Anatomy of a Smear Campaign

R. Sungenis: I think it has become painfully obvious that Karl Keating, Mark Shea, and David Palm have become pathologically obsessed and deathly afraid of our movie, The Principle. In all my years as a Catholic, I've never seen such malicious vitriol. It usually comes from atheists and agnostics, but it's sad to see it coming from people who wave the Christian banner. They actually think they are being good Christians by smearing other Christians who have an alternative interpretation of cosmological science (an interpretation that actually backs up the consensus of the Fathers and the two popes who condemned Galileo. Imagine that). Apparently we've hit a raw nerve.

Keating, Shea and Palm believe that any rejection of the popular interpretations of modern science (e.g., Big Bang, evolution, Copernicanism) simply makes the Catholic Church look bad in a modern society that has done a good job of removing itself from anything that has the marks of Catholic traditional teaching.

Since modernist Catholics now live in the age of ecumenism where everyone shakes hands and slaps each other on the back no matter how diverse their respective beliefs, it is simply passé to Keating, Shea and Palm that a Catholic should still be militant against something as popular as modern cosmology. After all, we all talk on cell phones and fly in jets, don't we? What could be wrong with modern science? In fact, one could argue that the inventions of modern science make it much easier for the Catholic Church to communicate the Gospel to the world. What pope previous to our day could have envisioned that Catholic doctrine would be spread to the whole world over the Internet?

In reality, many of the inventions from modern science are based on simple concepts such as a sequence of zeroes and ones that provide us electronic conveniences. Although we greatly enjoy these inventions, one problem they create is to pacify us into accepting anything modern science says about the more esoteric and speculative subjects (such as cosmogony, cosmology, anthropology and paleontology, which have little to do with zeroes and ones and a lot to do with metaphysical and philosophical assumptions) which, by the admission of modern scientists, requires as a prerequisite that they remove God and revelation out of the picture when they formulate their conclusions.

Keating, Shea and Palm are among a group of modern Catholics who have been working for decades, perhaps centuries, to erase the so-called “disaster” that occurred when high-placed Catholic clerics of the 1600s condemned Galileo and his heliocentric universe. Then, when Fr. Lemaitre, the Belgian-born priest who became a top-flight scientist, rubbed shoulders with Albert Einstein and invented what was later dubbed the “Big Bang,” modernist Catholics couldn't bend over fast enough to make their bed with modern cosmology and cosmogony. As
long as Catholics could put the “God did it” label at the beginning of any modern scientific theory (no matter how bizarre the theory was), Catholics could lap it up and continue to sleep tight with modern science. Since they made this concession to modern science, they were then hoping the “embarrassment” from the Galileo affair would soon be forgotten.

In a word, Keating, Shea and Palm have bought into the myth that modern cosmology and cosmogony are virtually infallible in their interpretations of the scientific data. Whatever the reigning icons of modern science say, they swallow it whole. Many of their icons are out-and-out atheists, but that doesn’t matter to these three self-appointed scientific gatekeepers. They are all about accepting the party-line and keeping the status quo. Revolutionary advances in our thinking that actually show the Catholic Church had been right all along about its condemnation of Galileo and heliocentrism is simply too big for them. Small minds can’t think that big.

Of the three, Mark Shea knows the least science, but his rhetoric is the most scurrilous. After sending a tweet to both Lawrence Krauss and Michio Kaku (two of the scientists that appear in our film) telling them that our movie was promoting geocentrism (which it isn’t), on April 10, 2014, Shea ran a piece on his blog titled “Liars for Jesus,” accusing me and the producers of The Principle of the most vulgar and heinous sins. As you read his words, keep in mind that neither Shea nor anyone else has seen The Principle, but somehow they all “know” what it is about (but they are all wrong). Here are Shea’s words:

While Catholics labor to bear honest witness to the Faith, Bob Sungenis and Rick Delano have managed to take their lunatic boutique obsession with geocentric idiocy and create a national splash of scorn for the Church by the venerable technique of Lying for Jesus.

First, Lawrence Krauss makes it clear that he has no idea how he wound up in the film.

Then, poor Kate Mulgrew likewise announces:

“I understand there has been some controversy about my participation in a documentary called THE PRINCIPLE. Let me assure everyone that I completely agree with the eminent physicist Lawrence Krauss, who was himself misrepresented in the film, and who has written a succinct rebuttal in SLATE. I am not a geocentrist, nor am I in any way a proponent of geocentrism. More importantly, I do not subscribe to anything Robert Sungenis has written regarding science and history and, had I known of his involvement, would most certainly have avoided this documentary. I was a voice for hire, and a misinformed one, at that. I apologize for any confusion that my voice on this trailer may have caused. Kate Mulgrew”

Delano releases a long, self-aggrandizing statement, the core of which is to lie that because these people were tricked into signing release statements they were
therefore not lied into believing the film was about something besides geocentrist quackery. But of course, the reality is that absolutely no serious person would have been roped into this bunk without being lied and tricked into it. It will be interesting to see if any of the other people lied into participating will come forward too.

Now Slate, NPR, TIME, Daily Kos and various other outlets have picked up the story and used it for this week’s 15 minute hate themed “Why Christians are Lying Morons”. In this case, there is no reply except, “Guilty as charged”. Good job, guys. And all for a movie that will probably never see the inside of a theatre (unless Delano and Sungenis get their relatives to rent one out for the night). Quite the vanity project.

**R. Sungenis**: Here are the facts:

Michio Kaku agreed to give his views on cosmology in general and the Copernican Principle in particular. He signed a release form specifically stating that the movie was about investigations into the Copernican Principle. He cashed the check that was written from Stellar Motion Pictures to him for that purpose. There was no “clever editing” and Kaku was not made to look like a geocentrist. He espoused his own views in every scene he appeared.

George Ellis agreed to give his views on cosmology in general and the Copernican Principle in particular. He signed a release form specifically stating that the movie was about investigations into the Copernican Principle. Stellar Motion Pictures paid for Ellis’ plane fare from South Africa as payment for his appearance in the movie. As was the case with Kaku, Ellis was not made to look like a geocentrist. He espoused his own views in every scene he appeared. All participants were treated very fairly.

Julian Barbour agreed to give his views on cosmology in general and the Copernican Principle in particular. He signed a release form specifically stating that the movie was about investigations into the Copernican Principle. He was also paid handsomely for his interview and the check was cashed. As was the case with Kaku and Ellis, Barbour was not made to look like a geocentrist. He espoused his own views in every scene he appeared.

Max Tegmark agreed to give his views on cosmology in general and the Copernican Principle in particular. He signed a release form specifically stating that the movie was about investigations into the Copernican Principle. In fact, Tegmark signed an additional contract with Stellar Motion Pictures in order to be a “scientific consultant” for the producer of the film, Rick Delano. Tegmark’s expertise in cosmology was sought regarding what is dubbed “The Axis of Evil,” which is a preferred direction outlined in the universe by the cosmic microwave radiation.

Lawrence Krauss also agreed to be interviewed for the film, which interview took place at Arizona State University where he presently teaches. The interview took five hours and Krauss was paid well for his services. Krauss, perhaps due to the fact that his interview with the producer from Stellar Motion Pictures occurred three years ago at Arizona State University and
may have slipped his memory, is resorting to the party line that the movie is about geocentrism, which is a gross misrepresentation of the film.

The film is fair to all views, particularly Krauss’ view, since he receives the most screen time. Additionally, no clips from other sources were used of Krauss or anyone else who appears in The Principle. All footage came from the five hours Krauss was interviewed by the director.

The film was not “presented” as geocentrism to any of the participants simply because the movie is not about geocentrism, but about whether the Copernican Principle is a valid scientific hypothesis. Five of the ten participants believe the Copernican Principle is the foundation for modern cosmology. The movie was designed to hear and probe that foundation. Each of the five participants were allowed to say anything they thought would support the Copernican Principle.

As for Kate Mulgrew, she was not “duped” into doing the film. She is apparently making such claims at the present time because she was, in actuality, duped by the news media into believing certain falsehoods both about the content of The Principle and the character and work of Robert Sungenis. Mrs. Mulgrew was given the script of The Principle many weeks in advance, and her narration was contingent upon her and her agency’s approval of the script.

Mrs. Mulgrew no more had to subscribe to the views of Robert Sungenis in The Principle than she had to subscribe to the idea that spaceships can travel at warp speed to fulfill her role as Captain Janeway on Star Trek Voyager. Mrs. Mulgrew was hired mainly because of her baritone voice that was needed for the narration, and because her Star Trek persona would help attract people who are interested in scientific investigation.

Mr. Shea continues:

Oh, and for extra fun, Sungenis’ writings about the Holocaust (Summary: “It never happened and besides the Jews deserved it”) are also coming to light along with the geocentrism idiocy and lies.

R. Sungenis: Of course, no diatribe from Mark Shea against Bob Sungenis would be complete without bringing up desperate accusations of anti-semitism and holocaust denial, both of which I categorically deny, but both of which Mark Shea continues to drum beat to keep up the malicious demagoguery. For the record, let me say this as my official statement on this issue:

The Principle, of which I am the executive producer, has nothing to do with the Jewish religion or the Jewish people.
As a Catholic theologian and apologist for the last twenty years, I have critiqued the religious and political positions of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, but that in no way makes me anti-semitic anymore than it makes me anti-Catholic.

Anti-semitism is dictionary defined as an irrational hatred of the Jewish people simply because they are Jewish. On that basis, I am not now nor ever have been anti-semitic.

Some of my past comments regarding the Jews have been taken out of their political or religious context and were never meant to be the basis of personal debate.

For clarification and absolute certainty, I believe the holocaust occurred and it was an awful event against the core of my religious beliefs. Vast numbers of Jews were either wrongly imprisoned or systematically executed, as well as others, including Catholics and Protestants and other people of various ethnic origins and religious beliefs.

Mark Shea continues:

Happily, at least the Daily Kos had the integrity to note that Sungenis' bishop had ordered him to stop using “Catholic” in the name of his website. So there is some recognition that these clowns don’t speak for the Church.

R. Sungenis: My ideological enemies have desperately tried to get as much mileage out of my confrontation with Bishop Rhoades as possible, but the story they tell is distorted for the purpose of discrediting me. The real story regarding the name “Catholic” is as follows.

Catholic Canon Law #216 states: “Since they participate in the mission of the Church, all the Christian faithful have the right to promote or sustain apostolic action even by their own undertakings, according to their own state and condition. Nevertheless, no undertaking is to claim then name ‘Catholic’ without the consent of competent ecclesiastical authority.”

When my apostolate, Catholic Apologetics International, was established in 1993, we did not seek the consent of the bishop to use the name “Catholic” simply because, being new Catholics, we did not even know of Canon 216. At that time we were domiciled under the bishop of Baltimore, MD, and then under the bishop of Arlington, VA. For the next fourteen years (1993 to 2007), the word “Catholic” in the CAI logo was never officially authorized, but no bishop had complained about it.

