

Palm: Respectfully, but not so Stephen. As I've pointed out to you before, the CMB vectors do not contain any positional information whatsoever. And they would have their origin at the point of observation by definition. Therefore, they do not "point like an arrow . . . directly to the Earth", "point directly to the Earth as the center", "show that the whole Universe is centered on the Earth", or any of the other extravagant things claimed by the new geocentrists.

R. Sungenis: Mr. Palm, who hasn't even studied cosmology much less has any degrees in it, acts as if he has the one and only authoritative interpretation of the CMB data. Since Mr. Palm has lost sight of who his friends and enemies are, he is bamboozled by Mr. MacAndrew, who, incidentally, also has no training in examining CMB data. Sadly, Mr. Palm doesn't even know how MacAndrew arrived at his CMB conclusion, much less is he able to explain it. He blindly accepts it as the truth.

Mr. Palm says, "As I've pointed out to you before, the CMB vectors do not contain any positional information whatsoever."

R. Sungenis: Mr. Palm is a master at misdirection. The CMB, as we have said many times, puts a DIRECTION in space, which is unheard of and unacceptable in the Big Bang cosmology that Mr. Palm and Mr. MacAndrew believe in.

But it just so happens that not only is there a direction in space, that direction aligns with: (1) the Sun-Earth ecliptic (and that's why they call it the Axis of Evil in the science literature); and (2) with the Earth's equinoxes. If this is not the case, then why are many prominent astrophysicists saying that the CMB direction aligns with these two positions, and why is Alec MacAndrew the only one saying that the CMB does not do so?

By now we have all heard the word of one of the leading astrophysicists, Lawrence Krauss, admitting the CMB is aligned with the Sun-Earth ecliptic, namely:

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

There are at least a dozen other cosmologists who have admitted the same thing and I have documented all of them, and others have documented them as well. See <http://kgov.com/the-axis-of-evil-and-anisotropy>

So where does Mr. Palm get his conviction? It comes from his hatred of me and a faulty analysis that MacAndrew did of the Planck report. Table 18 shows a 7 degree angle difference between the CMB octopole and CMB quadrupole. So then Mr. MacAndrew goes on a wild goose chase and calculates that some of the angular discrepancies can be up to "16 degrees." Let's see how he arrives at his "16 degrees." You will be amazed.

Here are MacAndrew's own calculations (by the way, all he did to get these figures is start with a one known and then add and subtract to get the other seven categories. No big deal):

The quadrupole to the equinox is 23.1°

The octopole to the equinox is 17.6°
The quadrupole to the dipole is 28.5°
The quadrupole to the octopole is 7.7°
The dipole to the equinox is well known and is 14.1°
The dipole to the ecliptic plane is 11.1°
The quadrupole to the ecliptic plane is 16.0°
The octopole to the ecliptic plane is 8.6°

So let's look at these:

MacAndrew: "The quadrupole to the equinox is 23.1° "

All we can say is "Thanks, Mr. MacAndrew. We couldn't have said it better ourselves." Since we have consistently stated, from the experts, that the CMB quadrupole is aligned with the ecliptic, and since the ecliptic is known to be 23.5 degrees from the equinox, then having the quadrupole at 23.1 degrees from the equinox, by MacAndrew's own findings, fits perfectly with the CMB being aligned with our Sun-Earth ecliptic. That is why they call it the "Axis of Evil." Case closed.

MacAndrew: The octopole to the equinox is 17.6°

R. Sungenis: No one really cares about the octupole's relation to the equinox. Even at a 7.7 degree difference, the Planck report still considers that quadrupole and octupole in virtual alignment with one another.

MacAndrew: The quadrupole to the dipole is 28.5°

R. Sungenis: Huh? If the "quadrupole to the equinox is 23.1° " and the "dipole to the equinox is 14.1° " then how can the "quadrupole to the dipole be 28.5° "? Mr. MacAndrew's figure is three times too big. Moreover, according to current figures, the dipole is at 264, 48, and the quadrupole is at 260, 60 (Kate Land, <http://www.cita.utoronto.ca/TALKS/Land-Nov23.pdf>). They are close to each other, not 28.5 degrees apart.

MacAndrew: The quadrupole to the octopole is 7.7°

R. Sungenis: This is the only factual information that the Planck study gave Mr. MacAndrew, and notice how small the number is. Besides, no one in the Planck report uses this 7.7 degree difference to claim that "there is no positional information in the CMB data," unlike Mr. MacAndrew – a first-timer in CMB analysis. That is because a 7.7 degree difference is a negligible difference. Even the Planck report recognizes this.

