

Appendix 23 The Tychos – Our Geoaxial Binary System

10 July 2019, 11:04 am¹

The hilarious tale of Mercury’s “anomalous” precession

Dear readers, I will hereby do my best to summarize in simple layman’s terms and math this historically crucial, worldwide scientific debate, namely “the mystery of the anomalous precession of Mercury’s perihelion”. In this raging debate, no less than Newton’s “sacrosanct” laws were at stake since Mercury was observed to disobey the same. Eventually, the “victory” went to Mr. Albert Einstein, thus rocketing the little-known patent clerk (and proven plagiarist) to universal fame literally overnight. By all accounts, Einstein’s fledgling Theory of General Relativity was born and gloriously confirmed by his dreadfully convoluted “explanation” of Mercury’s seemingly anomalous behavior.

The whole issue revolved around a small 43" (arcseconds) discrepancy in Mercury’s precessional motion around the Sun: Mercury had been observed by Urbain Le Verrier to precess by an excess of 43" per century, a fact which contradicted Newton’s laws.

As it is, at the end of Chapter 28 of my 2018 book² on the Tychos model, I pointed out a few facts that appeared to be more than coincidental:

“At the time of the vivid debate set off by Le Verrier about Mercury, the equinoctial precession was observed to be about 5,026" (arcseconds) per century. Since Mercury’s perihelion was observed to precess by 5,600" per century (of which 531" were deemed to be caused by the “gravitational tug” of the other planets) the whole controversy revolved around the supposedly anomalous 43 extra arcseconds per century attributed to Mercury’s precession.

As the story goes, the mystery of these pesky 43 extra arcseconds could not be solved by Newton’s gravitational theories, but were then “elegantly resolved” by Einstein’s convoluted Theory of General Relativity.

I have no desire to add more fuel to the century-long inferno concerning Mercury’s allegedly anomalous precession. Yet, I feel compelled to ask if I might at least approach the problem with new insight. As such, I wish to highlight some points that I find more than coincidental:

The allegedly anomalous precession of Mercury was 43" per century. As already mentioned above, the observed equinoctial precession was, at the time, 5026" per century. Now, if we divide 5026 by Mercury’s synodic period, we obtain: $5026" / 116.88 \text{ days} \approx 43"$

In the Tychos model, the equinoctial precession is caused by Earth’s 1-mph motion. The Sun revolves once around Earth in about 365.25 days. Back in the early 1900s, the daily equinoctial precession would thus have amounted to: $5026" / 36,525 \approx 0.1376"$

Since Mercury, a moon of the Sun, revolves 3.125 times around the Sun every year, we have $116.88 \times 3.125 = 365.25$

We see that $3.125 \times 0.1376"$ is 0.43", corresponding to 1/100 of the alleged 43" per century “anomaly”.

Now, you may ask yourself, why did most of our world’s astronomers agree that Mercury precesses by an “anomalous extra amount” of 43" per century? It has gradually dawned upon me that the answer to this question may well be almost hilariously simple, although this lingering realization of mine never made it into the book. Let me first remind you of a basic difference between the Copernican model and the Tychos model:

- The Copernican model has Earth revolving around Mercury once every year.
- The Tychos model has Mercury revolving around Earth once every year.

Since Copernicans assume that Earth laps Mercury each year (thus “subtracting one 360° rotational unit” from its gyrations), they will naturally surmise that Earth needs one more rotation (i.e. one more day) to complete its yearly circling around Mercury. Therefore, their measurements of Mercury’s annual precession will erroneously include one extra day of its motions. As we saw above, this amounts to 0.43" of Mercury’s precessional progression. Thus, Mercury will appear to Copernican astronomers to precess each year by an extra 0.43"—or by an extra 43" per century.

To be sure, I am by no means the first person on this planet to conclude that the alleged “anomalous” precession of Mercury’s perihelion is spurious and that, consequently, Einstein’s very first “proof” of his nebulous Theory of General Relativity was based on thin air. For instance, here is what the eminent professor Roger A. Rydin wrote about the subject:

“The question now is whether or not the excess shift of the perihelion of Mercury is real and has been properly explained in terms of General Relativity, or if there are other reasons for the observations. There are significant arguments that General Relativity has not been proven experimentally, and that it contains mathematical errors that invalidate its predictions. Vankov has analyzed Einstein’s 1915 derivation and concludes that when an inconsistency is corrected, there is no perihelion shift at all!”³

It should therefore come as no surprise that Einstein never returned to the issue of Mercury’s precession in his later writings on the General Relativity, as pointed out by Vankov:

“Einstein’s paper devoted to the GR prediction of Mercury’s perihelion advance, Doc.24 (see Notes), is the only one among his publications that contains the explanation of the GR effect. In his following paper ‘The Foundations of the General Theory of Relativity’, 1916, Doc.30, Einstein presents his new (he called it ‘correct’) calculation of the bending of light while the Mercury perihelion is only mentioned by referring it as in Doc.24, along with Schwarzschild’s work on ‘the exact solution’. Since then, to our knowledge, he never returned to the methodology of the GR perihelion advance problem [of Mercury].”⁴

¹ <https://cluesforum.info/viewtopic.php?p=2412560#p2412560>

² <https://www.tychos.info/>

³ https://www.tychos.info/citation/126A_Mercury-Precession.pdf

⁴ https://www.tychos.info/citation/124A_Vankov-Relativity.pdf

In any event, if my above interpretation/delucidation of the alleged anomaly of Mercury's precession is correct, I dare say it has to be the simplest debunking of Einstein's General Relativity to have ever been put forth.

Make no mistake: this is no petty matter, as it may appear to the layman. The ultimate implications of all this are far-reaching, not least because it would mean that the currently accepted black hole physics is plain nonsense.⁵

⁵ <https://youtu.be/rv5GJcKI-bk?t=1457>