The Article That Latin Mass Magazine Was Too Scared to Publish

Formerly Titled:

“The Ultimate Game-Changer – Geocentrism”

Geocentrism? Are you serious? To the educated of modern society, of which many Catholics consider themselves devoted members, it almost seems silly, if not pretentious, resurrecting what most think is an obsolete and discredited topic. I used to think the same way, at least until I saw the scientific evidence and realized how much we have been deceived.

I was so moved that I raised a few million dollars, started a movie company, Stellar Motion Pictures, and produced a movie, The Principle, that showed in 13 cities in the US at Regal and AMC cinemas between October 2014 and April 2015. If you didn’t see it, it is coming out on DVD in November 2015. It features some of the top cosmologists in the world; an excellent narration by Kate Mulgrew, the former “Captain Janeway” of the TV series Star Trek Voyager; and the most recent scientific evidence available today. I also wrote a three-volume, 2,200-page treatise titled Galileo Was Wrong: The Church Was Right and recently made a 4.5 hour DVD by the same title.

If I’m right, what would happen if the world suddenly discovered that Galileo was wrong and the Church was right? A stunning reversal in the world’s sentiments would immediately occur. First, the world would be forced to recognize and respect the Roman Catholic Church’s authority as never before. Pope Benedict XVI, for example, would never have seen the mural on the city wall in Scotland in 2007, which depicted a woman dressed as a priest and holding a host, flanked on either side by Copernicus and Galileo with the caption “Oops” underneath both. No longer would we hear the common complaint: “Well, the Church got Galileo wrong, so why should we trust it on other matters?”

Instead, science would be turned on its head as the Copernican Principle is demoted by the very instruments that once promoted it.

---

1 In late summer of 2015 I was invited by Latin Mass Magazine to write an article on Geocentrism. The article was scheduled to be published in their magazine for the December 2015 issue. But then the editor, Marcia, with advice from her unnamed “advisors,” decided to pull the plug. No explanation, no apology, and no remedial recourse was offered. In fact, the Latin Mass staff tried to avoid contacting me until I forced them by repeated emails to reveal their plans, which I just learned of on Sunday, December 6. So much for courage and decency from an organization whose website says as its Mission statement: “Develop The Latin Mass journal into the intellectual arm of Catholics working for the return of the Church to tradition and authentic organic development...Identify, develop and publish writers committed to Catholic liturgical, spiritual, theological and cultural traditions...Organize educational conferences that will offer priests and faithful (often isolated because of their views and dispositions) a sense of hope and rekindle enthusiasm for grassroots propagation of the Faith.” As you can guess, I fit into each of these categories, but apparently Latin Mass Magazine doesn’t have the courage of its convictions. This time around, they looked the Devil right in the eye and the Latin Mass staff was the first to blink. Such is the case when they are confronted with the real truth and authors who are a bit too “faithful” and “isolated because of their views.” Instead of a revealer of the truth, Latin Mass Magazine has become a suppresser of the truth.
No longer would the earth be a speck of dust out in the remote recesses of space (as Carl Sagan tried to convince us) but the very center of the universe upon which everything is built and moves. If the Earth is in the center, then logically Someone had to put it there, since any fool would realize that it couldn’t have happened by chance. A new vision, direction, and understanding of God would spread across the globe, and society would never be the same. In short, a Christian revolution would replace the Copernican revolution.

Perhaps you will better understand the potential paradigm shift if you remember what the Copernican Revolution did to the modern world. As historian Herbert Butterfield put it in his classic, *The Origins of Modern Science*:

> The Copernican revolution outshines everything since the rise of Christianity and reduces the Renaissance and Reformation to the rank of mere episodes, mere internal displacements, within the system of medieval Christendom, while transforming...the very texture of human life itself; it looms so large as the real origin both of the modern world and of the modern mentality, that our customary periodization of European history has become an anachronism and an encumbrance.

Remember the “God is dead” movement of the 1960s? It was the result of nihilist Friedrich Nietzsche’s 1881 poem, “Thus Spoke Zarathustra.” But few realize that Nietzsche blamed a large part of it on the Copernican revolution:

> “Where has God gone? he cried. I shall tell you. We have killed him – you and I. But how have we done this? What did we do when we unchained the Earth from its sun? Whither is it moving now? Whither are we moving now? Away from all suns? Are we not perpetually falling? Backward, sideward, forward, in all directions? Is there any up or down left? Are we not straying as through in infinite nothing? Do we not feel the breath of empty space?”