MacAndrew: The dipole to the equinox is well known and is 14.1°

R. Sungenis: Here is what MacAndrew says in his paper: "The alignment between the CMB dipole and the equinox has been known for over 30 years. The magnitude and direction of the dipole have been refined by many probes of the CMB including the satellites COBE, WMAP and Planck. The measured values for the direction and amplitude of the CMB dipole have remained the same for a decade or more. The direction of the CMB dipole vector is 14.1° from the autumnal equinox (The way the geocentrists describe these alignments you'd think that they are exact)."

Actually, the same galactic coordinates have been passed around since the 1990 COBE probe, which is $l = 264$ and $b = 48$, which is the same figure Land uses above. But other studies have shown that those coordinates are not correct. A paper by Rubart and Schwarz, July 2013, titled, "Cosmic radio dipole from NVSS and WENSS," says that coordinates are RA 154 degrees +/- 19 and dec at -2 degrees +/- 19, and they explain why as "We compare several difference estimators and show that conflicting claims in the literature can be attributed to the use of different estimators." Their findings make the dipole closer to the equinox than previous studies. Rubart and Schwarz also show that previous attempts to attribute the dipole anisotropy to solar motion cannot be correct (which error was probably the cause for the high declination). They state that the NVSS dipole amplitude "exceeds the one expected from the CMB by a factor of 4 and is inconsistent with the assumption of a pure kinetic origin of the radio dipole at 99.6% CL."

So why isn't MacAndrew talking about this anomaly? Because it is extremely bad news for his Big Bang theory. The evidence shows the dipole is intrinsic and not caused by the Doppler effect. It is another slap in the face to Copernicanism since without a Doppler effect of the CMB there is no measurable motion between the Earth and the universe except a relative rotation.

The real issue, which MacAndrew conveniently avoids, is the Axis of Evil, from which all measurements start. The Axis of Evil is the quadrupole's alignment with the Sun-Earth ecliptic. Now, let's observe what mathematical fudges MacAndrew used to escape this important alignment. Notice above that MacAndrew's first calculation is the "Quadrupole to the Equinox" which he calculates to be "23.1" degrees, which we said above, is precisely where we would expect it to be since the equinox is the Earth's equator. The equinox/equator is at 0 degrees. We know the sun-earth Ecliptic is 23.5 degrees from the equator/equinox. But notice what MacAndrew does with the category of "quadrupole to the ecliptic plane." He says the quadrupole is "16.0" degrees from the ecliptic plane. Well, if MacAndrew already admitted that the quadrupole is "23.1" degrees from the equator/equinox, and we know that the ecliptic is 23.5 degrees from the equator/equinox, how can MacAndrew say the quadrupole is "16.0" degrees from the ecliptic plane?!

The dipole to the ecliptic plane is 11.1°

R. Sungenis: This amounts to nothing because MacAndrew doesn't know what the exact degrees are between the dipole and the equinox.

MacAndrew: The quadrupole to the ecliptic plane is 16.0°

R. Sungenis: As noted above, if MacAndrew already admitted that the quadrupole is "23.1" degrees from the equator/equinox, and we know that the ecliptic is 23.5 degrees from the equator/equinox, how can MacAndrew say the quadrupole is "16.0" degrees from the ecliptic plane?!

MacAndrew's conclusion is that if the CMB alignment with Earth can be off by 16 degrees, then the CMB offers "no positional information." Keep in mind that the only thing Table 18 of the Planck report said is that there is a 7.7 degree angle difference between the octupole and quadrupole. That means that Table 18 from the Planck report is only speaking of the angular relation of the quadrupole to the octupole, not of the CMB's relation to the Earth! Everything else is from MacAndrew's skewed personal analysis, and this coming from someone who has never analyzed CMB data in his life, except when it was presented to him by David Palm.

Palm: Unfortunately, you've fallen for a pseudo-scientific scam. Cf.

R. Sungenis: Unfortunately, Mr. Palm's desire to discredit me is, by his own admission, generated by his intense animosity of me because of my position on the Jews. His desire has been to discredit my position on geocentrism so that people will not listen to my research on Jews. Mr. Palm especially doesn't like it when I criticize the theories of Albert Einstein, a Jewish Zionist like Mr. Palm, and specifically stated that he was going to try to discredit me because I dared to reveal the sordid life of Einstein in my book, *Galileo Was Wrong* (NB: Einstein was adulterer, wife-beater, dead-beat dad, philanderer, plagiarist, etc).

SH: Since you are a leading critic here of the Sungenis position that has caused so much of stir, even in scholarly and theological circles, even with you personally, (and since Ricker is dismissed as practically irrelevant to the matter at hand) please describe your own background of demonstrated competence in the question at hand.

Palm: I have two B.S. degrees in engineering and a Master's in New Testament studies.

R. Sungenis: In other words, David Palm has the same degrees (i.e., engineering) that Harry Ricker has, but says that Harry Ricker should not use those degrees to judge geocentrism, yet Mr. Palm judges geocentrism as a "pseudo-scientific scam" based on his engineering degrees. Go figure.

