



Search Google Custom Search

Hello There, Guest!

Login Register

Search

Member List

Calendar

The Thinking Atheist Forum > The Heavy Stuff > Atheism and Theism > Creationism

Please provide a Geocentric diagram

Please provide a Geocentric diagram

Threaded Mode | Linear Mode

Pages (10): << Previous 1 ... 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Next >>

Thread Rating:

New Reply

18-02-2013, 10:56 PM

#61

Atothetheist

An Optimist, A Pessimist, a Romantic



Likes Given: 1,685
Likes Received: 3,730 in 1,977 posts

Posts: 7,134
Joined: Sep 2011
Reputation: 116

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

How the hell would a geocentric system work? Logic follows that the earth couldn't possibly hold the sun in orbit. Much less the other planets. The moon is about the only thing conceivable.

I love it how AE seemingly pulls this shit from thin air.

Love ya man, you are hilarious.



Credit goes to UndercoverAtheist.


Find

Like

Reply

18-02-2013, 11:22 PM

#62



Free Thought

Too young to be so old.



Likes Given: 14,417
Likes Received: 9,293 in 4,739 posts

Posts: 12,521
Joined: May 2012
Reputation: 109

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

Atothetheist Wrote:

(18-02-2013 10:56 PM)

How the hell would a geocentric system work? Logic follows that the earth couldn't possibly hold the sun in orbit. Much less the other planets. The moon is about the only thing conceivable.

I love it how AE seemingly pulls this shit from thin air.

Love ya man, you are hilarious.

I asked about the Earth not being big enough to sustain everything orbiting it.

I was told that everybody has lied, and everything in space is much smaller than where they are reported to be.

The people closely associated with the namesake of female canines are suffering from a nondescript form of lunacy.

"Anti-environmentalism is like standing in front of a forest and going 'quick kill them they're coming right for us!'" - Jake Farr-Wharton, The Imaginary Friend Show.

Find

Like

Reply

21-02-2013, 04:46 AM

#63



Hafnof

Frequent Poster




Likes Given: 6,830
Likes Received: 3,699 in 1,605 posts

Posts: 3,369
Joined: Apr 2012
Reputation: 68

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

CHL's latest offering.



Give me your argument in the form of a published paper, and then we can start to talk.

Find

Like

Reply

1 user Likes Hafnof's post

21-02-2013, 07:25 AM

#64

hedgehog648

Junior Member



Likes Given: 52

Likes Received: 181 in 83 posts

Posts: 194

Joined: Nov 2012

Reputation: **7**

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

He set it as private for some reason.

Find

Like

Reply

22-02-2013, 08:09 AM

#65



Hafnof

Frequent Poster



Likes Given: 6,830

Likes Received: 3,699 in 1,605 posts

Posts: 3,369

Joined: Apr 2012

Reputation: **68**

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

Oh - ok. Here's the video again. It looks like he took it down for some reason - maybe an edit - and put it back up again with a different video URL:



Give me your argument in the form of a published paper, and then we can start to talk.

Find

Like

Reply

22-02-2013, 08:16 AM

#66



Vosur

Member of the Cult of Kek



Likes Given: 25,004

Likes Received: 9,957 in 4,187 posts

Posts: 8,896

Joined: May 2012

Reputation: **128**

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

hedgehog648 Wrote:

(21-02-2013 07:25 AM)

He set it as private for some reason.

**Himencrash** 17 hours ago

Why the re-upload?

Reply ·

**CoolHardLogic** 17 hours ago

The result time for a geostationary satellite to fall to Earth was woefully incorrect in the first upload. That's now corrected and IMHO regains a certain something that the barn scene lost due to the cock-up - a swifter conclusion to the geocentrist's failure.

Reply · in reply to Himencrash

The image you are requesting does not exist or is no longer available.

imgur.com

Find

Like

Reply

27-02-2013, 04:24 AM

#67

**Sceptical Prophet**

Newbie



Likes Given: 3

Likes Received: 42 in 13 posts

Posts: 54

Joined: Feb 2013

Reputation: 0

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

If I remember correctly, Aristotle's geocentric model contained 55 layers upon which identified celestial bodies moved around Earth. And that was just what could be seen in the sky in Ancient Greece.

If it took him 55 layers to explain it, I doubt any theists have the capacity to begin to explain the amount of celestial bodies we have identified today. I'd be surprised if geocentric believers could even count to 55.

Science, logic and how they destroy religious arguments @ <http://scepticalprophet.wordpress.com/>

To surrender to ignorance and call it God has always been premature, and it remains premature today.

