

## The Tychos – Our Geoaxial Binary System

7 July 2019, 10:48 am<sup>1</sup>

### Another reason why the Copernican model is untenable

In my book on the Tychos model I expounded and illustrated a number of optical, mechanical and geometric aberrations of the Copernican model which disqualify it as a physically plausible configuration of our Solar System. However, there is another major problem with the Copernican model which, unsurprisingly, has been carefully shunned or deliberately suppressed by heliocentrists ever since it was justly pointed out by Tycho Brahe some 400 years ago.

I recently found a most concise summary of this problem on a Polish truthseeking blog<sup>2</sup> which I reproduce below in its entirety lest it disappear some day from the internets, as appears to be the “norm” these days for any inconvenient tidbit of truthful information.

#### Tycho Brahe already refuted the Copernican system

9 September 2014



According to the testimony of today’s astronomers, Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) was one of the greatest astronomers ever. Kepler was his employee. Tycho Brahe postulated a world system of his own and fought against the Copernican with good reason. Now this is odd and certainly there is a special reason for the fact that in the later works of astronomers to this day, although the Ptolemaic world view is described in detail, Tycho Brahe’s system is either not mentioned at all, or dismissed with a few meaningless words. Those reasons for the rejection of the Copernican system by Tycho Brahe, which are believed to have been invalidated successfully today, are being addressed at great length in modern books on astronomy. But the main reason of Tycho Brahe opposing Copernicanism is not mentioned anywhere. Unfortunately the astronomers succeeded in ignoring him completely. We will now get this evidence against Copernicus from the “lumber room of history” and dust it off thoroughly.

It is known that the planets are not always “prograding”, but occasionally move in the opposite direction: they retrograde.<sup>3</sup>



The Copernicans adjudicate this to be an illusion that would be caused by the earth’s orbit around the sun. But then planets and comets should be equally subject to this illusion.



If you are sitting in a moving train and look out of the window, then the trees outside seemingly move in the opposite direction, and that means all of them, without exception. If the visible movement of the trees is only an illusion created by the movement of the train, then it is impossible that the apple trees are moving and the pear trees remain static. Nor can planets participate in a simulated by the “earth movement (earth flight)” retrograde motion, while comets don’t. It is particularly interesting to note the keeping silent of the Copernicans with respect to this unexplicable phenomenon, knowing that Copernicus only postulated his system to create an explication for the apparent retrograde motion.

In his book “The Contradictions in Astronomy” (Berlin 1869), Dr. Carl Schöpffer wrote:

*“We already know that the assumption that the earth might be a planet and orbit the sun, was only postulated to explain the striking stations and retrogrades of the planets. If a revolution of the earth took place, the orbits of the comets should also be able to change from prograde to retrograde motion and vice versa. But this is never the case. All comets retain their course unchanged, are either immutably prograde or immutably retrograde.”*

*[...] Tycho had also observed these peculiarities of comets, but had also immediately drawn the conclusion from them that the adopted movement of the earth must be a false conclusion, because otherwise it would have to exert an influence on the apparent motion of the comets.*

*In his biography by Olav Bang there is a letter from him to Caspar Peucer, in which he wrote these memorable words to the Wittenberg scholar:*

<sup>1</sup> <https://cluesforum.info/viewtopic.php?p=2412550#p2412550>

<sup>2</sup> <http://zbawienienews.blogspot.com/2014/09/tycho-brahe-already-refuted-copernican.html>

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Retrograde\\_and\\_prograde\\_motion](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Retrograde_and_prograde_motion)

“In addition to that also two comets, which came into opposition with the sun, showed apparently enough, that the earth in fact does not move, because their adopted motion had no effect on the previously calculated and even course of the latter, as is the case with planets, of which Copernik says that they would retrograde for this reason.”

*Later on there has often occurred an occasion in which comets could be observed long enough to become convinced of their inconsistency with the Copernican system. The Great Comet of 1811 was observed 511 days, 359 days the comet of 1825, 286 days Halley in 1835 and 269 days the Great Comet of 1858, but with all of them the course in the sky was an even one, no semblance of deviation was brought about by the assumed orbit of the earth.*

*[...] How is it, then, that in the textbooks on astronomy only those of Tycho's pleas against the Copernican system, which arose from the ignorance of his time with physical things, are mentioned and refuted with unnecessary garrulity, whilst this strong objection is carefully concealed or only superficially touched?"*

These were the words of Dr. Carl Schöpffer which document how the astronomical scholars deal with contradictions: The facts are simply suppressed! Copernicus is scientifically disproved and we should no longer disseminate the Copernican system as a matter of course in the truth movement. It is about time to establish a new world system.

The Inner World Cosmos may certainly maintain its position, because it is the only world system that can explain all known phenomena and observations consistently. All alternative world systems are based on the false Copernican assumptions (e.g., hollow earth, electric universe, welteislehre), therefore are contradictory and cannot lay rightful claim to universal validity.

The Tycho's model, of course, eliminates this problem since the retrograde motions of our surrounding planets are not optical illusions but plain physical occurrences caused by their revolutions around our star, the Sun (their common “magnetic centre”), whereas comets revolve as described here. In conclusion, since comets never reverse direction as expected by the heliocentric theory, the Copernican explanation for the retrograde periods of our outer planets cannot be true.