82.

- Also from the same book: "Today we cannot say that the Copernican theory is "right" and the Ptolemaic theory is "wrong" in any meaningful sense. The two theories are ... physically equivalent to one another" (ibid, p. 88).
- 5 From Copernicus to Einstein, 1970, pp, 18, 82.
- 6 Quoted from Dennis W. Sciama's, The Unity of the Universe, 1961, pp.102-103.
- 7 I. Bernard Cohen, Birth of a New Physics, revised, 1985, p. 78.
- 8 Arthur Lynch, The Case Against Einstein, p. 22.

9 Lorentz's 1886 paper, "On the Influence of the Earth's Motion of Luminiferous Phenomena," in A. Miller's Albert Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, p. 20.

10 Wolfgang Pauli, Theory of Relativity, 1958, p. 4.

11 From Poincaré's lecture titled: "L'état actuel et l'avenir de la physique mathematique," St. Louis, Sept. 24, 1904, Scientific Monthly, April, 1956.

12 Ernst Mach, Die Mechanik in Ihrer Entwicklung Historich-Kritisch Dargestellt, Liepzig: Brokhaus, 1883. English title: The Science of Me' chanics: A Critical and Historical Account of its Development, translated by T. J. Macormack, La Salle, Open Court Publishing, 1960, 6th edition, p.201. The seventh edition of Mach's book was published in 1912. 13 Julian Barbour, Absolute or Relative Motion, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 226

14 From Poincaré's report La science et l'hypothèse ("Science and Hypoth0000esis") 1901, 1968, p. 182, in Kostro's, Einstein and the Ether, 2000, p. 30.

15 The Evolution of Physics: From Early Concepts to Relativity and Quanta, Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, 1938, 1966, p. 212. 16 Steven Weinberg, To Explain the World: The Discovery of Modern Science, Harper Collins, 2015, pp. 251-252.

17 The Relativity Explosion, 1976, pp. 86-87. The previous edition published in 1962 under the title: Relativity for the Million. 18 Bertrand Russell, The ABC of Relativity, London, revised edition, editor Felix Pirani, 1958, pp. 13-14.

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

20 "The Energy of Empty Space is not Zero," The Edge, 2006. https://www.edge.org/conversation/the-energy-of-empty-space that-isn39t-zero

21 Feynman, R. P., Morinigo, F. B. and Wagner, W. G., Feynman Lectures on Gravitation, Penguin Books, London, 1999, p. 166 22 "Cosmic Heresy?" Nature, 273:336, 1978.

23 Kitty Ferguson, Measuring the Universe, Walker and Company, New York, 1999, p. 35.

24 The Bad Astronomer website:http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/badastronomy/2010/09/14/geocentrism333 seriously

25 "Does Dark Energy Really Exist?" Scientific American Apr. 2009, p. 48.

26 Max Born, Einstein's Theory of Relativity, 1962, 1965, pp. 344-34

Quotes sourced in 'Geocentricity for Dumskies and Smart Kids' Vol 1 The Science. Robert Sungenis CAI Publishing, Inc. 2019. P. O. Box 278 State Line, Pennsylvania, 17263

BREAKING THE POWER OF SECULARISM

Ouotes from Scientists and Philosophers about a **NON-MOVING Earth**



Physicist, Albert Einstein: "...to the question whether or not the motion of the Earth in space can be made perceptible in terrestrial experiments. We have already remarked that all attempts of this nature led to a negative result."1

Lincoln Barnett (foreword by Albert Einstein): "We can't feel our motion through space, nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the Earth actually is in motion."2

Physicist, Stephen Hawking: "So which is real, the Ptolemaic or Copernican system? Although it is not uncommon for people to say that Copernicus proved Ptolemy wrong, that is not true....one can use either picture as a model of the universe, for our observations of the heavens can be explained by assuming either the earth or the sun to be at Rest." 3

Physicist, Hans Reichenbach: "It makes no sense, accordingly, to speak of a difference in truth between Copernicus and Ptolemy: both conceptions are equally permissible descriptions. What has been considered as the greatest discovery of occidental wisdom, as opposed to that of antiquity, is questioned as to its truth value."5

Physicist, Dennis Sciama: "Whether the Earth rotates once a day from west to east, as Copernicus taught, or the heavens revolve once a day from east to west, as his predecessors believed, the observable phenomena will be exactly the same. This shows a defect in Newtonian dynamics, since an empirical science ought not to contain a metaphysical assumption, which can never be proved or disproved by observation."6

^{1 &}quot;Relativity - The Special and General Theory," cited in Stephen Hawking's, A Stubbornly Persistent Illusion, 2007, p. 169. 2 Lincoln Barnett, The Universe and Dr. Einstein, 2nd rev. ed. 1957, p. 73.