- Isaac Asimov.

Faith means not wanting to know what is true.

- Friedrich Nietzsche

Find

Like

Reply

27-02-2013, 08:30 AM

#68

**Hafnof**

Frequent Poster



Likes Given: 6,830

Likes Received: 3,699 in 1,605 posts

Posts: 3,369

Joined: Apr 2012

Reputation: **68****RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram**

Well, not only that - accurate observations disqualify Aristotle's model. A geocentric model that agrees with reality would need to be much more complex. Beyond that we now measure distance to nearby stars using the parallax from the location of the earth for measurements taken 6 months apart. The model would need to explain that. Beyond that we have inserted our own objects into the heavens with spacecraft on other planets or orbiting other planets as well as orbiting our on in ways that would require even more complex answers.

No one is doing science to develop and update a geocentric model in line with new facts, to put it in CHL's terms, "because geocentricism is bullshit".

Give me your argument in the form of a published paper, and then we can start to talk.

Find

Like

Reply

19-08-2013, 04:23 AM

#69

excubitor

Junior Member



Likes Given: 2

Likes Received: 2 in 1 posts

Posts: 271

Joined: Aug 2013

Reputation: **-24****RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram**

I have found that very few school text books explain this properly. It is to do with the differential of the gravitational forces on different parts of the earth. If you use Newtons equation on the near side of the earth compared to the far side, then you will find that the differences in the forces are far greater with the moon than with the sun on account of the fact that the sun is so much further away.

The trick is not to think of the earth as being fixed in space. It is actually falling (for want of a better word) constantly towards the moon but the side near to the moon is falling faster than the earth is falling and the far side is falling slower. Hence we have two bulges which is why we have two tides per day as the earth rotates.

As this is correctly explained in the school the thick brain of the student may spark into what the student interprets to be understanding and they may conclude that because they have grasped something which formerly they could not understand that therefore the thing which they grasped must be true.

This is of course a logical fallacy, but is the way that much of science works.

Of course this explanation of tides is utterly fanciful because some parts of the world have no tides and other parts have only one tide per day. You would expect that in this scenario that biggest tides should be at the elliptical however the reality is that the biggest tides occur near the poles. Tide maps also do not show circular bands but irregularly placed blotches where high tides occur in random at various places throughout the world. The inexplicable nature of tide maps is attributed to variations in the sea floor but this is utterly without proof and no computer model has ever demonstrated this to be the case. Evidence of this is that tides are not predicted on the basis of the motions of the sun and moon and the topology of the sea floor, but rather are mere recordings of previous tide readings which repeat every 19 years with astonishing regularity and accuracy.

The fact that the moon and sun also repeat their positions in a 19 year time cycle may add weight to the idea that the tides are linked to the motions of the sun and moon, but this is merely circumstantial evidence. The fact is that the moon as a cause of tides is JUST A THEORY and a preposterous one at that. More accurate is to say that we just don't know what causes the tides. But that is unthinkable to even suggest that and starts to expose modern science as a system of belief as dodgery as a house of cards.

[COLLAPSED] AtheismExposed Wrote:

(05-02-2013 06:28 AM)

Ok then answer me this: Using Newton's equation to work out the gravitational attraction between two bodies (and putting in the heliocentrist's own numbers for the mass and distance of the sun), the gravitational force between the earth and sun is two orders of magnitude greater than the force between the earth and the moon. Why, then, does the moon cause much larger tides on the earth's oceans ...**[SNIP]**... = $G(m_1 m_2 / r^2)$ where m_1 and m_2 are the masses of the bodies and r is the distance between them. For the earth and moon, the magic number is 1.982E20, for the earth and sun it's 3.529E22. Surely the sun should be causing tidal surges almost 200 times larger than what we get from the moon? Or can we safely conclude that the Atheist's numbers for the mass and distance of the sun are RUBBISH?

On this last point I am quite happy to come to this conclusion also.

