

[All Categories](#)  
 [Apologetics](#)  
 [Eastern](#)  
 [Traditional](#)  
 [Non-Catholic](#)  
 [Liturgy/Sacraments](#)  
 [Catholic Living](#)  
 [News](#)  
[Sacred Scripture](#)  
[Philosophy](#)  
[Moral Theology](#)  
[Social Justice](#)

**excubitor**

**May '10**

In the days of Galileo and Keplar, Tycho Brahe rejected heliocentrism primarily because of the complete lack of Stellar Parallax. In the last hundred years or so tiny changes in position of stars have been observed which we are told are Stellar Parallax. The reason these changes in position are so tiny (we are told) is because the stars are trillions of kilometres distant, light years away.

What is also not told to the general public is that half of the stars which exhibit parallax actually exhibit NEGATIVE PARALLAX.

If stellar parallax indicates that a particular star is closer to the main background of stars then negative stellar parallax should indicate that a particular star is further away than the main background of stars.

This however is completely incompatible with the conventional model of astronomy which teaches that the furthest stars exhibit no parallax because of their great distance from the earth. My question therefore is how do we deal with the issue of negative parallax in an open and honest way?

I believe that conventional astronomical community are in open fraud because they completely ignore negative parallax readings, explaining them away as measurement errors, at the same time as they happily use positive parallax readings to "prove" their theories in opposition to geocentrism. That is intellectual skulduggery of the worst kind in my view and is basically a lie. If negative parallax readings are "errors" then what cause do we have to assume that positive parallax readings are not themselves also "errors".

For further information on this issue please read Dr. Neville Thomas Jones Ph.D., D.I.C., M.Sc.(Phys), M.Sc.(Comp), B.Sc.(Hons) which also has some useful diagrams.

[realityreviewed.com/Negative%20parallax.htm](http://realityreviewed.com/Negative%20parallax.htm)

**tjm190**

**May '10**

Parallax- You look measure the angle from a point on Th Earth's surface, wait til we're on the opposite side of the orbit, and then do it again. You now have an angle, a side, and another angle of a triangle so you can determine the other two sides- the distance to that star.

Where does this business of negative come in? Can stars shift with a 'negative' displacement?

Furthermore, Brahe was completely open to the conclusion that stars were too far away to have parallax.

**DISCLAIMER:** The views and opinions expressed in these forums do not necessarily reflect those of Catholic Answers. For official apologetics resources please visit [www.catholic.com](http://www.catholic.com).

**VociMike****May '10**

Physically, how can negative parallax exist? An object at infinity will have zero parallax, all closer objects will have positive parallax (maybe too small to measure).

Besides, what does this have to do with geocentrism? Whether the earth moves relative to the stars, or the stars move relative to the earth, the parallax will be the same.

**pnewton****May '10**

Does this also prove that the Earth is sitting on the back of a giant turtle?

First, negative movement is not a logical possibility. Negative numbers are only a statistical result of inaccurate measures.

[shatters.net/forum/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=11381](http://shatters.net/forum/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=11381)

Second, as pointed out, what is moving where is not shown by parallax. Only relative movement is shown.

Finally, as my first question alluded to, even when we find scientific theories to be inaccurate or invalid, it does not "prove" another theory. Since the article is ignorant of the definition of "proof", it is difficult to take them seriously.

**excubitor****May '10**

pnewton:

Does this also prove that the Earth is sitting on the back of a giant turtle?

First, negative movement is not a logical possibility. Negative numbers are only a statistical result of inaccurate measures.

[shatters.net/forum/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=11381](http://shatters.net/forum/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=11381)

Second, as pointed out, what is moving where is not shown by parallax. Only relative movement is shown.

Finally, as my first question alluded to, even when we find scientific theories to be inaccurate or invalid, it does not "prove" another theory. Since the article is ignorant of the definition of "proof", it is difficult to take them seriously.

Your turtle comment is simply an ad hominen attack.

Do you think I am a fool do you who believes that the earth sits on the back of a turtle?

It seems that you do not clearly understand the issue here.

If negative movement is not logically possible as you are suggesting and the negative parallax measurements are inaccurate then why do you not also conclude that the positive parallax

**DISCLAIMER:** The views and opinions expressed in these forums do not necessarily reflect those of Catholic Answers. For official apologetics resources please visit [www.catholic.com](http://www.catholic.com).

29% positive parallax readings and the remainder showing effectively no parallax. Also the magnitude of the readings were equal between negative and positive.

If it is impossible as you suggest in a stellar parallax scenario for negative readings to be recorded without error then we must conclude one of two things.

1. The equipment is faulty and is unable to record changes in star positions accurately and reliably;  
or
2. That the movements of the stars which are recorded are not actually proof of parallax at all but are simply proof that the stars themselves are moving.

As for whether or not this constitutes proof of Geocentrism. What I think it proves is that heliocentrism/acentrism is not supported by the observable facts and that Geocentrism is therefore the overwhelmingly most probable scenario.