In 2003, we moved to the Harrisburg, PA, diocese. In 2004, Bishop Rhoades was installed in Harrisburg. In 2007, the bishop and I had a conflict over certain doctrinal issues regarding the Church’s teaching on the status of Jewish people in relation to the Christian faith. The most pressing issue concerned “supersessionism,” that is, whether the Mosaic covenant remains a valid covenant for the Jewish people. I maintained that the Mosaic covenant had been
superseded by the New Covenant and thus was no longer valid, while the vicar general, Fr. William King, who stated that he spoke for Bishop Rhoades and the diocese, maintained the Mosaic covenant was not superseded (which position was confirmed by an email memo that Fr. King had sent out to the priests and deacons of the Harrisburg diocese on July 15, 2008).

Since I was not willing to capitulate on supersessionism (along with ancillary issues, e.g., whether the Jews remained the “Chosen People” and were entitled to the modern land of Palestine), Bishop Rhoades, who personally did not agree with my views, then threatened to enforce Canon 216 against me (NB: Canon 216 requires the bishop’s authorization to use the name “Catholic” for one’s apostolate) unless I removed my views about the Jews from my website.

Since Canon 216 also states that “the Christian faithful have the right to promote or sustain apostolic action even by their own undertakings” and can do so without using the name “Catholic,” I decided to remove the name “Catholic” from my apostolate so that I could continue to teach the truth regarding supersessionism and its ancillary issues. After the removal of the name “Catholic,” the bishop and I had no further communication, most likely because he had no further recourse to curtail my teaching.

In this way, I obeyed the bishop’s enforcement of Canon 216, but also preserved my apostolate, which continues to this day.

In 2008, my view of supersessionism appears to have been vindicated, since the US bishops voted, 243 to 14, in their August 2008 executive session to remove an erroneous sentence from page 131 of the 2006 United States Catholic Catechism for Adults. In advance of the vote, many months prior I had alerted both the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington DC, and the Vatican in Rome, as well as both Bishop Rhoades and Fr. King, that the sentence on page 131 was erroneous. The sentence stated: “Thus the covenant that God made with the Jewish people through Moses remains eternally valid for them.” Supersessionism holds that the Mosaic covenant is no longer valid for the Jews. The overwhelming vote by the US bishops to excise the sentence was then affirmed by the Vatican in 2009 and the Vatican’s decision was sent to the USCCB in the form of an official “recognitio.”

As we can see, the issue is much more complicated than Mark Shea’s version, which is purposely truncated to cast aspersions on me.

Mark Shea continues:

But they still drag the name of Christ into disrepute. I hope that sooner or later the suckers who invested in this project realize what fools they’ve been and demand their money back. But the people who go for this junk tend to hail from among the Reactionaries who see themselves as The Greatest Catholics of All Time and therefore
chalk up their epic failures of discernment to Shadowy Forces Arrayed Against Them such as Jews and Modernists and Neo-Catholics. Never to themselves.

R. Sungenis: As we can see, it never once crossed Mark Shea’s mind that HE could be the one in the wrong for making pernicious judgments about the producers of the film without ever having seen the film or inquiring from us what our side of the story was. Shea merely used the caricature of Bob Sungenis that he has molded over the last decade and hung that out as an effigy for the public to excoriate. To justify his malicious attack, he then goes into even greater depths of calumny by telling the public that our motive for making the film was merely to be seen as “The Greatest Catholics of All Time.” All I can say is that the calumnious sins of Mark Shea reek to high heaven and someone should start praying long and hard for his soul.

Karl Keating, however, appears to be the real mastermind. On his blog a few months ago he made a statement that he was going to contact the Jewish organization B’nai B’rith to enlist them to help stop the theatrical release of The Principle. Several people saw his statement and called us immediately. For some reason, Mr. Keating took down the statement only a few hours later. Perhaps he sensed that in making such a threat his obsession against Bob Sungenis would become clear to all, and they would see that he has been the prime instigator in getting the Jews riled up against me. But perhaps now we know who was behind the media barrage against The Principle that started in mid-April, since many of the news reports accused me of “anti-semitism” and “holocaust denial.”

Mr. Keating’s participation in the smear campaign was further explicated on Mark Shea’s blog of May 29, 2014 in a piece titled: “Karl Keating Does all the Heavy Lifting So I Don’t Have To.” He writes:

Evidently, CMTV has done another puff piece on “The Principle” and Karl Keating, Dave Palm and Yr. Obdt. Svt are fingered as the sinister agents of the Church of Nice out to destroy the Work of God Almighty. Karl responds:

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOT MUCH

For the second time, Bob Sungenis and Rick DeLano appeared on Michael Voris’s “Mic’d Up” program to talk about their film “The Principle.”

DeLano, at his blog, had done his best to hype this evening’s show, but in … his promo he pretty much said what ended up being said on “Mic’d Up”: that the film’s producers had in their possession signed releases from those whose interviews are in the film and that the film has been taken on by a distributor.

I don’t remember anyone claiming that those interviewed, such as Lawrence Krauss and Michio Kaku, hadn’t signed releases, so that always was a non-issue. Krauss claimed a lack of memory of having been filmed, but a clip shown by DeLano on “Mic’d Up” made it clear that Krauss was aware that he was on camera.
What wasn’t made clear tonight—and apparently it wasn’t made clear to Krauss or Kaku prior to the interviews—was the undergirding argument of “The Principle,” that geocentrism is true.

The real issue never was whether those interviewed had signed releases but whether they had been told what the film was intended to argue toward. Nothing in tonight’s program would lead one to believe that Sungenis and DeLano had been up front with the interviewees.

(The signed releases were shown on screen, to prove the interviewees had been paid for their time. The amounts paid were redacted except in one case, where the release showed that the interviewee was paid $1,500.)

R. Sungenis: This is one of Mr. Keating’s typical strawman arguments. Mr. Keating hasn’t seen The Principle, yet somehow he “knows” it is a movie about geocentrism. No, Mr. Keating, it is not. The movie is about challenging the Copernican Principle, which is the foundational presupposition for modern cosmology. Five of the world’s top cosmologists are interviewed to give their views on the recent scientific challenges to the Copernican Principle – challenges that are admitted by the very high-scholarly publications that these men write for. Some of these challenges include the 2001 WMAP and 2009 Planck probes of the CMB, in addition to the 2005 SDSS survey of galaxies, as well as the inability of modern cosmology to find empirical evidence of Dark Energy, Dark Matter, and Inflation. We then interview alternative cosmological views to see if they have a better answer to these same challenges. We interview two galactocentrists, three geocentrists, and one heliocentric anti-Relativist, in order to cover the gamut of views available. All views are presented fairly and accurately and the audience is allowed to make up its own mind as to which view or views has the better answer. Of course, since Mr. Keating is on a witch hunt to knock anything “centric” out of the running due to his devotion to Evolution and the Big Bang, it makes good press to cast The Principle as a biased and “jam it down your throat” treatise on geocentrism.

Keating: As in the earlier edition of “Mic’d Up,” Bob Sungenis said very little. Most of the words came from DeLano, secondly from Voris.

The two of them posited the existence of a concerted effort by what Voris has dubbed “the Church of Nice” to undercut the film. Three people were named as ringleaders: Mark Shea, David Palm, and me. My name was mentioned just once in passing;* more or less the same for David Palm’s. But Mark Shea got considerable attention.

DeLano showed on screen a tweet that Shea had made on Krauss’s Twitter feed in which Shea asked Krauss whether he knew that “The Principle” actually was made by people backing geocentrism. In DeLano’s opinion, it was this query from Shea that made Krauss—and later the film’s narrator Kate Mulgrew—go public against the film.
Considerable time was spent on promoting the idea that Shea, Palm, and I have been trying to undercut the film by claiming it promotes anti-Semitism. This was an argument Voris repeatedly made, but none of us ever alleged anything of the kind about the film. We never have said or even implied that there is a hint of anti-Semitism in the film. We presume there isn’t.

What we have said—repeatedly, over many years—is that Bob Sungenis wrote many dozens of articles, at his website and elsewhere, against Jews, accusing them of being responsible for manifold political, social, and cultural evils. For instance, he argued that Jews were responsible for the destruction of the Twin Towers.

I more than once noted that Sungenis seemed obsessed with Jews and that he freely and uncritically reproduced statements that placed Jews in a bad light—going even so far as to quote a high Nazi official against the Jews.

On tonight’s program Sungenis didn’t refer to any of his tens of thousands of words written against Jews. He just claimed that in his writings he criticized Catholics twice as often as he criticized Jews. No doubt a word count of the articles that appeared at his website would show that this is a grotesque exaggeration.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice how Keating throws out these seeming facts that are nothing more than his personal views. He’s never done a word-count, but wants to leave the impression that my critiques of the Jews was an “obsession” nevertheless. What’s more to the point is that I removed all the “tens of thousands of words written against the Jews” from my website over a year ago, and Mr. Keating knows this. I stated that I have no more interest or conviction about any of the political issues dealing with the Jews. I stated that I had a new vision about my purpose and my work. Mr. Keating ignored all of this. He was determined to burn me at the stake.

Here is the real kicker. Not only did he state on his own blog just a few months ago that he was going to enlist the services of B’nai B’rith to stop The Principle from being released (which he subsequently took down, but not before two witnesses saw it), but since he couldn’t get to my old articles from my website, he and David Palm went to the Internet Archives which stores material from all websites, even after I protested that such mining of my work was malicious and unchristian since I no longer wanted to delve into those political issues. My next step, of course, was to deactivate the Internet Archive of my articles, since it was obvious that Keating and Palm wanted to continue their witch hunt no matter how I tried to reason with them.

**Keating:** A puzzler: Voris said that he didn’t know Mark Shea. Strange. They had a public debate at the Argument of the Month Club in St. Paul last October. Hundreds of people were in attendance. Has Voris forgotten that encounter already?

At the end of the program Sungenis and DeLano announced that “The Principle” would have its theatrical release on September 9. It will be shown, apparently, at one theater in
one (unnamed) “major city.” The distribution is being handled by Rocky Mountain Pictures.

According to the website Box Office Mojo, this two-man organization has promoted 24 indie films. Five of them grossed more than a million dollars, the two best known being “2016: Obama’s America” ($33.4 million) and “Expelled” ($7.7 million). But 12 of the films brought in less than $100,000, the least bringing in $2,000.

The two big-grossers had famous names (Dinesh D’Souza and Ben Stein, respectively), which no doubt accounted for much of their box-office success. “The Principle” features no one of comparable fame.

Of the 24 films handled by Rocky Mountain Pictures, 15 appeared in 30 or fewer theaters—hardly enough to cover costs of production.

Box Office Mojo lists the production budget of only two of the 24 films. “The End of the Spear” brought in $12 million and cost $10 to produce, so it made a profit. “Atlas Shrugged: Part I” brought in $4.6 million but cost $20 million, so it had a big loss—surprising, perhaps, for a film based on a best-selling novel.

R. Sungenis: It’s easy to see what Mr. Keating is trying to do. He is now trying to discredit or cast suspicions on even the companies with which we do business. It’s obvious that the only one who is “obsessed” is Karl Keating.

Keating: What can one expect for a documentary based, if it’s based on anything, on the non-seller** “Galileo Was Wrong”?