Palm: Dr. MacAndrew, who has contributed to my site, has B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in physics from Imperial College, London.

R. Sungenis: Dr. MacAndrew is an atheist who would never consider alternative explanations to cosmology that give credence to Christianity, much less gives credence to the Catholic Church's condemnation of Galileo. Dr. MacAndrew only knows what they teach in mainstream physics, which is a devotion to the bankrupt theories of Albert Einstein. In addition, MacAndrew has never studied astrophysics or cosmology, nor has any degrees dealing with those subjects, yet considers himself an authority on the CMB alignments. How is it then, that dozens of astrophysicists and peer-reviewed papers see the CMB alignments with the Earth's equator and the Sun-Earth ecliptic that MacAndrew denies?

Palm: But consider the nature of your query, Stephen. The Magisterium has officially ruled that Catholics are free to embrace non-geocentric cosmological views (<http://www.geocentrismdebunked.org/magisterium-rules-debate/>). No one requires any special competence to point that out.

R. Sungenis: Mr. Palm continues his obfuscation of the issue and apparently it will never stop. He is referring to the imprimatur given to Canon Settele in 1821 for his book on heliocentrism. But what Mr. Palm ignores is the fact that the reason Pius VII allowed the imprimatur is that he was lied to by the Commissioner of the Index, Maurizio Olivieri, about why the 1616 and 1633 magisterium rejected heliocentrism. Olivieri claimed that those magisteriums rejected heliocentrism only because (1) Galileo's model did not contain the elliptical orbits of Kepler; and (2) that if the Earth moved the atmosphere would be sucked away by outer space. It was one of the most horrific lies ever told. So the present "allowance" of heliocentrism in the Church is based on nothing but a bald-faced lie. But Mr. Palm congratulates Olivieri for telling the lie, since, as he claims, "modern science has proven heliocentrism to be correct," even though he knows that Kepler's elliptical orbits were put on the

Index in 1619 and reiterated in 1664 by Alexander VII, thus showing that the Church DID NOT use elliptical orbits in judging Galileo's model. Galileo made the Earth move and the Church said it didn't move. It was as simple as that. But Mr. Palm's sleight of hand wants you to miss it.

Palm: But surely it would be reasonable to expect some very special competence from someone who claims that the Catholic Church still officially teaches geocentrism as doctrine, right? Do the new geocentrists have such demonstrated competence?

R. Sungenis: All one need do is read the condemnations against heliocentrism from the minutes of the 1616 and 1633 declarations approved by the reigning pope, and then ask oneself the question: has the Church ever made an official and formal rescission of those decrees and declared it to the whole Church? The answer is no. Mr. Palm has nothing except the big lie that Olivieri told to Pius VII.

Palm: Similarly, there is not a single working physicist or astronomer who holds to strict geocentrism and as far as I can tell there hasn't been for decades, if not centuries.

R. Sungenis: They may not admit they are geocentrists, but anyone who holds to Einstein's theories cannot discredit geocentrism and must consider it as much a scientifically valid theory as heliocentrism. Since all of the physics community believes in Einstein's theory, then all of them are closet geocentrists, otherwise they are not being true to Einstein's theory.

Palm: This represents a consensus of Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and yes, even atheist scientists. We would expect some very special competence from someone who claims to be qualified to overthrow this massive scientific consensus, right?

R. Sungenis: Yes, that's right. That's why I use Einstein's theories, Mach's theories, and even Newton's theories to show the viability of geocentrism, along with the many present day physicists and astrophysicists who have admitted that all three views of physics will allow a geocentric universe and that the only reason they reject geocentrism is due to their philosophical biases. I'm only the messenger boy. But Mr. Palm doesn't like this messenger boy because this messenger boy opposes Mr. Palm's views about the Jews.

Palm: How do the new geocentrists fare? Consider that Sungenis has no demonstrated competence in any scientific field

R. Sungenis: Does a journalist need to be a politician in order to critique politicians? No. He only needs to be thoroughly familiar with politics and how politicians use or abuse politics. As noted above, I am simply a journalist about science, and since I am very familiar with science and have come to know how scientists use and abuse the data they receive from their telescopes to coincide with their philosophical biases and atheistic worldviews, and since people have come to respect my research in other areas (e.g., theology, biblical studies, current events, etc.) they have come to respect my research into the previously tabooed subject of modern science. They have discovered, as I have, that it is filled with as many lies and inventions as any other endeavor of man. Scientists, in fact, are little better than politicians when it comes to telling the truth and laying aside their biases.

Palm: and regularly makes basic blunders in math and science (see e.g. <http://www.geocentrismdebunked.org/sungenis-elementary.../> and <http://www.geocentrismdebunked.org/sungenis-botches-the.../>).