Physicist, I Bernard Cohen: "There is no planetary observation by which we on Earth can prove that the Earth is moving in an orbit around the sun. Thus all Galileo's discoveries with the telescope can be accommodated to the system invented by Tycho Brahe just before Galileo began his observations of the heavens. In this Tychonic system, the planets...move in orbits around the sun, while the sun moves in an orbit around the Earth in a year. Furthermore, the daily rotation of the heavens is communicated to the sun and planets, so that the Earth itself neither rotates nor revolves in an orbit."7

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

*Physicist, Henrick Lorentz: "Briefly, everything occurs as if the Earth were at rest..."*9

Physicist, Wolfgang Pauli: "The failure of the many attempts to measure terrestrially any effects of the earth's motion..."10

Physicist, Henri Poincaré: "We do not have and cannot have any means of discovering whether or not we are carried along in a uniform motion of translation."11

Physicist, Ernst Mach: "Obviously it matters little if we think of the Earth as turning about on its axis, or if we view it at rest while the fixed stars revolve around it. Geometrically these are exactly the same case of a relative rotation of the Earth and the fixed stars with respect to one another." 12

Physicist, Julian B. Barbour: "Thus, even now, three and a half centuries after Galileo's condemnation by the Inquisition, it is still remarkably difficult to say categorically whether the earth moves, and, if so, in what particular sense." 13

Physicist, Albert Einstein: "The struggle, so violent in the early days of science, between the views of Ptolemy and Copernicus would then be quite meaningless. Either coordinate system could be used with equal justification. The two sentences: 'the sun is at rest and the Earth moves,' or 'the sun moves and the Earth is at rest,' would simply mean two different conventions concerning two different coordinate systems."15 **Physicist, Isaac Newton:** "In order for the Earth to be at rest in the centre of the system of the Sun, Planets, and Comets, there is required both universal gravity and another force in addition that acts on all bodies equally according to the quantity of matter in each of them and is equal and opposite to the accelerative gravity with which the Earth tends to the Sun....Since this force is equal and opposite to its gravity toward the Sun, the Earth can truly remain in equilibrium between these two forces and be at rest. And thus celestial bodies can move around the Earth at rest, as in the Tychonic system."16

Science historian, Martin Gardner: "The ancient argument over whether the Earth rotates or the heavens revolve around it (as Aristotle taught) is seen to be no more than an argument over the simplest choice of a frame of reference. Obviously, the most convenient choice is the universe. Nothing except inconvenience prevents us from choosing the Earth as a fixed frame of reference."17

Philosopher, Bertrand Russell: "But in the modern theory the question between Copernicus and his predecessors is merely one of convenience; all motion is relative, and there is no difference between the two statements: 'the earth rotates once a day' and 'the heavens revolve about the Earth once a day.'"18

Astronomer, J. L. E. Dryer: "...the Earth-centered system...is in reality absolutely identical with the system of Copernicus and all computation of the places of the planets are the same for the two systems."19

Physicist, Lawrence Krauss: "But when you look at CMB map, you also see that the structure that is observed, is in fact, in a weird way, correlated with the plane of the earth around the sun. Is this Copernicus coming back to haunt us? That's crazy. We're looking out at the whole universe. There's no way there should be a correlation of structure with our motion of the earth around the sun – the plane of the earth around the sun – the ecliptic. That would say we are truly the center of the universe."20

Physicist, Richard Feynman: "... I suspect that the assumption of uniformity of the universe reflects a prejudice born of a sequence of overthrows of geocentric ideas....It would be embarrassing to find, after stating that we live in an ordinary planet about an ordinary star in an ordinary galaxy, that our place in the universe is extraordinary...To avoid embarrassment we cling to the hypothesis of uniformity."21

Physicist P. C. W. Davies: "...as we see only redshifts whichever direction we look in the sky, the only way in which this could be consistent with a gravitational explanation is if the Earth is situated at the center of an inhomogeneous Universe."22