R. Sungenis: Notice that Keating is now adding to his previous accusation that “the undergirding argument of The Principle, [is] that geocentrism is true” by now saying that it is “based on... Galileo Was Wrong.” We need not repeat here why Mr. Keating is wrong. What we will say is that on his blog a few weeks ago, Mr. Keating stated that the sales of my book, Galileo Was Wrong, was one of the worst in Amazon’s history, since it was 7.8 millionth in books sold by Amazon (which you will see in his comments below). This, unlike anything else, will show you how devious and unchristian Mr. Keating is. The 7.8 million calculation comes from someone who pirated my book and is trying to sell it on Amazon for $295.00. Obviously, no one in their right mind is going to buy a book for that much money.

The kicker here is that I wrote a letter to Mr. Keating many months ago when he tried the same trick. At that time the same $295.00 book was in the 6.1 million range on Amazon. I told Keating in the letter that he was misrepresenting the popularity of my book by his referencing of the pirated book. Keating ignored my facts and instead tried the same tactic on his blog a few weeks ago, using the 7.8 million figure. [If he contests this, then I will show the letter I wrote to him for public viewing]. Obviously, he wants everyone to think that Galileo Was Wrong is a very poor seller, since he wants to dissuade people from geocentrism (but he doesn’t have the guts
to debate me in public on the issue, since he has refused to do so). At the least, we know what Mr. Keating’s motives are. Unfortunately, we see that he has stooped to using sinful tactics to advance his beliefs instead of being fair and honest.

Up until about a week ago, we weren’t selling the Galileo Was Wrong books on Amazon. The only thing for sale was the CDROM of Galileo Was Wrong, but Mr. Keating didn’t cite the sales numbers on it. Why? Because it was in the low hundred thousands – where many of his own books rate. Interestingly enough, our new book, Geocentrism 101 had a rating of 22,000 a few weeks ago, which means that it was the 22,000th most popular book on Amazon. It also was the 39th most popular book on cosmology, right next to Stephen Hawking’s book, A Brief History of Time. In addition, our CDROM had a rating of 49,000 at around the same time.

Keating: The bottom line is that Sungenis and DeLano didn’t announced what, months ago, they promised to announce: Opening night in multiple cities with a major distributor handling their film. Rocky Mountain Pictures is a small outfit, and “The Principle” will open in just one city, presumably at just one theater. It will have to do very well there to go on the road.

R. Sungenis: We never “announced” that we would definitely open in multiple cities. We were certainly striving for that kind of opening, but we made no official press release or committment. Leave it to Karl Keating to make it sound as if we were reneging on our word.

Keating: (*I think my name was mentioned just once. The sound was off during a good portion of the program–there was a glitch at the studio–so it’s possible I was referred to more than once.)

(“Galileo Was Wrong” has an Amazon best-sellers rank of 7,874,135 among books.)

R. Sungenis: And thus you see the proof from Keating’s own mouth as to the figure he used to make it appear as if Galileo Was Wrong isn’t selling. In fact, of all the 20 books I have written, GWW is by far our best seller.

While I’m on the subject of Karl Keating, he continues to take his vicious pot shots at me on his blog, this time accusing me of being a “fraud.” Below are his remarks and my response to them:

Response to Karl Keating’s Remarks:

Keating: Quite some time ago, at Catholic Answers Forums, I wrote about whether we have to be agnostic about whether the Earth orbits the Sun or the Sun the Earth. I was responding to a claim by Bob Sungenis, who has written that, if we can work up an equation that explains how A orbits B, then we equally can work up an equation that shows how B orbits A. That's fine, I said, until we try to apply those equations to real-life situations. Either equation may account for apparent motion, but only one will take into account gravity. When you do that—that is, when you go beyond mere math and into physics--then only the equation that explains how the Earth orbits the Sun works. My comment was the impetus for a long refutation of Sungenis’s ideas by
Alec MacAndrew, a physicist. Sungenis, who is innocent of physics, now has given a long reply to MacAndrew. A friend brought the reply to my attention. He thought I would be interested because my name appears in it. It does: 22 times, mostly in passing. Early on, Sungenis writes, "It appears that MacAndrew has been hired to answer for Keating." Hired by whom? Not by me--I don't even know MacAndrew--and not by David Palm, at whose website, Geocentrism Debunked, the MacAndrew essay appears.

R. Sungenis: Perhaps Mr. Keating didn't “hire” MacAndrew, but that means David Palm did. For clarification, “hire” here means that Palm enlisted the services of MacAndrew to rebut my critique of Keating’s above assertion that “Either equation may account for apparent motion, but only one will take into account gravity.” As for Mr. Keating’s comment: “Sungenis, who is innocent of physics,” this shows that Mr. Keating can’t be trusted with the facts. He knows that I have said many times I was a physics major in college. Further, my book, *Galileo Was Wrong*, explains the physics behind geocentrism and cites reputable physicists to back up what I claim. Mr. Keating may disagree with my claims, but it doesn’t mean I am “innocent of physics,” whatever Mr. Keating is trying to imply by that obscure description.

Keating: Sungenis says, "Keating and Palm are Catholic, but know very little science. MacAndrew has a Ph.D. in physics, but is an avowed atheist." As I said, I don’t know MacAndrew; perhaps he is an atheist. His irreligion might have impelled him to tackle Sungenis's arguments, but MacAndrew's essay is entirely in terms of physics, not of metaphysics or theology.

R. Sungenis: It behooves Mr. Keating to know the philosophical disposition of those he is depending upon to discredit geocentrism. If he doesn’t, then he is either naïve or trying to cover the fact that atheism drives current cosmology and cosmogony. Modern science has admitted a long time ago that their interpretation of the scientific date necessarily excludes God. Nevertheless, after the marching orders are given by the atheists, theists of Mr. Keating’s persuasion (add, Fr. Spitzer, Fr. Baron, et al) try to make atheistic science palatable to the modern mind by merely adding that “God planned it that way.” It’s easy to put “God” in front of the equations that atheistic science spits out, but it neither agrees with Scripture or Tradition, or even science, for that matter, since most scientists disagree on the details. Moreover, the atheists don’t like when the theists do such things. If you get MacAndrew to debate Keating or Palm on whether “God did it,” MacAndrew will repudiate it. But Keating and Palm insist on it because they don’t want the Church to be “embarrassed” in the face of popular science.

Keating: Sungenis has no degree in science--not a Ph.D. and not even a bachelor's degree--but he thinks it necessary to discredit my knowledge of science. (He would have much difficulty in saying that MacAndrew, with a Ph.D. in physics, knows nothing about physics.)

R. Sungenis: I didn’t “discredit” Mr. Keating’s knowledge of science. I merely said he knows little science, and that can be gleaned both by the way Keating talks about science and the little time he spends writing about it and researching it, both in cosmology and cosmogony. It is obvious
that Mr. Keating ventured into discussing cosmology just a few years ago. He was sent a copy of *Galileo Was Wrong* many years ago. When a couple of years later I asked him if he had read it, he excused himself from reading it due to the “long reading list” he had to finish first. The fact is, Mr. Keating accepts modern cosmology and cosmogony wholesale without any critical thinking. The fact that he doesn't even consider that someone's atheism will have a profound effect on whether that person is capable of giving an unbiased interpretation of the scientific data and any credence to geocentrism shows that Mr. Keating doesn't realize how deep the water really is. For the record, I don't need a “degree” in physics in order to know the physics. In today's Scientism (as opposed to real Science), a degree in physics often means that you have been indoctrinated by the reigning powers of atheism. It means you can publish papers creating all kinds of unproven and bizarre concepts in order to keep the reigning atheistic paradigm viable in the minds of the public (e.g., Inflation, Dark Matter, Dark Energy, Multiverses, etc.).

Keating: Sungenis writes: "Karl Keating knows nothing about dynamics or coordinate transforms. All he knows is what he has been taught by the science textbooks in high school." This is an interesting example of fantasizing, since Sungenis knows full well what I have written in reply to him before about my educational background. I'll repeat that here, so you can judge whether his characterization of me in the preceding paragraph is correct. Of course I had some science in high school—didn't we all?—but that wasn't where my science education ended. My undergraduate work was done at the San Diego campus of the University of California. At the time it had three constituent colleges. I was resident and registered in Revelle College, which was the science school. It boasted half a dozen Nobel Prize laureates. With MIT and CalTech, UCSD was one of the three top schools for math in the country. I was a math major. It was a requirement to take a lot of hard science courses, particularly physics. One such course was directly on point regarding Sungenis's hobbyhorse, geocentrism. The course was a mathematical investigation of the Ptolemaic theory and the geocentric theories that flowed from it. We used the actual ancient data and worked through complex equations to see whether, with ever finer data, the geocentric theory "saved the appearances." (The answer was No.)

R. Sungenis: This only shows that Mr. Keating doesn't know the science as much as he thinks he knows it, or that he has uncritically accepted the status quo without researching other qualified sources that say just the opposite of his firm “No.” To find these sources, all Mr. Keating need do is crack open *Galileo Was Wrong*. Take, for example, Julian Barbour, a world class physicist whom we quote extensively in *Galileo Was Wrong*. I would suggest Mr. Keating read Barbour’s book, *Absolute or Relative Motion*, one of the most mathematically rigorous treatises on ancient and modern cosmology available today. Barbour has the highest praise for Ptolemy’s model, especially Ptolemy's invention of the Equant to do precisely what Mr. Keating denies – that he “saved the appearances.” The only appearances that Ptolemy didn't save were the phases of Venus, but that is because he didn't know the distances to the planets. But, because of that acknowledged lacuna, he left six variables in his model so that it could be adjusted to account for Venus. This was eventually done by Tycho Brahe who put Venus and Mercury in the right
places, and Riccioli then added elliptical orbits to Brahe's model to match, movement for movement, the reigning heliocentric model invented by Kepler. So, again, Mr. Keating's “No” only shows that he hasn't really studied these issues in the depth he is claiming above, or, at the least, he has uncritically accepted the sources that have made the “No” claims and is just parroting them.

**Keating:** The professor for that course was Curtis Wilson, then and now considered to be the top American expert on Kepler and his theories. It would not have been possible to take such a course from a more knowledgeable man. (So impressed was I by Wilson's course that I have retained his course materials—mainly mimeographed sheets—for more than four decades.)

**R. Sungenis:** Anytime Mr. Keating would like to send those “course materials” to me for critical review, I will be happy to do so. Incidentally, one of the issues Mr. Keating and I discussed many years back was the Lorentz transformations. Mr. Keating was proud of the fact that he “went through the derivation of the Lorentz transforms.” What Mr. Keating wasn't willing to admit is that the Lorentz transform was an *ad hoc* invention by Lorentz to have at least some answer to the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment that showed the Earth wasn't moving through space. This is just another case in which Mr. Keating accepts, uncritically, whatever popular science tells him. That he won't even entertain the idea that the Lorentz transform was invented merely to preserve the Copernican status of the modern Zeitgeist and to keep the Church’s decision against Galileo as a serious mistake, shows where Mr. Keating is coming from. If he were a serious scientist, he would reexamine the origin and reason for the Lorentz transform, which is precisely what he will find if he reads Galileo Was Wrong.