Let’s get some perspective from history. In the Church’s battle against Galileo, she relied mostly on the consensus from the Church Fathers. To a man, the Fathers interpreted Scripture literally whether it taught the geocentric universe or the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. They trusted Scripture and took it at face value. And as Bellarmine reminded Galileo, the Council of Trent required that we obey their consensus on doctrine. The Church also had the ordinary magisterium, since the saints, doctors and theologians of the medieval period preserved the patristic tradition; its culmination appearing in the 1566 Tridentine Catechism, which taught geocentrism in four places. The consensus was capped by two popes, Paul V in 1616 and Urban VIII in 1633, respectively, which approved the doctrinal decisions of the Holy Office (the CDF of today), deeming that heliocentrism was either “formally heretical” and/or “philosophically absurd.”

What was missing from both sides, of course, was the hard science, since Galileo’s appeal to the Venusian phases and the Jovian moons couldn’t provide any proof to overturn 1600 years of Church tradition. By the same token, the Church’s science certainly wasn’t anymore convincing than Galileo’s. Both were in their infancy.
About 50 years after Galileo, Isaac Newton entered the fray with sophisticated mathematical equations for gravity and force that actually worked in the laboratory. If applied to the sun and the planets, they necessitated that the Earth revolve around the sun. Kant and the Enlightenment supported Newton and the secular world was happy to see a significant demotion of the Church’s authority. (But here is a little secret. As much as Newton pushed Copernicanism with his equations, he also admitted in his Proposition 43 that if gravity and inertial forces existed outside the solar system, then Earth could be at rest and the celestial bodies would revolve around it. Two hundred years later, physicist Ernst Mach, followed by Albert Einstein, confirmed the same truth).

During the Enlightenment’s assault, the Church was still holding her ground. Newton’s famous 1667 book which housed his iconic equations, *The Principia*, contained a disclaimer by its Catholic editors, Jaquier and LeSuer, stating: “Newton in his third book assumes the hypothesis of the earth’s movement....But we profess obedience to the decrees made by the Supreme Pontiffs against the movement of the earth,” which persisted in all volumes until the 1833 Glasgow edition.

You can imagine the pressure the Church was under. After Newton and through the early 1800s, she was bombarded by the press and academia for being “backward” and “anti-science” for persisting in geocentrism. Even in her own court the troops were restless. A crack appeared in her resolve when in 1820 the Catholic canon, Giuseppe Settele, sought an imprimatur for a book he wrote extolling heliocentrism, which was at first denied publication by the Master of the Sacred Palace, Father Filippo Anfossi (the “traditionalist” of his day), but was afterward ram-rodded through by his liberal rival, Maurizio Olivieri, Commissioner of the Index, who succeeded in his ploy by lying to Pope Pius VII about the reason Galileo’s book was originally condemned; lies that influenced Pius to grant Settele the imprimatur. Subsequently, Olivieri’s partner, Cardinal Capalleri, eventually become Gregory XVI in 1831 and took Copernicus’ and Galileo’s names off the Index in 1835 without so much as a sentence of explanation.

The only other significant mention of the Galileo affair came in 1981 when John Paul II initiated a papal commission, which ended in 1992 when he gave a modest speech to the Pontifical Academy of Science, seemingly conceding that the Church of Galileo’s day had made a “mistake in interpreting Scripture.” To save face, Cardinal Poupard, a prominent liberal who wrote the speech, dubbed the culprits “theologians” rather than “popes and cardinals,” even though Paul V, Urban VIII, and Cardinal Bellarmine led the charge against Galileo. In fact, in 1632, after rescinding the imprimatur that Galileo finagled out of Cardinal Riccardi, Urban VIII was in protracted discussions with the Archduke of Tuscany, Cosimo Medici II, to enlist his help to silence Galileo for what, in Urban’s own words were, “a great harm to religion, indeed the worst ever conceived” that “endangered Christianity with some sinister opinion...dangerous dogmas...and very evil doctrine.”
The thrust of my article, however, is what occurred in modern science around 1835 and through 1992 that should jar the thinking of any modern Catholic on the subject of geocentrism. To start off, while Cardinal Olivieri was busy twisting the arm of Pius VII, the French scientist, Dominique Arago, had shown through two experiments in the 1820s that the Earth seemed to be motionless in space. A temporary reprieve for the Copernicans occurred in the 1860s when two other Frenchmen, Fresnel and Fizeau, convinced everyone by means of an ad hoc theory that Arago’s results were not what they seemed to be. But the Englishman, George Airy, showed through another experiment in 1871, commonly known as “Airy’s Failure,” that Arago was on the right track.