Find

Like

Reply

19-08-2013, 04:51 AM

#70

excubitor
Junior Member
★★

Likes Given: 2
Likes Received: 2 in 1 posts

Posts: 271
Joined: Aug 2013
Reputation: **-24**

RE: Please provide a Geocentric diagram

[COLLAPSED] Phaedrus Wrote:

(24-01-2013 12:21 AM)

Ok, AtheismExposed and any other geocentrists on here. Please show me what YOU think the universe looks like. I want to see diagrams which explain the positions and motions of the following bodies: Earth Earth's Moon The Sun Mercury Venus Mars Ceres Asteroids in the Asteroid Belt Asteroids in Jupiter's Trojan Points Jupiter Io Europa Ganymede Callisto Saturn Titan Tethys Enceladus Saturn's rings ...**[SNIP]**...e) Also please explain: Seasons Planetary retrograde motion Meteor showers Phases of the Moon Phases of Venus, Mercury, Mars, and Jupiter Why Mercury seems to move back and forth within 20 degrees of the sun Why Venus seems to move back and forth within 30 degrees of the sun Why planets move near the ecliptic (a plane described by the sun's celestial equator) and not the Earth's celestial equator

The positions of the stellar bodies are identical in both the heliocentric and the geocentric. They are merely co-ordinate transformations using a different frame of reference. Modern geocentrists tend to use Tycho Brahes model of the solar system whilst heliocentrists giggle like school children at Ptolemy's model. In fact Kepler used all of Tycho Brahes measurements to demonstrate the heliocentric model. All this proves is that the two models are both equivalent with respect to the relative positions of the stellar objects.

In Tycho Brahes model the earth is the centre of the universe (which should be obvious to everyone), the sun orbits the earth and the planets orbit the sun.

You won't find a physicist who will disagree with me on this point.

This is why Albert Einstein wrote.

"Albert Einstein

"The struggle, so violent in the early days of science, between the views of Ptolemy and Copernicus would then be quite meaningless. Either coordinate system could be used with equal justification. The two sentences: "The sun is at rest and the earth moves," or "the sun moves and the earth is at rest," would simply mean two different conventions concerning two different coordinate systems" The Evolution of Physics Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld."

Phaedrus Wrote:

(24-01-2013 12:21 AM)

Stellar parallax

This is an interesting one and is one of the biggest hoaxes in modern astronomy. The Hipparcos satellite recorded 50% of the parallax readings were negative which is not possible. In one of the biggest cover ups in scientific history the readings were "adjusted" or I would call it cooked to make them all positive. What a croc.

The existence of negative stellar parallax proves that the stars are much closer than we are being told. And if in fact the stars are very much closer than we are being told then that is proof that we are in the centre of the universe.

The reason astronomers have calculated the universe to be such an enormous size is to mask the almost complete lack of stellar parallax which is what caused Tycho Brahe to conclude that we were in the centre of the universe.

Phaedrus Wrote:

(24-01-2013 12:21 AM)

Also please tell me what physical laws govern these motions and phenomena, or if it simply requires a continuous miracle.

Gravity is a continuous miracle. Nobody understands what causes objects to fall to the ground. Gravity has all the characteristics of a miracle. It cannot be shielded. It constantly pulls objects down to it in perpetuity, never lessening its force. If we cannot understand a force that we can observe right under our nose then why do we suppose that we can understand the forces which govern the motions of the sun and planets? Observing the motions of the planets and predicting their positions is not the same thing as understanding the causes of those motions. If indeed the cause of the motion is supernatural then what of it? If that is the truth then we will never understand it by the application of science.

Your premise here is that there must be a physical explanation for all things. This is of course a tenet of science but it is a false premise and cannot itself be proven. This is what is called a philosophy of science, that everything must have a physical explanation. It will surprise you to learn that most of science is driven by philosophies such as this than you would like to believe, and that most of these philosophies are anti-God, anti-Scripture, anti-Christian and anti-Church.

Phaedrus Wrote:

(24-01-2013 12:21 AM)

Please use as many separate diagrams as you need to explain these phenomena, and if you can demonstrate anything mathematically, please, please, please do in as much detail as you can muster. Also include any observations and measurements you've made, especially if these

observations might contradict the observations of "conspiring" astronomers.

I look forward to your response.

I recommend that you purchase Robert Sungenis book Galileo was Wrong for all of this information. I don't agree with him on every point but if you are truly interested in these questions then you will consult his book rather than expecting bloggers with html editor to reproduce his book. But you won't read his book because you have no real personal interest in learning. Rather you seek to discredit geocentrists even though you know practically nothing about the subject. Learn the subject first and then ask genuine questions

Find

Like

Reply

Pages (10): << Previous 1 ... 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Next >>

New Reply

<< Next Oldest | Next Newest >>

Enter Keywords

Search Thread

User(s) browsing this thread: 1 Guest(s)

Forum Jump: ---- Creationism Go

- [View a Printable Version](#)
- [Send this Thread to a Friend](#)
- [Subscribe to this thread](#)