**Keating:** Back in those days, I could do the calculus. I can't today, having been away from it for too long. But I can spot a mathematics fraud, especially one as blatant as Sungenis. For one thing, he has no sense of what calculus is. He says, "Calculus is really nothing more than a hypersensitive arithmetic." All one can do when coming upon such a comment is to shakes one's head. You might as well say that the Pieta is nothing more than a hypersensitive clay model done by a child.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice Mr. Keating doesn't explain why he doesn't accept that “calculus is really nothing more than a hypersensitive arithmetic” or even quote the rest of my explanation for clarification. He got his sound bite, and that is all he needs. Mr. Keating doesn't really know what I mean by “hypersensitive” and chooses not to ask, but nevertheless can't help himself in the calumny of calling me a “blatant mathematical fraud.” Such Christian charity. I also had calculus in college, being a physics major. I know what I'm talking about. Like Keating, my calculus may be a little rusty, but I don't follow it up by claiming Mr. Keating is a “mathematical fraud” just because he no longer is up to speed on the calculus.

**Keating:** If you have a decent science or math background and read through Sungenis's rebuttal to MacAndrew, it becomes clear that Sungenis simply can't do the math.
**R. Sungenis:** Notice Mr. Keating gives no examples to prove his point. It’s easier just to throw out accusations, since Keating knows the average reader can’t check up on whether his assertion is correct or not.

**Keating:** He refutes MacAndrew by calling him an atheist.

**R. Sungenis:** Again, Mr. Keating can’t be trusted with the facts. The truth is that I refute MacAndrew by going through each of his physical and mathematical assertions. That is why the rebuttal is over 60 pages long. In that critique, we discover that MacAndrew admits that both Machian and Einsteinian physics supports geocentrism, but he then tries his best to make Newtonian physics deny geocentrism. He fails in this attempt, because he distorts the derivation and meaning of the “center of mass.” If Mr. Keating would like to talk about THAT aspect of my paper, let’s do so. The paper can be found at:


In reading it, it will be easy to notice that I begin my critique by pointing out to the audience that MacAndrew’s atheism influences how he views geocentric cosmology in general – something Keating should have done but refuses to do.

**Keating:** He refutes me by claiming my science education ended in high school.

**R. Sungenis:** Again, Mr. Keating can’t be trusted with the facts. I refuted Keating by a long rebuttal to his arguments. One can find it at [http://galileowaswrong.com/karl-keatings-scientific-attempt-to-debunk-geocentrism](http://galileowaswrong.com/karl-keatings-scientific-attempt-to-debunk-geocentrism). It is 23 pages long. I merely added the fact that Keating’s science background is at the high school level and that he refuses to look critically at the claims of popular cosmology and cosmogony.

**Keating:** It’s bizarre but understandable. What else can he do, having no competence in math or science himself?

**R. Sungenis:** If I have “no competence in math or science” than why did about a dozen Ph.D. physicists and Ph.D mathematicians, in the opening pages of *Galileo Was Wrong*, praise it for being the best treatise on geocentrism that has been written to date? Why is it that the only criticisms of me having “no competence” are from Keating’s side of the fence? Still, if Mr. Keating wants to verify his suspicions, let’s settle this once and for all. I’ve asked Mr. Keating before and I’ll ask him again. Let’s have a formal and public debate on the topic of geocentrism. He can take one podium, I’ll take the other, and we will secure an unbiased moderator. I’m growing quite tired of Mr. Keating hiding behind his blog and Facebook page to take his pot shots.

**David Palm:** I am unaware of a single physicist in a prominent position teaching astronomical sciences who holds to strict geocentrism, viz. that the entire universe revolves around a stationary earth once every twenty-four hours. Do you know any? If not, shouldn't that say something about the viability of the view scientifically? They're not all atheists, you know, there
are many physicists of faith. And they don't reject strict geocentrism because they've been
hookwinked by some atheistic conspiracy. They reject it because scientifically-speaking it's a
massive exercise in special pleading.

**R. Sungenis:** What Mr. Palm doesn't know or doesn't reveal is that any scientist today who
believes in either Machian or Einsteinian physics allows for geocentrism. They may not put their
names on websites or books advocating geocentrism, but they acknowledge it as a viable
consequence of their physics. Additionally, there are many prominent physicists who publically
acknowledge the viability of geocentrism, but also state that they do not prefer it due to their
philosophical presuppositions. Here are two good examples.

**George F. R. Ellis,** probably the premier physicist in the world today:

“I can construct [for] you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its center, and you
cannot disprove it based on observations. You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds. In
my view there is absolutely nothing wrong in that. What I want to bring into the open is the fact
that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide
No. 4, p. 55).

**Stephen Hawking:** probably the most popular physicist today:

“Now at first sight, all this evidence that the universe looks the same whichever direction we
look might seem to suggest there is something special about our place in the universe. In
particular, it might seem that if we observe all other galaxies to be moving away from us, then
we must be at the center of the universe. There is, however, an alternate explanation [to a
central Earth]: the universe might look the same in every direction as seen from any other
galaxy, too. This, as we have seen, was Friedmann’s second assumption. We have no scientific
evidence for, or against, this assumption. We believe it only on grounds of modesty: it would be
most remarkable if the universe looked the same in every direction around us, but not around
other points in the universe.” (A Brief History of Time, 1988, p. 42).

**Karl Keating:** I've seen Bob's book, and, yes, it has equations in it. He credits his co-author with
the most equation-intensive parts of the book, but I don't think Bob actually understands most
of the math, no matter which part of the book it's in. He cuts and pastes from others but gives
no indication that he can "do" the math himself. He leaves readers with an impression that he
can take pencil and paper and work through differential equations and the like, but I see nothing
in the book that suggests he can.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice how Mr. Keating keeps playing the guessing-game attack, e.g., “but I don’t
THINK Bob actually understands most of the math.” Obviously, Karl doesn't know anything
about what I know about math because he's never spoken with me about it. But for Karl
Keating, who is on a witch hunt to destroy the reputation of Bob Sungenis, a good old-fashioned
guess is as good as a fact. And notice how he phrases his words: “I don't think Bob actually
understands MOST of the math.” That's very clever. Keating leaves himself an out just in case he finds out that I do know the math that he thought I didn’t know.

**Karl Keating:** Bob doesn't appreciate that a Modernist (capital T) is different from a modernist (lowercase t). The former term refers to a theological stance of about a century ago. The latter term is used more broadly, particularly in literature. You could say that T. S. Eliot was a modernist, but he wasn't a Modernist. When Bob calls someone a "modernist," it just means "I don't like this guy." Coming from him, the epithet has no force.

**R. Sungenis:** Once again, we see the guessing-game attack. One accusation is just as good as another, as far as Mr. Keating is concerned. But will Mr. Keating actually come out from under his keyboard and face me in a debate? He likes to hide behind his keyboard and throw stones, especially when he has the power to delete someone by a finger push, as he did to Rick Delano months ago and has never restored him. For the record, let me clarify what a “modernist” is. Among other things, today it is one who has imbibed the idea that Scripture has errors when it speaks about anything other than salvation. The early Catholic Modernists began to teach this heretical doctrine of limited inerrancy in the late 1800s due to the influence from Darwin's evolution theory. Today's “modernists” do the same, especially after they got hold of Vatican II’s *Dei Verbum* 11, from which they tried to twist its words (“for the sake of our salvation”) to agree with the idea that Scripture is only inerrant when it speaks about salvation. But it doesn't say any such thing, and the Church never taught such a doctrine. But Mr. Keating teaches it, and thus he is a modernist.

While we are on the subject, allow me to quote from Bill S. Preston who posted on Mr. Keating’s blog (or Facebook page):

**Bill S Preston Esqwire:** First I want to stress here that I am a sinner, and someone attempting to be a decent catecumen, as im studying to be Catholic. Now that I've got that it of the way. I just don't get these passive aggressive attacks on people, Karl. Instead of having a decent argument and dialogue with folks that subscribe to traditional parts of our wonderful faith that differ from yours you continue to passive dog whistle statements to activate those that appear to have either personal hate or mental illness. Last I checked, there wasn't a condemnation of geocentrism, so why continue to beat up on Bob Sungenis? Aren't you really just hoping for someone like Mark Shea to show up and bash him for questionable past statements, whereby your main attempt of character assassination gets fulfilled by someone else? Again, your hands stay somewhat clean. I really wish you could go back to your good work of mopping up on protestant errors, like Pentecostal movements, Baptists, non denominational errors and the like. I greatly enjoyed Catholicism and Fundamentalism and this book was a classic, but there's no doubt you have personally taken a different trajectory of late, going after fellow Catholics, with borderline obsessive ways and means. As everyone knows, there are some bad apples in the bunch (I'm NOT stating Bob is one, btw) but this scandal being caused by harming the body of Christ's church is wrong. You are also encouraging behavior that would get one instantly banned from your Catholic Answers forums. I suggest you check your motives, and decide
whether these personal attacks, or open doorways for frothingly calumnous usual suspects (ie Mark Shea and is exceedingly harsh attacks on anybody not practicing his misguided version of catholicism.

R. Sungenis: Keating responded to Mr. Preston as follows:

Karl Keating: You want me to go back to my "good work of mopping up on Protestant errors," but you object to me (and to others) "mopping up" on Catholic errors—or, at least, on Catholics who promote error. I suspect you wouldn't mind if we critiqued liberal Catholics and their errors, but we're not supposed to critique Catholics who cause scandal by claiming the Church mandates a belief in geocentrism or Catholics who engage in relentless anti-Semitism, which is even more scandalous.

R. Sungenis: Even though I disagree with Mr. Keating’s open-ended definition of anti-semitism, nevertheless, it is now a well-known fact that I took down all my writings about Jewish issues from our website more than a year ago. I stated that I had no more interest and no more conviction about these political issues, and would not revisit them again. But that wasn’t good enough for Mr. Keating’s witch hunt aspirations. He needed to keep beating the drum of anti-semitism because it works so well in the past (as we saw with the media barrage in April 2014 in which those against geocentrism fought it by accusing me of anti-semitism and holocaust denial).

So what did he and Mr. Palm do now that they couldn’t go to my website to get their fodder? They went to the Wayback Machine, or what is better known as Internet Archives, which stores past articles from all websites. They then presented these to the public as evidence of my so-called “anti-semitism.” Mr. Palm did so even after I warned him in several email exchanges that his act was malicious and unchristian. Mr. Keating recently tried to do the same when he was challenged by a woman on his own blog for evidence of his “anti-semitic” charges. Since Mr. Keating and Mr. Palm wanted to continue their witch hunt, I had no choice but to deactivate the Internet Archives from being able to get those old articles. But even though Keating and Palm can’t get them anymore, they continue to beat the drum of anti-semitism against me, no matter what I do to accommodate them and no matter how many times I state that I am not anti-semitic.

As for Mr. Keating wanting to “critique Catholics,” he can do so all he wants. I only ask that he come out from behind his keyboard and face me like a man, in a public and formal debate. If Mr. Keating really wants to “critique Catholics,” there is no better way than to confront your opponent face to face and allow him to defend himself in the face of the charges. I would also ask that he stop the calumny against me, as is evident from the guessing-game he played above concerning my knowledge and my motives. I hope Mr. Keating doesn’t do what he did in the past, which is to shrug off my challenge and make some flimsy excuse for not engaging in a public debate.
Back to Mark Shea:

**Mark Shea:** Actually John Farrell did most of the heavy lifting bringing it to Krauss’ attention, since he seems to know the guy a bit. I don’t know the man, so he never responded to me. I am quite happy to acknowledge that I did what I could to make sure that the people who got lied into participating in it were alerted to the lie (which wasn’t much on my part) and that viewers were warned that it is out and out quackery.