**excubitor**

**May '10**

[quote="VociMike, post:3, topic:199954"]

Physically, how can negative parallax exist? An object at infinity will have zero parallax, all closer objects will have positive parallax (maybe too small to measure).

[/quote]

Exactly. So therefore if negative parallax is an impossibility for objects at infinity, it proves therefore that what is being recorded is not a parallax reading at all but an actual movement in the position of the star.

[quote="VociMike, post:3, topic:199954"]

Besides, what does this have to do with geocentrism? Whether the earth moves relative to the stars, or the stars move relative to the earth, the parallax will be the same.

[/quote]

I truly can't believe anyone could ask this question. Obviously I am contending that the stars are moving relative to us which is otherwise to say that the earth is NOT moving. Which is the whole point of the Geocentric argument.

**VociMike**

**May '10**

[quote="excubitor, post:6, topic:199954"]

Exactly. So therefore if negative parallax is an impossibility for objects at infinity, it proves therefore that what is being recorded is not a parallax reading at all but an actual movement in the position of the star.

[/quote]

Moving in what fashion? Straight line motion? Does geocentrism require that the stars move in straight line motion?

I truly can't believe anyone could ask this question.

Sure you can. :)

[quote="tjm190, post:2, topic:199954"]

Where does this business of negative come in? Can stars shift with a 'negative' displacement?

[/quote]

Didn't you read the link. Negative parallax is recorded as frequently as positive parallax by the European Space Agency Hipparcos Satellite.

Have a look at this forum. [answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20080819185322AA7gwL2](https://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20080819185322AA7gwL2)

Poor astronomy student struggling with negative parallax and wondering what to do with it.

Answer provided to struggle student. "Just ignore it, its an error".

JUST IGNORE IT???????????? IS that Science ????????

Just throw out the stars says the Astrophysics professor. Ironic. This is exactly what Copernicus did when he invented the concept of a solar system. He threw out the stars because they just don't fit into a heliocentric model.

**pnewton**

**May '10**

[quote="excubitor, post:5, topic:199954"]

Your turtle comment is simply an ad hominen attack.

Do you think I am a fool do you who believes that the earth sits on the back of a turtle?

It seems that you do not clearly understand the issue here.

[/quote]

And I think you have no idea what an ad hominem attack is. I did not say one word about you. I was commenting on the argument and the ridiculous conclusion that it proved geocentrism. I think the only thing we see is evidence (not proof) that parallax measurements can be inaccurate in some cases.

From your Yahoo link:

If the answer is negative then the parallax angle is smaller than the errors in the astrometry - so the number is meaningless.

Such evidence does no more to prove geocentrism than it proves that the Earth is on the back of a giant turtle.

If you think this statement is an ad hominem, then feel free to report it.

**excubitor**

**May '10**

[quote="pnewton, post:9, topic:199954"]

And I think you have no idea what an ad hominem attack is. I did not say one word about you. I was commenting on the argument and the ridiculous conclusion that it proved geocentrism. I think the only thing we see is evidence (not proof) that parallax measurements can be inaccurate in some cases.

From your Yahoo link:

Such evidence does no more to prove geocentrism than it proves that the Earth is on the back of a giant turtle.

If you think this statement is an ad hominem, then feel free to report it.

DISCLAIMER: The views and opinions expressed in these forums do not necessarily reflect those of Catholic Answers. For official apologetics resources please visit [www.catholic.com](http://www.catholic.com).

Alright then fair enough. Perhaps it was not strictly ad hominem, but it was a mocking comment designed to heap disdain and scorn upon the argument which I was raising. Which is by extension a negative reflection on the person who is raising and supporting the argument. All I ask is a fair crack of the whip. If I am wrong, then show me where I am wrong.

You provided this quote "If the answer is negative then the parallax angle is smaller than the errors in the astrometry - so the number is meaningless."

However this is simply not true. The negative numbers are just as large as the positive numbers and just as evenly distributed. Therefore if the "errors in the astrometry" are so great as to render all the negative measurements as meaningless then they should also render all the positive measurements as being meaningless as well. In which case there is no stellar parallax AT ALL. And if there is no stellar parallax then it can only be because THE EARTH IS STATIONERY.

You are going to have to provide a better analysis and explanation to counter my argument.

DISCLAIMER: The views and opinions expressed in these forums do not necessarily reflect those of Catholic Answers. For official apologetics resources please visit [www.catholic.com](http://www.catholic.com).

DISCLAIMER: The views and opinions expressed in these forums do not necessarily reflect those of Catholic Answers. For official apologetics resources please visit [www.catholic.com](http://www.catholic.com).





DISCLAIMER: The views and opinions expressed in these forums do not necessarily reflect those of Catholic Answers. For official apologetics resources please visit [www.catholic.com](http://www.catholic.com).