

## Re: ? heliocentric vs geocentric models ?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2008-07/msg00534.html>

---

- *From:* oriel36 <kelleher.gerald@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 18 Jul 2008 23:22:16 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Jul 18, 11:40 pm, Charlie Siegrist  
<none.act...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I find it rather extraordinary that a regular poster here (one who apparently wants to be taken seriously) is given to dismissing both Brahe and Newton's works, even to the extent of referring to Newton as "that really stupiid (sic) man."

As far as I am concerned,a person stands or falls on the technical arguments which support structural astronomical views and Newton's view of retrogrades and their resolution is silly,stupid or whatever other appropriate judgement can be attached to his view of retrogrades .Contemporary imaging shows our planet overtaking the outer planets in our common orbit around the central Sun,this being the basis for the conclusion by Copernicus that the Earth orbits the central Sun between Venus and Mars with axial rotation left to explain the daily cycle –

[http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0112/JuSa2000\\_teze1.gif](http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0112/JuSa2000_teze1.gif)

If a person calling themselves an astronomer made the following statement after looking at the time lapse footage above I would still call them silly for the obvious reason that we see our motion around the Sun directly due to our orbital motion and position with respect to the other planets –

"For to the earth planetary motions appear sometimes direct, sometimes stationary, nay, and sometimes retrograde. But from the sun they are always seen direct" Newton

It is not a question of whether Newton was stupid,it is a matter of whether his view meshes with that of Copernicus and to a lesser extent,those of Kepler and Galileo and actual imaging shows it does not.In this respect,to justify Newton's view you then must find that Copernicus is incorrect so it is not a judgement of personality but a purely technical judgement.

Re: ? heliocentric vs geocentric models ?

The idea that a geocentric theory can be

proposed, requiring however some very twisted math, is interesting as an exercise, and I don't think doing so is of any harm. It is very likely a great learning experience, much like considering Copernicus' futile effort to mathematize a means for the planets' orbits to be circular. Because the predecessors got a few things wrong is no reason to discard the greater good, and certainly no reason to call a great man like Isaac Newton "stupid."

Again, you are no better or worse than the detractor of Starlord, you try to sound different but ultimately you try to rob astronomy of its magnificence and its dignity. Trying to invoke Tycho or the false reasoning of Bradley just to protect the astrologically based concepts of Newton cannot conceal the basic error but it does reveal how miserable you are as human beings.

You appear at first glance to be a very bitter person. How's my intuition?