**R. Sungenis:** Shea continues the calumny with total disregard for the reputations he is damaging. No one was “lied to.” The problem, as we have seen earlier, is that Mr. Shea is working off his own perception as to what *The Principle* is about without ever having seen the film. The only one who is being “lied to” is you, the public, and you are being “lied to” by Mark Shea.

**Shea:** I’m also happy to acknowledge that I was critical of CMTV for throwing Sungenis softballs and never questioning his history of nutty Jew-hating commentary (a pattern repeated here). But again, much of the heavy lifting in chronicling Sungenis’ Jew-hating work was done by the redoubtable Karl Keating, whom I am proud to call a friend. I did do what I could to make sure that people were forewarned what an incredibly dodgy and discreditable thing it was to back this piece of junk, but I don’t think I did all that much. I wish I could have done more, but I didn’t want to draw more attention to this project than was necessary.

**R. Sungenis:** I don’t hate the Jews. I love the Jews, and I wish the best for them. I despise people like Mark Shea who pose as good Catholics, but are not.

Lastly, there is David Palm. I have already answered Mr. Palm’s historical and theological objections in the eight-part series “Debunking David Palm.” This is my final installment on those issues.

Mr. Palm begins:

**Some Background on the New Geocentrists**

The new geocentrists and their supporters commonly embrace a range of conspiracy theories, from 911-Trutherism, to lunar landing denial, to holocaust denial/revisionism.

**R. Sungenis:** So we see immediately the tactic Mr. Palm will employ. It is to lead the reader to think that someone who espouses geocentrism as a viable scientific answer to the cosmological data is a “conspiracy theorist.” Why? Because in our modern society, anyone who questions, doubts, or simply doesn’t believe the party-line (which is often limited to the “official government story”) is marginalized and given a derogatory label. We all have seen the
psychologically unstable street dweller in shabby clothes who yells out vulgar epithets against the government and society. The image of a crazed human being is what sticks in our mind. This is the kind of image David Palm is seeking to create in your mind against me.

Why? Because it is very effective, at least for people who read it in docility and do not think for themselves. Moreover, it is a safe place for Mr. Palm to be. If you want to win an intellectual battle against someone else, one of the best chances of looking normal is to state that you completely accept the majority opinion or “official story.” For you know that if you begin questioning the “official story,” no matter how slight, you open yourself up to being marginalized as a “conspiracy theorist,” as if he is against the reigning powers, and is more or less, a vigilante or even a traitor.

But here’s the rub. It is a deadly sin. And Mr. Palm is guilty of it.

It is a deadly sin for several reasons.

First, it is a tactic commonly called “thought-control.” This is an insidious but highly effective attack that, without proof that the challenging view is incorrect or implausible, seeks to eliminate it from even being considered. It is often used when the perpetrator knows his view is equivocal, but seeks to maintain it because he realizes he will lose his status, his authority, or even his money, if he were to admit that his challenger may have a legitimate argument. Instead of having a debate about the issue to determine who has the truth, the opponent simply tries to shut the challenger down.

If the challenger happens to keep talking, the opponent implements the next tactic – make whatever he says appear as deranged as possible. The “conspiracy theorist” label works quite well in such cases, since we all know the image of the derelict who walks the streets muttering various conspiracy theories. In either case, the tactic is to control thought. This is the tactic of David Palm.

At the same time, the opponent exempts himself from having to prove, or even possess convincing evidence, that his view is correct and the challenger’s is wrong. Hence, the opponent will refrain from entering a debate of the issues he complains about, but without such a debate, it is an egregious evil to exploit someone’s misgivings about the party-line version of a high-profile issue, which is precisely what David Palm does.

If there is sufficient evidence that the party-line interpretation is suspected by many and varied experts and authorities not to have the ring of truth, why would we not want to at least listen to what they have to say? After all, they are experts in their field. They do it for a living and people pay them for their opinions. The only reason someone would not want to listen to or debate them is for fear that they would show convincing evidence of their case, which is what I suspect of David Palm.
Let’s see what else Mr. Palm has to say:

**Mr. Palm:** Is it just *ad hominem* or guilt by association to point this out? Not at all. The point is to illustrate how these individuals think, how they evaluate evidence, how they fundamentally perceive reality. In short, it goes straight to the question of credibility.

**R. Sungenis:** So we see that Mr. Palm is trying to convince himself that guilt by association isn’t really guilt by association. Mr. Palm believes that if someone has a different interpretation of an historical event than he does, then it’s time to marginalize his challenger’s irrational “thinking” and attack how they “fundamentally perceive reality.” In other words, Mr. Palm will give no thought to the possibility that his challenger might actually have a credible case, for that just might expose Mr. Palm’s position as being the most dubious. So in order to win the public relations battle, Mr. Palm desires to make his challenger into a prime candidate for an insane asylum. In short, if you question the party-line, then you’re a nut who needs to be silenced or put away, and your “credibility” needs to be destroyed.

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm:** Most people don’t have the time or energy to sift through lengthy and elaborate theories. At some point, it’s reasonable that it comes down to who is credible and who is not. So, take a look at some of the prominent new geocentrist and judge for yourself. Does the background, expertise, and judgment of these individuals fill you with the sort of confidence and trust that would lead you to reject virtually all of the scientific community on matters of science and believe them instead?

**R. Sungenis:** So let’s turn the tables and ask the same thing of Mr. Palm’s “expertise” in handling various controversial issues. For example, in the weeks leading up to the year 2000, Mr. Palm went on EWTN to proclaim that he thought all our computers would come crashing down because they weren’t prepared to accept a change from a two-digit calendar to four-digit calendar. The glitch was touted as the biggest mistake that computer programmers had ever made. Some were even calling it a “conspiracy” by the US government. Nothing happened, of course, and thus Mr. Palm’s national alarm was false.

Be that as it may, let’s take a closer look at what might be described as Mr. Palm’s acute conspiratorial mentality in the midst of Y2K and other controversial issues of the day. The website [http://www.kshay.com/teaki/onthisday/1999/04/27/](http://www.kshay.com/teaki/onthisday/1999/04/27/) contains an interview of David Palm talking about Y2K and other events.

April 27, 1999 Permalink

I do think that the chances of a total meltdown are less now than they were 1 year ago. My family has been preparing for the worst and I don’t regret that one bit. One can
only react to the information one has at the present time. Why regret having to change one’s outlook based on new information?

But I do still think there’s a less-than-trivial chance of things going Infomagic; it’s just that my estimation of that chance has decreased. Some months ago I fully expected it to be “lights out” nationwide with the attendant catastrophe and I think that based on the evidence at hand that was a very reasonable outlook, no apologies to those who were Polly’s back then. Now it appears that there’s less chance of that. Good. Great!!!

That being said, I still agree 100% with Ed Yourdon that we’re probably facing “one year of disruptions, ten years of depression.” That’s still pretty much my best case. Not so good. And well worth some serious preparations. Will that destabilize our population or global dynamics enough to trigger war and hence a slide into Infomagic? Possibly. Again, well worth preparing for.

IMO we live in the most dangerous times since the Cuban Missile Crisis. I have seen people on this forum scoff at those who built bomb shelters back then. Balderdash! Those people were prudent. So what if they were wrong? They acted reasonably in the face of what we know now was an greater threat than even they imagined at the time. So it is now.

With all my preparations, I just hope I don’t have the last laugh.

—David Palm, Time Bomb 2000 Forums (LUSENET), 04/27/99

R. Sungenis: Here Palm shows a mentality similar to the conspiracy theorists he decries. He speaks of us “living in the most dangerous times.” He speaks of the “Cuban Missile Crisis” (which we now know was not really a “crisis” at all, but the theatrics orchestrated by the Kennedy administration after it made a deal with Kruschev to take US missiles out of the countries bordering Russia in exchange for Kruschev taking Russian missiles out of Cuba. The US could then make it look like Kennedy stood up to the Russians, and no one was the wiser). In fact, Mr. Palm is so taken in by the ominous portent that he has developed a “bomb shelter” mentality. As he implies himself, David Palm would have been considered a reactionary for building a bomb shelter.

Along those lines, Mr. Palm also says:

“So what if they were wrong? They acted reasonably in the face of what we know now was an greater threat than even they imagined at the time. So it is now.”

So we see the double standard at work. When it comes to the mountains of evidence experts have gathered showing the likelihood that 911 was an inside job, where is Mr. Palm’s calm and
unprejudiced demeanor that allows these US citizens the room to enjoy the position of: “So what if they were wrong? They acted reasonably in the face of what we know now was a greater threat than even they imagined at the time. So it is now.”

Sorry, that’s not allowed in David Palm’s world. Only certain people are allowed to think these are “the most dangerous times” and only certain people are allowed to build bomb shelters when they have evidence of potential danger. David Palm will be the judge of that permission, thank you. If you oppose the party-line version, then you are classified as a Chicken Little. But if you thought Y2K was going to bring at least “ten years of depression,” you have David’s permission to build a bomb shelter. As Palm says, such a crisis as Y2K is “well worth some serious preparations.”

He then asks: “Will that destabilize our population or global dynamics enough to trigger war and hence a slide into Infomagic? Possibly. Again, well worth preparing for.” So we can see why David had his sights on building a bomb shelter. He believed there was going to be a global crisis and an all out war because of Y2K. We can look back on it now and say: “Wow, what a conspiracy theorist!”

Let's look at another instance of Mr. Palm's double standard when it comes to judging current events and conspiracy theories. In 2004, Mr. Palm wrote an article about John Paul II for the Seattle Catholic.

http://www.seattlecatholic.com/article_20040406.html

Catholic Confusion at the Very Top

by David Palm

Overcoming My Resistance to Face the Facts

(Reprinted with permission from NEW OXFORD REVIEW, 1069 Kains Ave., Berkeley, CA 94706, U.S.A.)

I do not think it would be difficult to reach a broad consensus among NOR (NEW OXFORD REVIEW) readers that the state of the Catholic Church today is downright confusing on many fronts. Where we would begin to diverge from one another is in the analysis of the root causes of that confusion. Although all would likely agree that there is no single source, orthodox Catholics have increasingly stated in public that at least part of the confusion in the Church today has its origins at the very top — that some of the words, deeds, and omissions of Pope John Paul II are causing confusion among faithful Catholics. To state this, however, is immediately to raise some hackles — hackles that I myself have experienced until recently. In a letter to the editor
published in the NOR (Oct. 2003), Bill Foley chided the NOR for criticizing the Pope. Indeed, there are those who believe that any criticism of the Pope leads to undermining papal authority as such. I agree that such a danger exists.