The stage was set for what historian John D. Bernal calls “the most famous negative result in the history of science” – the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment. To the world’s consternation, Albert Michelson’s results likewise indicated the Earth was motionless in space. As Bernard Jaffe notes in Michelson and the Speed of Light: “The data were almost unbelievable…There was only one other possible conclusion to draw — that the Earth was at rest.” The experiment was repeated dozens of times after Michelson, and always with the same result.

Of course, admitting the Earth didn’t move was unacceptable to modern science, since everyone “knew” it was moving. As Einstein’s biographer put it: “The problem which now faced science was considerable. For there seemed to be only three alternatives. The first was that the Earth was standing still, which meant scuttling the whole Copernican theory and was unthinkable.” Physicist G. J. Whitrow even admitted that if Michelson’s experiment was available when the Church was debating Galileo, “…the result would surely have been interpreted as conclusive evidence for the immobility of the Earth, and therefore as a triumphant…falsification of the Copernican hypothesis.”

Here is where the story gets rather interesting. One of the other two “alternatives” to keep the Earth moving was proposed in 1892 by world-renowned Dutch physicist, Hendrik Lorentz. He suggested that as the Earth moved around the sun at 66,000 mph, the ether in space that it traveled against put pressure on Michelson’s instrument and shrank it. With a distorted instrument, the measurement was off-kilter and made it appear that the Earth was standing still. This became known as the “Lorentz contraction theory” and was put into an equation \( \frac{L_{\text{new}}}{L_{\text{old}}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} \). Today, next to Newton’s \( F = ma \), it is probably the most widely used equation in physics.

Einstein came along in 1905 to examine the issue. Although he was forced to keep Lorentz’s “shrinking” hypothesis, he decided that since there was no scientific evidence that ether shrunk moving objects (for previously, ether was understood to produce no friction), it was better to abandon the ether. Instead, Einstein proposed that Michelson’s instrument shrank due to an unknown principle of nature. But since Einstein gave no physical cause for the contraction, he was summarily accused by his critics of violating the laws of metaphysics, namely, having an effect without a cause.
Length contraction was certainly an oddity in the annals of physics, but the ramifications were even stranger. If the length of an object is contracted when it moves from point A to point B, then it will not arrive at point B in the same time as when the object is not contracted. Consequently, the time of travel must be increased to make everything balance; hence, Einstein's famous “time dilation” was invented. Additionally, length contraction will make the mass of the object denser, hence, Einstein’s famous “mass increase.”

All of these *ad hoc* solutions to Michelson’s experiment became the foundation of Einstein’s 1905 Special Theory of Relativity. Essentially, Special Relativity was invented for one reason – to convince the world that the Earth was moving when the experiments showed it was fixed in space. Einstein admitted as much in his 1924 speech in Kyoto, Japan. But as bizarre as it was, length contraction was the only answer modern science could produce after almost a quarter century of collective head-banging on the problem. Of course, since the alternative was to admit the Catholic Church was right in condemning Galileo, modern society was ready to accept almost any alternative, even if it meant turning physics into a haunted house of mirrors, as Einstein’s relativity certainly did.

The irony of the whole charade was revealed in 1915 when Einstein was forced to invent General Relativity due to the weakness of the Special theory. Einstein rudely discovered that his General theory allowed Earth to be the motionless center of the universe. As he puts it in 1914:

“We need not necessarily trace the existence of these centrifugal forces back to an absolute movement of K’ [Earth]; we can instead just as well trace them back to the rotational movement of the distant ponderable masses [the stars] in relation to K’ [Earth] whereby we treat K’ [Earth] as ‘at rest.’”

The General theory also contradicted the Special theory in other ways. First, in the General theory, Einstein took back the very ether he had abandoned in the Special theory. He writes in 1920:

“Recapitulating, we may say that according to the general theory of relativity, space is endowed with physical qualities; in this sense, therefore, there exists an ether. According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense.”

Second, the General Theory allowed light to travel at any speed, whereas in the Special theory he had to limit the speed of light to make it appear the Earth was moving. Again, Einstein wrote in 1920:

“In the second place our result shows that, according to the general theory of relativity, the law of the constancy of the velocity of light in vacuo, which constitutes one of the two fundamental assumptions in the special theory of relativity and to which we have already frequently referred, cannot claim any unlimited validity.”

In all these machinations, Einstein admitted several times in his career that he could not disprove geocentrism, even though philosophically he preferred heliocentrism. In his 1938 book, *The Evolution of Physics*, he writes: “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.”

*Stephen Hawking* recently did the same in his 2010 book, *The Grand Design*, saying, “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 famous physicist George F. R. Ellis (who is interviewed in *The Principle*), co-authored a book with Hawking and says much the same: “I can construct 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…A lot of cosmology tries to hide that.”