R. Sungenis: The so-called mistake was simply when I plugged the wrong units into an on-line calculator since I wasn't thoroughly familiar with the abbreviations and nomenclature it was using. When I was alerted to the mistake I finally fixed it and admitted my error. It is only people like David Palm who detest me for my political views who will take instances like this and exploit them to that he can make me look incompetent.

Palm: He and Drs. Bennett and Bouw are demonstrated plagiarists, stealing the hard work of others rather than doing the work themselves (see <http://www.geocentrismdebunked.org/geocentrists-caught/>).

R. Sungenis: This is another instance in which Palm simply exaggerates the story and makes himself judge, jury and executioner, regardless of how his accusations are discredited. The fact is, when I exposed Albert Einstein as a plagiarist (see "Einstein the Incurable Plagiarist" at <http://www.amazon.com/Albert-Einstein-The.../dp/09719629870>, that is when Mr. Palm started his crusade).

Palm: They have no scientific model of their own, but rely on special pleading and conspiracies to fill in the gaps.

R. Sungenis: We most certainly do have a model, but Mr. Palm wouldn't know it if he bumped into it. He simply doesn't have the physics acumen to know it or judge it. Most recently, one model of ours was written up in the European Journal of Physics in 2013, written by Dr. Luka Popov, and which appears in Chapter 2 of Galileo Was Wrong.

Palm: I find this genuinely puzzling, Stephen. How would you answer this question: Despite their lack of demonstrated competence, their plagiarism, their conspiracy mongering, and their basic blunders in math and science, I still find the new geocentrists to be credible because _____ ?

R. Sungenis: Here's the answer: ...because Mr. Palm shows that he can't be trusted, since all his accusations are specious and his criticisms biased, if not totally devoid of the truth.

Palm: That's right. Ricker is not a real physicist. He's an electrical engineer (as am I). This posting from Ricker is a mere diversion, Stephen. Whether the CMB vectors do or do not provide positional, as opposed to directional, data is a matter of empirical fact, not conjecture. Ricker doesn't address it and neither do you.

R. Sungenis: Well here are some people who address it, and they have the credentials to do so. See <http://kgov.com/the-axis-of-evil-and-anisotropy>

Palm: I say again, the CMB vectors have their origin at the point of observation (in our case our local system) by definition. And they convey no positional but only directional information. So the assertions from the new geocentrists that they "point like an arrow . . . directly to the Earth", "point directly to the Earth as the center", "show that the whole Universe is centered on the Earth", or any of the other extravagant things claimed by the new geocentrists are part of a pseudo-scientific scam. Do you have anything that would rebut the substance of that?

R. Sungenis: This is another of Mr. Palm's attempts at grandstanding to make it appear that we are making more of the data than what it actually says. But let's look closely at this. The University of Michigan team that has studied the CMB alignments more than anyone, and stated in their 2010 paper: "Our studies indicate that the observed alignments are with the ecliptic plane, with the

equinox or with the CMB dipole, and not with the Galactic plane" ("Large-angle anomalies in the CMB," Craig J. Copi, D. Huterer, D. Schwarz, and G. Starkman, Nov. 12, 2010, arXiv:1004.5602v2).

So, if there is a direction in space (the quadrupole) that goes from one side of the universe all the way to the other side, and that direction happens to line up with the Sun-Earth ecliptic; and then there is a second direction (the dipole) that goes from one side of the universe all the way to the other side, and that direction happens to line up with the Earth's equinoxes, why would someone object to describing that as "point like an arrow...directly to the Earth"? If Krauss can see, just from the quadrupole alignment (the famous Axis of Evil) that "we are truly the center of the universe," why does David Palm object when I say the two CMB alignments "shows that the whole Universe is centered on the Earth"?

My guess is because Mr. Palm simply doesn't want it to be the case, and he will try to use any means to make it appear such. Palm's reaction should be, as Lawrence Vesera puts it, "The discovery that the CMB is cosmically aligned to the Earth should make the hair on the back of your neck stand up" (Nov. 9, 2007, <http://www.idscience.org/2007/11/09/the-discovery-that-dare-not-speak-its-name/>), but Palm will simply not even marvel that these alignments come close to our little region of the universe. Why? Well, it has more to do with Mr. Palm's vendetta against Robert Sungenis than it does true science. Obviously, the science is there even if we quibble over a few degrees, but this is not about science for Mr. Palm. This is about his idolization of the Jews – a position which Robert Sungenis rejects out of hand.

Palm: Interesting that after four months the new geocentrists have refused to take the CMB Alignment Challenge: <http://www.geocentrismdebunked.org/take-the-cmb.../>

R. Sungenis: This "Challenge" has already been met in other papers I have written against MacAndrew's analysis of the CMB. You can see them at debunkingdavidpalm.com. But I will go one step farther to settle all doubt. I will begin a line-by-line critique of the very paper Mr. Palm presents above and post that within the next week or so.