But I have come to believe that there is also a danger in not speaking out. The difficulty is that if a certain hierarch — whether priest, bishop, or pope — is particularly well respected, the faithful under his charge may be tempted to take his every word, action, and even inaction as a positive example. They may be tempted to conform their understanding of right Catholic faith and practice to the man, rather than to the man to the Faith.

R. Sungenis: Make no mistake about it. David Palm is attacking John Paul II as the root cause for the confusion in the Church today. This is a classic conspiracy theory. As such, he has besmirched the very vicar of Christ on Earth, accusing him of an insidious plot to undermine the Catholic Church! In fact, Mr. Palm’s attack is premeditated, for Bill Foley had made him aware of the dangers of attacking the pope, but Mr. Palm was already convinced that John Paul II’s conspiracy was so egregious that Palm came “to believe that there is also a danger in not speaking out.” Mr. Palm basically accuses John Paul II of not having the “right Catholic faith” and not having the “right Catholic practice,” so much so that John Paul II was actually deceiving the gullible Christian masses. Not only can we conclude from Mr. Palm’s own definition that Mr. Palm is, indeed, a certified conspiracy theorist, he is among the most rabid and dangerous of conspiracy theorists, for he is attacking the very heart of the Catholic faith, “for where Peter is, so is the Church.”

To give an even better picture of Mr. Palm’s double standard, let’s replace the pope’s name in Mr. Palm’s paragraph with that of president George Bush, so as to have a reference point for the 911 Truthers who have implicated Bush in a conspiracy to bring down the Twin Towers.

Overcoming My Resistance to Face the Facts

I do not think it would be difficult to reach a broad consensus among the citizens of America that the state of America is downright confusing on many fronts. Where we would begin to diverge from one another is in the analysis of the root causes of that confusion. Although all would likely agree that there is no single source, honorable Americans have increasingly stated in public that at least part of the confusion in America today has its origins at the very top — that some of the words, deeds, and omissions of president George Bush are causing confusion among faithful Americans. To state this, however, is immediately to raise some hackles — hackles that I myself have experienced until recently. In a letter to the editor published in the Washington Times, vice president Dick Chaney chided the TIMES for criticizing the president. Indeed, there are those who believe that any criticism of the president leads to undermining presidential authority as such. I agree that such a danger exists.
But I have come to believe that there is also a danger in not speaking out. The difficulty is that if a certain political office holder — whether president, senator, or governor — is particularly well respected, the faithful under his charge may be tempted to take his every word, action, and even inaction as a positive example. They may be tempted to conform their understanding of correct American citizenship and duty to the man, rather than the man to the honor and truth of being an American citizen.

This is precisely what the thousands of professional engineers, pilots, physicists, chemists, investigative journalists and explosive experts, otherwise known as “911 Truthers,” have been doing since 2001 – speaking out against a political leader and his underlings for what appears to be their complicity in the 911 attacks on America. But according to Mr. Palm, we can dismiss their concerns and all their evidence because, after all, they are just “conspiracy theorists.” When the shoe is on the other foot, however, Mr. Palm changes his tune. If Mr. Palm saw one of these 911 Truthers building a bomb shelter for fear of being attacked by the same people they believe orchestrated 911, he would laugh at them.

Which then brings me to another aspect of the “credibility” issue concerning Mr. Palm. In 2007, Mr. Palm posted a picture of himself holding a glass of beer under a website named “Catholic Beer Review.”

[Image]


Now, don't get me wrong. I enjoy beer just as much as the next Chestertonian Catholic, but a Catholic advertising what many people know to be a killer of 40% of the human beings on America’s highways would have most mothers of Mothers Against Drunk Driving appalled at Mr. Palm's hubris. In fact, we could make a sufficient case that David Paul is promoting the abuse of alcohol and encouraging teenagers to get drunk and drive. Madison Avenue would have a field day with the above picture of David Palm. Yes, indeed, a picture tells a thousand words. But we won’t do so. Why? Because it’s a defamation of character. It’s a malicious attack of another human being based on innuendo and insinuation. Mr. Palm has every right to post whatever he wants on his website (as long as it doesn’t lead other people to sin, but then again, Mr. Palm would have a problem in that regard with his attack on John Paul II, especially since they just sainted him in April 2014).
The point is this. One can take almost anything someone has written or any picture of the person who wrote it, and make it look bad. It only takes a little imagination and a lot of prejudicial and devious thinking, and Viola! You've just destroyed someone’s reputation! And in this day of the Internet, millions of people may see the defamation, but since they have no information to the contrary from the same website to reason out a fair judgment, they leave with a very negative impression.

Let’s see what else Mr. Palm has to say along this reputation-destroying boogeyman he is attempting to create:

**David Palm:** Robert Sungenis: [Leading proponent of the new geocentrism: Author of *Galileo Was Wrong*, organizer of the 2010 conference on geocentrism, and executive producer of a movie promoting geocentrism.]

**R. Sungenis:** We see rather quickly Mr. Palm’s devious agenda. In reality, my IMDb page lists me as the “executive producer of The Principle,” not “executive producer of a movie promoting geocentrism” (See [http://www.imdb.com/name/nm5334156/](http://www.imdb.com/name/nm5334156/)).

Why is that important? For the simple reason that *The Principle* is not a movie promoting geocentrism. It is a movie showing the cosmological evidence gathered in the last 100 or so years which leads us to the question whether the Copernican Principle, the foundation of modern society, is able to satisfactorily answer that evidence. The movie allows five internationally well known cosmologists to accept the challenge and answer it. It then allows two galactocentrists and three geocentrists to offer their views at answering the same evidence. The audience is left to judge which one did the best job.

But since Mr. Palm and the media are on a witch hunt against the producers of *The Principle* for simply offering an alternative view of the world, and are thus seeking to obliterate them and their ideas off the public landscape (i.e., “thought control”), any derisive label will do. It wouldn’t be so comical except for the fact that neither Mr. Palm nor his cohorts have ever seen the movie, yet somehow “know” what it’s about. As Mr. Palm himself said, such foibles get right to the heart of the matter, which is “credibility.”

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm:** Sungenis has an appendix in his book *Galileo Was Wrong* entitled, “The Personal Lives of: Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Einstein” and in an April 2013 interview with In the Spirit of Chartes entitled “The Real Albert Einstein,” he stated:

“I delved into the personality of the man [Einstein] . . . I delved into his character, and his relationship with people, his family, . . . his exploits . . . I always like to know who’s behind the theories. Because these theories don't come up in a vacuum, a lot of it is
based on the philosophy of the person . . . I can go into the details because I think it’s the details that will convince people.”

R. Sungenis: So, we see yet another devious tactic of Mr. Palm’s. Since I did a detailed exposé on Albert Einstein’s personal life, Mr. Palm has decided to use it to justify his personal attack on me. Ironically, Mr. Palm opened this present critique by characterizing his attack on me as: “Is it just ad hominem or guilt by association to point this out? Not at all.” But obviously, he is now using “guilt by association” by saying that if I attack Einstein’s personal life then it’s okay for David Palm to attack my personal life. It doesn’t matter to Mr. Palm that Einstein has been dead for 59 years and that the details of his personal life were released some 30 years after his death by his own executor, Helen Dukas, but that I am still living and will suffer the brunt of his attack along with my wife and eleven children.

Be that as it may, if you read my exposé on Albert Einstein you will see that it involves his many and varied mortal sins – sins that tell you exactly what kind of person he was and how this necessarily affected his atheistic view of the cosmos. I, on the other hand, have no mortal sins that Mr. Palm can expose.

So what remains for Mr. Palm to make his attack? Nothing but my alternative answers to the historical events that have occurred in our recent history. In other words, my crime is “thought crime.” Mr. Palm will thus attempt to put me on par with Einstein’s sins by making it appear that my “thought crimes” are just as wicked as Mr. Einstein’s grossly immoral behavior (which include fornication, serial adultery, divorce, child abandonment, wife beating, to name a few). It seems that David Palm is much more willing to defend what the Catholic Church and Scripture indentify as a gross immoral sinner rather than defend a fellow Catholic who seeks to defend traditional Catholic doctrine and entertains alternative interpretations to secular events.

It is apparent, then, that Mr. Palm is bent on destroying my reputation and preserving Albert Einstein’s. Not only does this expose Mr. Palm’s underhanded tactics, it shows his utter hypocrisy, since, as noted above in his 2004 article for the Seattle Catholic, he himself has already sought to defend traditional Catholic doctrine against the beliefs and practices of John Paul II, which is the same as I have tried to do regarding John Paul II since I, as put best by Mr. Palm himself when he decided to attack John Paul II, was forced into “Overcoming My Resistance to Face the Facts.”

Which then brings up another issue Mr. Palm must confront. The very people who support Mr. Palm’s attacks against me are those who disagree entirely with Mr. Palm’s attack on John Paul II. Among others, Palm’s main cohorts are Karl Keating of Catholic Answers and Mark P. Shea of the National Catholic Register. In the whole career of Keating, which I believe begins with his 1981 book, Catholicism and Fundamentalism, I am not aware of even one pope he has written any criticism. The same goes for Mark Shea, who began his career in the mid-1990s.
But Keating and Shea have formed an alliance with Palm to attack me because of my beliefs on geocentrism and my anti-party-line interpretation of secular events. So you can see the hypocrisy of Keating and Shea. They are willing to excuse Mr. Palm’s casting of John Paul II into a virtual heretic, but they encourage Mr. Palm to viciously attack me for “thought crimes.”

Now, let’s ask the question about my pursuit against the Copernican Principle. Am I so off the mark that Mr. Palm should mount such a vociferous and relentless campaign against me? Imagine, if you will, all the hours Mr. Palm must spend on his computer keyboard wringing his hands and thinking of ways to bring down Bob Sungenis. The answer is simple. Not only are the Church Fathers behind me 100%; but all the medieval theologians, including Aquinas; the 1566 Tridentine catechism; the very two popes that approved the condemnation of both Galileo and heliocentrism; and the fact that the Catholic Church has made no official statement reversing those judgments to this very day.

In fact, the very popes Mr. Palm has railed against have given similar opinions to mine regarding how Galileo and Einstein have negatively influenced the Church. For example, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger noted the damaging effects from Einstein’s theory of Relativity (the very theory that was invented to answer the experimental evidence from the 1800s showing the Earth was not moving in space).

“Here we come in contact with the really critical issue of the modern age. The concept of truth has been virtually given up and replaced by the concept of progress. Progress itself "is" truth. But through this seeming exaltation, progress loses its direction and becomes nullified. For if no direction exists, everything can just as well be regress as progress. Einstein's relativity theory properly concerns the physical cosmos. But it seems to me to describe exactly the situation of the intellectual/spiritual world of our time. Relativity theory states there are no fixed systems of reference in the universe. When we declare a system to be a reference point from which we try to measure a whole, it is we who do the determining. Only in such a way can we attain any results at all. But the determination could always have been done differently. What we said about the physical cosmos is reflected in the second ‘Copernican revolution’ regarding our basic relationship to reality. The truth as such, the absolute, the very reference point of thinking, is no longer visible. For this reason, precisely in the spiritual sense, there is no longer "up or down." There are no directions in a world without fixed measuring points. What we view to be direction is not based on a standard which is true in itself but on our decision and finally on considerations of expediency. In such a relativistic context, so-called teleological or consequentialist ethics ultimately becomes nihilistic, even if it fails to see this. And what is called conscience in such a worldview is, on deeper reflection, but a euphemistic way of saying that there is no such thing as an actual conscience, conscience understood as a "co-knowing" with the truth. Each person determines his own standards. And, needless to say, in general relativity, no one can be of much help to the other, much less prescribe behavior to him.”
(Conscience and Truth, presented at the 10th Workshop for Bishops February 1991 Dallas, Texas).