Things really came to roost when Michelson (who never accepted Einstein’s Relativity theory), did another experiment in 1925. This time he wanted to provide evidence for our 24-hour rotation. He used the same methodology as he did in 1887 – measuring movement by using the interference of light waves against ether in space. This time the results were positive, very positive. Michelson measured 98% of the daily rotation. He thus confirmed a relative rotation between Earth and the universe; and that ether definitely existed.

So, although Einstein was able to escape Michelson’s 1887 experiment by ignoring the laws of cause-and-effect, he was not able to do so with Michelson’s 1925 experiment. Einstein could no longer deny the presence of ether, but denying ether had been an indispensable foundation to his Special theory. Einstein himself admitted: “If Michelson-Morley is wrong, then Relativity is wrong.”

Charles Lane Poor, professor of physics at Columbia University, explains what he meant: “The Michelson-Morley experiment forms the basis of the relativity theory: Einstein calls it decisive…if it should develop that there is a measurable ether-drift, then the entire fabric of the relativity theory would collapse like a house of cards.”

Einstein’s friends tried to help him. The *New York Times* did so by pretending there was no problem. In its article of January 9, 1925 the *Times* both lied and contradicted itself. Its headline stated: “Michelson Proves Einstein Theory,” which was a total falsehood. The subheading stated: “Ether Drift is Confirmed,” which, although true, disproved Einstein’s Special theory, not proved it, as noted above from the words of Charles Lane Poor. Of course, the reason for the fabrication was that if Special Relativity was discredited, it meant the world no longer possessed an explanation for Michelson’s 1887 experiment. Borrowing from an old movie title, it would amount to “The Day the Earth Stood Still.” Unfortunately for the public, these events were ignored by the world’s press for the rest of the 20th century. Hence, Einstein remained the icon of modern science even though his theory had been falsified.

For the geocentrist, both of Michelson’s experiments make perfect sense. The 1887 experiment didn’t measure any movement of the Earth around the sun since the Earth isn’t moving around the sun. But the
1925 experiment measured a full daily rotation since space is rotating around a motionless Earth every 24 hours. For heliocentrics it’s not so easy, for they require both a daily rotation and a yearly revolution. They cannot have one without the other. But the experimental evidence provides only a daily rotation.

Last but certainly not least, as John Paul II was giving his speech in 1992 about the Church’s “mistake” against Galileo, NASA was sending up probes into space to check on previously reported evidence from the late 1970s that Earth might be in the center of the universe. The name of the 1990 probe was COBE – Cosmic Background Explorer. Prior to COBE, the universe had been touted as being a homogeneous microwave sea – something we would expect if there had been a Big Bang several billion years ago – a homogeneous bang that would not have allowed the Earth to be in the center. But COBE showed the universe was not homogeneous. It was more like non-homogenized milk – lumpy. Even more surprising was that the microwave lumps, which went from one end of the universe to the other, oriented themselves around the Sun-Earth ecliptic and the Earth’s equator, making two axes with Earth in the virtual center. That’s like saying the Milky Way galaxy is centered on a pea. Moreover, the microwaves were lumpy enough to discredit any notion of a Big Bang, since the Big Bang required a very smooth explosion.

To check on COBE’s results, in 2001 NASA sent up the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe and it confirmed COBE in much more clarity. So remarkable were WMAP’s findings that in 2004, the science community derogatorily called the universe’s alignment with the ecliptic and equator “The Axis of Evil.” It was “evil” for them, of course, because it defied the Copernican Principle and put Earth at or near the center of the universe. One of the leading cosmologists in the world (who also is interviewed in The Principle), Lawrence Krauss of Arizona State University, candidly admitted: “But when you look at CMB map, you also see that the structure that is observed, is in fact, in a weird way, correlated with the plane of the earth around the sun. Is this Copernicus coming back to haunt us? That would say we are truly the center of the universe.”

Disturbed by these results, NASA teamed up with the ESA and sent up a third probe in 2009 called “Planck.” Its results were revealed in March 2013. The Axis of Evil was even more prominent; and Earth’s central location was confirmed. Max Tegmark, an astrophysicist at MIT (who is also interviewed in The Principle), stated: “I have to confess that The Axis of Evil is linked to a special direction in our solar system….I’m keeping all my options on the table.”

But the fact that you haven’t heard any of these facts on either the CBS Morning News or any news outlet in the world shows that the world cannot come to grips with its own scientific findings. They will ignore it as long as they can, because they all know what the consequences will be – a total game-changing paradigm shift of the modern mentality.
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