As for Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI, both have admitted that it was the Galileo affair that not only prompted the initiation of Vatican II, but that Vatican II was forced to introduce a new hermeneutic to take care of the so-called problem. In February 2013, Benedict revealed the following secret:

So we went to the Council not only with joy, but with enthusiasm. There was an incredible anticipation. We hoped that everything would be renewed, that a new Pentecost would truly come, a new era of the Church – because at that time, the Church was still strong enough: Sunday practice still good, the vocations to the priesthood and to religious life were already a bit reduced but still sufficient. Nonetheless, we felt that the Church was not advancing, it was diminishing, and it seemed rather a reality of the past and not the bringer of the future. And in that moment, we hoped that this relationship would be renewed, that it would change; that the Church would once again be a force of tomorrow and a force of today. And we knew that the relationship between the Church and the modern period was a bit in conflict, beginning with the error of the Church in the case of Galileo Galilei; we thought we could correct this wrong beginning and find the union between the Church and the best forces in the world in order to open up the future of humanity, to open true progress. So we were full of hope, of enthusiasm, and of the will to do our part for this thing.¹

Pope Benedict’s words shouldn’t surprise us, since his predecessor, John Paul II, said much the same truth about Vatican II to the Pontifical Academy of Science in his famous 1992 Galileo speech. In paragraph 6 of the speech he stated:

The upset caused by the Copernican system thus demanded epistemological reflection on the biblical sciences, an effort which later would produce abundant fruit in modern exegetical works and which has found sanction and a new stimulus in the Dogmatic Constitution Dei Verbum of the Second Vatican Council.

In other words, the modern prelature’s belief that the “Copernican system” was proven correct was the basis for the content, or at least the interpretation of the content, of the document regarding Scripture, Dei Verbum, at Vatican II.

Whatever the implications of these current events, the most important thing to realize is that we now have it from the Church’s highest authorities that Vatican II was implemented for the express purpose of correcting the so-called “errors” of the traditional Church, and the first and

¹ Pope Benedict’s farewell address to priests at the Vatican, as reported by L’Osservatore Romano, February 14, 2013, page 4, paragraph #5 in the article “Al concilio pieno di entusiasmo e speranza.”
foremost “error”—the only error that receives mention—was the Church’s decision against Galileo. Since Father Joseph Ratzinger was present at the Council in 1962 and personally knew many of its major participants, his inside knowledge of what we can now call the “Galileo mentality” of Vatican II, must be taken as a reliable testimony. Due to his witness, it may be safe to conclude that if the Church of 1962 had not concluded that the Church of 1616 made an “error” in the Galileo case, Vatican Council II may never have happened. In the end, either the 1616 Church was in error or the reason for initiating Vatican II was in error.

But perhaps there is a different light in which we can view the Pope’s words concerning Galileo. In the same 1990 speech, the then Cardinal Ratzinger said these contrasting conclusions about the Galileo affair:

Today, things have changed. According to Bloch, the heliocentric system—just like the geocentric—is based upon presuppositions that can’t be empirically demonstrated. Among these, an important role is played by the affirmation of the existence of an absolute space; that’s an opinion that, in any event, has been cancelled by the Theory of Relativity. Bloch writes, in his own words: “From the moment that, with the abolition of the presupposition of an empty and immobile space, movement is no longer produced towards something, but there’s only a relative movement of bodies among themselves, and therefore the measurement of that [movement] depends to a great extent on the choice of a body to serve as a point of reference, in this case is it not merely the complexity of calculations that renders the [geocentric] hypothesis impractical? Then as now, one can suppose the earth to be fixed and the sun as mobile.”

Cardinal Ratzinger’s realization that the Earth can be the motionless center of the universe is the same thing that both Einstein and Hawking admitted about geocentrism:

Einstein stated:

“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” (The Evolution of Physics: From Early Concepts to Relativity and Quanta, Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, 1938, 1966, p. 212).

Stephen Hawking stated:

“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. (The Grand Design, Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, NY, Bantam, 2010, p. 41).

In the face of this evidence (which Palm has been given many times by me and other people), David Palm, without himself presenting any scientific proof that geocentrism is wrong or even being familiar with the science issues to stake a claim, maintains to the public that he has scientific proof that geocentrism is wrong, and then uses that belief to castigate me as some kind of kook running around with an idea completely my own that has no scientific evidence or history to support it.

I ask, sincerely, who between us is the real extremist and conspiracy theorist?

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm:** Without delving into Sungenis’s personal life, let’s examine some of his publicly expressed views and background.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice by this clever sentence that Mr. Palm makes it appear as if there actually exists some grave sins in my personal life, but he is going to be kind and not mention them. Thus, Mr. Palm has continued the calumny.

**Mr. Palm:** Educational Background: Sungenis, the leading new geocentrist, possesses no degrees in any scientific discipline.

**R. Sungenis:** The purpose of this statement, of course, is to make it look like I don’t know anything about science, just because I don’t have a degree in science. What Mr. Palm leaves out (and he knows he is doing so) is that I was a physics major in college before I switched to religion. So he knows very well that I know the science issues. Anyone who has read my papers and books knows this to be the case. I have also kept up with all the major physics journals over the last twenty years. Everyone knows so because my books and papers cite them voluminously.

I have also debated with dozens of physicists over the last ten years, and have challenged many others to debate. (Incidentally, the debates have always ended with my opponent not being able to disprove geocentrism or prove heliocentrism/acentrism, including Mr. Palm’s favorite, Alec MacAndrew). I’ve asked Mr. Palm to debate orally and publically, even with only the historical and ecclesiastical issues, but he has refused. The same is true with his cohorts, Karl Keating and Mark Shea – they refuse to debate the issues, but they instead attack me personally on their blogs. They also consistently ban people from their blogs who try to defend me against their slander.

The real irony here is that David Palm not only has no degrees in science, he doesn’t know any science at all. He has never talked or written about science. Hence, this is a classic case of the
pot calling the kettle black. In effect, Mr. Palm doesn’t have any comprehension about the new cosmological evidence we bring forth in The Principle and even in my books. Evidently, he prefers it that way. He doesn’t want to study the evidence. He just wants to fold his arms and say, “it ain’t happening on my watch.”

Mr. Palm: He has a B.A. in religion from George Washington University (1979) and an M.A. in theology from Westminster Theological Seminary (1982). He also claims an unaccredited Ph.D. in religious studies from Calamus International University, which describes itself as a “non-traditional” institution registered in the Republic of Vanuatu, a small island in the south Pacific. Others have characterized it as a diploma mill.

R. Sungenis: So again, the order of the day is insinuation. Simply because “others” have characterized CIU as a “diploma mill,” Mr. Palm wants you to take this as fact. But here are the facts:

CIU is not a “diploma mill.” There is no official organization that has classified CIU as such. Rather, the phrase “diploma mill” has been bandied about by my ideological enemies who want to discredit me and destroy my reputation.

A diploma mill is a colloquial term used against an unethical institution that illegally issues pieces of paper containing the word “diploma,” making it appear that someone has obtained a legitimate degree. But it is illegitimate because the person had no pre-qualifications for the degree nor did any work for the degree. Conversely, CIU requires its Ph.D. candidates to have the appropriate prerequisite degrees (BA or MA) and do the same rigorous work for a Ph.D. as other research degree programs common in Europe. The candidate is required to do an extensive dissertation, which is then judged by a select committee of Ph.Ds in that field. An academic advisor familiar with the subject material is also assigned to the candidate to guide in the writing of the dissertation. At the end of this process is CIU’s authorization to grant degrees by the governmental authority of the Republic of Vanuatu, where CIU is domiciled. The Republic of Vanuatu, like Denmark, does not require its degree-conferring institutions to have accreditation with a government entity but only the authorization to grant degrees based on the government’s acceptance of the institution. Hence, the degrees of CIU are legal degrees and it is not a diploma mill.

Mr. Palm continues:

Mr. Palm: The standards at Calamus do not meet those adhered to at institutions accredited by recognized accreditation bodies—for a discussion of the standards at Calamus, see here and here. For example, the supervising professor for Sungenis’s ostensive doctoral dissertation was his own co-author, Robert Bennett.
**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Palm continues to use this canard even though he has been told numerous times that his timing is wrong. Robert Bennett was asked to be my supervising professor for my dissertation BEFORE he became my co-author for *Galileo Was Wrong*. The fact that he agreed to be my supervising professor and took interest in my writing of the dissertation on geocentrism was the very reason I later asked him to co-author the book. But, of course, Mr. Palm isn’t interested in making known the alternative version to his juicy gossip. He would rather give the impression that his version is the only version, and I am guilty as charged.

**Mr. Palm:** His academic advisor, Morris Berg, claims a Ph.D. in hypnotherapy from what he describes as a “non-traditional university” and specializes in past life regressions and neo-shamanic healing.

**R. Sungenis:** So once again, in direct contradiction to his earlier claim that he will not engage in “guilt by association,” this is precisely what Mr. Palm is trying to do. In truth, just as Mr. Palm cited the erroneous beliefs of John Paul II, he can also cite the erroneous beliefs of Morris Berg (but this maneuver actually works against him, for John Paul II’s acts are worse than Berg’s, since they include PRAYING with Shamanic priests, voodoo practitioners, and African animists at his Assisi Interreligious Prayer Meetings in 1986 and 2002). But the fact is, just as I reject some of the faith and practices of John Paul II (as also Mr. Palm rejects them), so I reject some of the beliefs and practices of Morris Berg. The point in fact is that Morris Berg’s belief in “past life regressions” has nothing to do with my dissertation on geocentrism. Moreover, Dr. Berg did not evaluate my dissertation himself, but only headed up the committee that did so. The committee is a group of academics who are open to alternative views on medicine and science, instead of having to be corralled by the Rockefeller regime to practice only allopathic medicine and Big Bang and evolutionary science.

**Mr. Palm:** Calamus was recently offering doctorates for as low as $1600, but one can still get a Ph.D. there for about $2000 (1250 GBP).

**R. Sungenis:** Again, we see that even the smallest innuendo Mr. Palm can scrape up he will use, no matter how trivial. This is nothing but insinuation in order to make it appear that unless one spends the hundreds of thousands of dollars that US institutions charge for a Ph.D., then it is bogus. Meanwhile, in the areas of religion and cosmology, the US education system is one of the largest purveyors of atheism and anti-Catholicism. We should be appalled that US atheists charge hundreds of thousands of dollars, but the small Republic of Vanuatu allows a dissertation defending the traditional Catholic belief on cosmology is allowed for just a fraction of the cost.

**Mr. Palm:** Sungenis has publicly claimed that he has, “accepted a professorship” at a college in Texas and “will be starting there in September 2014.” According to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, a degree from Calamus is considered to be “Fraudulent or substandard” and “illegal to use” – a class B misdemeanor [link].
**R. Sungenis:** My enemies relished it when I made public my invitation to teach at Fisher-More College. It was like sharks at a feeding frenzy over at Karl Keating’s blog. They just couldn’t get enough of trying to discredit me with the obvious intent of derailing my appointment. Someone looked up the above Texas law and made it appear that I would be committing a crime if I taught at Fisher-More. The most astounding thing to witness was all this gossip came from those calling themselves Christians. It didn’t matter to them that I didn’t need to use, nor did I say I would use, my Calamus Ph.D. to teach at Fisher-More. It didn’t matter to them that there were hundreds of foreign institutions on the Texas list. It only mattered that Calamus was there. Of course, they also didn’t mention that I could simply use my US accredited BA and MA degrees to teach at Fisher-More. This didn’t matter to my detractors. Their intent was to make me look bad.

The real story is that Fisher-More was intent on hiring me because the faculty, especially Michael King who is the president of the college, was very impressed with the work I produced over the last 20 years. Since I didn’t spend my time gossiping under pseudonyms on Internet forums but put my nose to the grindstone writing books and articles to educate the public to a variety of subjects and did quite well in the process, it was this work that Fisher-More saw and admired, and was the reason they wanted me to teach at their school.

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm:** 2) Lunar Landing Skeptic/Conspiracy Theorist: As we will see below, it’s fairly common for the new geocentrists to also deny that men have landed on the moon. For his part, Sungenis has stated, “Any intelligent person who has studied the issue is going to have doubts as to whether the United States had the capability to put a man on the moon in 1969 . . .” (link). More recently, he has proposed the conspiracy theory that the lunar landings were filmed on a Hollywood set by Stanley Kubrick. For more on his lunar landing denial see also Dave Armstrong’s My Refusal to Wrangle With Robert Sungenis, 2012: _A Sungenis Odd-yssey_, and Robert Sungenis’ Responses to Recent Critiques (In reply to Armstrong, Sungenis stated, “Yes, I guess this argument would have some impact if I was the only nut in the world who doubted the moon landings.”)

**R. Sungenis:** So again, regardless of whether I accept, reject, or doubt the US moon landings, it makes little difference to Mr. Palm, since his tactic of choice is very evident – thought control. You are simply not allowed to think outside the box. If you do, they will hunt you down, they will find you, and they will kill you. Apparently, to Mr. Palm, being a US citizen means one can never question anything the US government says or does. Mr. Palm is a good little patriot, at least when it serves his advantages to discredit Bob Sungenis. Perhaps he will remain a good little patriot as he sees the US federal and state governments allow homosexual marriage, abortion on demand, no fault divorce, and many other societal ills which, once banned by our
government, are allowed with impunity. You will see nothing on Mr. Palm’s website about these societal issues, but you will see plenty of attacks against me.

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm:** 3) NASA and Crop Circles: Sungenis wrote, “I also think crop circles can be made from space with lasers or plasma projectors. All NASA would have to do is put a digital pattern in a laser/plasma projector aboard a satellite and then shoot it down to earth, and presto, you have a crop circle. It gets everybody talking about UFOs. But really, all they are doing is getting our minds off the Bible and Christ by making it look like neither are true”.

**R. Sungenis:** This is another one of Mr. Palm’s bait and switch tactics. In truth, the question from my patron concerned UFO’s and life on other worlds, not crop circles. Everyone is aware of how NASA has been pushing for decades the idea of extraterrestrial life. The simple reason is, life on other planets would take away the uniqueness of Earth. It would allow the possibility of evolution and that the Earth is just some cosmic accident. Why do they push for this? Because that would allow them to believe there is no God, and thus no one to whom they are responsible for their sins. Of course, this all goes right over the head of David Palm. It is apparently more important for him to bash Christians who reveal it. Crop circles were only added because it rounded out the answer. Here is the exchange at the “link” Mr. Palm cites:

Robert, What do you think of UFOs and crop circles? Are they real? Do we have anything to worry about?

John

R. Sungenis: John, NASA has every incentive in the world to promote UFOs, simply because they want to implant in our heads the idea that there is life on other planets. In that way the government will continue to give them billions of dollars to a program that the government has thought more than once of scrapping. All we’ve seen for years about UFOs are lights and small objects moving against the sky, and no one can get a clear photo to make an absolute identification (?). Not likely. I think this whole thing is cooked up by NASA and the powers-that-be in order to control people. I also think crop circles can be made from space with lasers or plasma projectors. All NASA would have to do is put a digital pattern in a laser/plasma projector aboard a satellite and then shoot it down to earth, and presto, you have a crop circle. It gets everybody talking about UFOs. But really, all they are doing is getting our minds off the Bible and Christ by making it look like neither are true. There are no aliens from other planets, John. The universe was made for this earth only. That’s not hard to understand once you accept that the earth is in the center. The very reason popular science wants you to think the earth is a somewhere far away in the remote recesses of space is so they
can promote the idea that we are not special. If we are not special, then surely there must be other beings in the universe, too. All of this, of course, ties in with evolution, because evolution explains how we both got here. It's all a big, big, lie cooked up by the devil. As John says in Apocalypse 13:3: ‘And the whole earth was amazed and followed after the beast.’ That is what is happening today. Don't be deceived.

Irrespective of Mr. Palm taking my words out of context, let’s call a spade a spade. What we see again is the same tactic of “thought control.” In Mr. Palm’s world, no one can even venture an educated guess that might implicate a government in crop circles. But does Mr. Palm offer an answer to explain the crop circles? Not at all. Perhaps he thinks they were made by aliens, and perhaps this might be “the most dangerous times since the Cuban Missile Crisis or Y2K”!

Personally, I’d much rather it be the workings of some government, since then at least I know who I am dealing with.

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm:** 4) 9-11: Sungenis wrote to journalist Jared Olar, “Yes, and I might as well tell you so I can beat Mr. Olar to the punch: I also believe 9-11 was an inside job and that the Muslims had nothing to do with it” ([link](#)). His stated position is that it’s “most likely” that low-yield nuclear weapons were used to bring down the Twin Towers ([link](#)). He expanded on those claims in articles at his website such as [US Military Discovering Israel did 911](#) and [Dr. Alan Sabrosky Ties Israel to 911](#). Sungenis also promoted the belief that the tsunami that led to the Fukushima reactor disaster was caused by nuclear weapons detonated by the Israelis off the coast of Japan, to punish that country for giving nuclear technology to the Iranians. The source he promoted also insists that the explosions at the reactor itself weren’t from hydrogen gas — those were from nuclear weapons disguised as security cameras put there by Israel ([link](#)).

**R. Sungenis:** Let me tell you a little story that will shed some light on Mr. Palm’s devious obsession with me. When Mr. Palm put up these seven topics to support his attack against geocentrism, I asked him to take them down, since they were obviously added to make a smear campaign against me. We had quite a few heated email exchanges over it. I told him that I am no longer talking about any of these issues. About a year ago, I took them all off our website. But Mr. Palm refused to remove them from his website. But since they were no longer on my website, he went to the Wayback machine at webarchive.org – a site that stores all the information from every website in the world (see [https://webarchive.org](https://webarchive.org)) – so that he could continue to make his case that I was some kind of conspiracy nut.

So, you can see how determined Mr. Palm is to make his case. Even when I said I was no longer addressing these issues and that I had no interest in addressing them in the future, Mr. Palm,
being such a “good Christian,” insisted that they be exposed to show the world of my “fundamental perception of reality.”

I think folks are beginning to see, however, that in light of Mr. Palm’s absolute obsession to defame me for simply disagreeing with him on various civil and science issues, it is not my “fundamental perception of reality” that is the problem. Be that as it may, since Mr. Palm’s obsession was apparently getting in the way of his Christian morals, I deactivated the Wayback machine. All the links that he put in this diatribe don’t work any longer. My prediction is that Mr. Palm will now seek some other source to fuel his obsession. After all, “we’ve got to get Bob Sungenis and bring him down so he never rises again,” as one of his cohorts put it a few years ago.

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm: 5)** Jewish Conspiracy Theories: For many years Sungenis promoted a wide range of Jewish conspiracy theories on his web site and at other venues (see for example [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)). He removed such material from his web site in late 2013 without comment but some of it is still present in other Internet venues.

**R. Sungenis:** So now we see the twisted rationale of David Palm. He finally admits that I took down all the material from my website, but that doesn’t matter to him. What he doesn’t reveal to you is that the very reason I took them down is that I had no interest and no conviction about them any longer. Mr. Palm knew I wanted to go in a completely different direction, for I told him explicitly so in my emails. So, “nice Christian” that he is, Mr. Palm ignores my request and decides to hunt down any vestige of what I previously said on these issues from other websites so as to make it appear as if I still pursue these topics. He had to go back to 2010 for the first link. The second link is from my Wikipedia page, which is written by my ideological enemies. Again, I would say Mr. Palm’s “fundamental perception of reality” is skewed, to say the least. It verges on the pathological.

Mr. Palm continues:

**Mr. Palm: 6)** Dinosaurs and Humans: Sungenis believes that dinosaurs co-existed with humans, but that a conspiracy keeps that evidence “suppressed”: “So, has modern science found irrefutable evidence that dinosaurs co-existed with humans? Yes, the evidence has been found but it is being systematically suppressed” ([here](#)).

**R. Sungenis:** Again, we see that “thought control” is the order of the day. Simply because I believe an alternate theory of history that is opposed to Mr. Palm’s view, this now becomes fodder to try to make me look like I’ve lost touch with reality. Isn’t it wonderful to see such “Christian love”? It wouldn’t be so bad, except for the fact that the view I espouse is the
traditional Catholic view, and Mr. Palm’s view is mainly from atheistic scientists who have rejected both Scripture and Tradition as their authority.

Mr. Palm continues:

Mr. Palm: 7) Titanic Conspiracy Theory: Sunegenis has promoted a conspiracy theory on the sinking of the Titanic, calling it “The Blueprint for 9-11” (see here).

R. Sunegenis: Once again, Mr. Palm dug this one up from the Wayback machine, despite me telling him that such topics were no longer on my list of concerns; and to prove so I had taken it off my website. But it was just too juicy of a “conspiracy theory” for him to let it go. Making a fool out of Bob Sunegenis is paramount. We must leave no stone unturned. His views on geocentrism may upset the whole world, and he must be stopped!

In the end, all this just shows how obsessed, fanatical, and perhaps pathological Mr. Palm is. He is your real enemy, not me. I merely try to offer alternative ways of looking at the evidence so that we can escape the one-size-fits-all mentality of this present secular world. But I think we can all agree that anyone who won’t let you even venture an educated guess as to the goings-on in this wicked world other than what lies in the boundaries of his own limited purview, is the paranoid and maniacal among us. When I think of all the hours Mr. Palm had to spend behind his computer screen wringing his hands saying, “Oh, I’ve got you now, Bob Sunegenis!” in order to cook up all the specious and caluminous rot in this present diatribe, it makes me shudder. And when we count all the sins Mr. Palm has fallen into in doing so, we must conclude that not only has he tarnished the image of the body of Christ, he has put his own soul in jeopardy.