


## The mechanics of the ellipse proves the heliocentric model to be wrong.



*Private opinion with conclusions derived from own research*

First uploaded 6<sup>th</sup> of June 2024 - [last edited 6<sup>th</sup> of June 2024]

By Aurelsson

This is my first paper on the new science section of my website. The legal system, money system and modern society and its hoaxes are not the only subjects that I am interested in. Science is probably my biggest area of interest, but it is for me the most challenging area to draw hard conclusions on. It is quite vast and complex and it needs more work and commitment to grasp as much as possible.

I also want to make something crystal clear: I **do not** subscribe either to the heliocentric model, **nor** to the flat earth model. My research has pointed out major flaws in both, rendering them **both** unacceptable models for the true form and mechanics of the creation we are living in. I am also **not** religious and do not abide by any religious text to be the be all end all. Some texts may be interesting as pointers, but it does not mean these texts are correct. Any religious text should be heavily scrutinized and triple checked. Most texts can be discarded by logic and mathematics alone.


This paper shows the **heliocentric model** to be **false**, simply by looking at the mechanics of the ellipse. I will provide a list of facts, with logical deductions as

arguments against the heliocentric model. If one fact demonstratively negates the possibility of the heliocentric model, then the conclusion is that the model is false.

This opens up the possibility to investigate alternatives to the heliocentric model that are more in line with reality and less so with accepted dogma.


## Arguments against the Heliocentric model

1. The ellipse **cannot only** work with gravity. This is because gravity is a unilateral field, i.e. it works in one direction only and **does not** have a perpendicular vector. In other words, a gravitational field **cannot** be responsible for the tangential velocity vector of an ellipse. If we take the example of the moon orbiting the Earth, gravity only works **towards** the Earth. It is an **attractive field only**. If only gravity was at play, then any satellite or any object in an elliptical or circular path around the Earth, would fall to Earth. The blue tangential velocity vector below in the picture, is always perpendicular to the gravity component. It is this velocity that is **also needed** to keep the ellipse going/stable. Gravity **will never** be able to influence this component, let alone vary it. So, there is something **missing** from modern 'science' to explain the ellipse fully, in relation to the heliocentric model. Since the model is incomplete and since the heliocentric model is only explained by gravity, the heliocentric model is void.



2. An ellipse is not a perfect circle. This means that on the elliptical path of the object around another object, there **must be** a **varying** acceleration, otherwise, the elliptical shape cannot be described. If we take the example of the Earth orbiting the sun, we see a larger acceleration near the sun (perihelion), then at the greatest distance from the sun (aphelion). This is because the **orbital velocity** at perihelion is **greater** than at aphelion, whereas the **tangential velocity** in both cases are the **same**. To satisfy the path of the Earth around the sun, the Earth **must** vary its **innate** speed. Since the Earth is **not** self-propelled, i.e. it cannot vary its speed on its own, there **must be** an secondary force field that influences the elliptical path of the object. This renders the heliocentric model as incorrect.

- Continuing from point 2, it is clear that for the elliptical path to work, you need a **repelling** force to counteract the **attractive** force of the gravity component. Since there are two objects at play, for example the Earth and the sun, it follows logically that the repelling force is the **combined** Electro Magnetic (EM) fields of both the Earth and the sun, working in unison to repel the gravity component that influences the ellipse. Since the heliocentric model denies the EM component as per modern 'science', the heliocentric model is void.
- Since many models still adhere to the heliocentric model working on gravity only, they have to 'invent' something metaphysical or occult to explain this missing component. Modern 'science' recognizes this missing component and usually we get something like this:



We get a 'ghost' at aphelion that nobody seems to be able to describe what it is. It is something mysterious, metaphysical or occult. You know that when you are told stories like this, you are being fleeced. It is just blatantly obvious the heliocentric model is a lie.

From the previous point we know that **both** EM fields of sun and Earth work together to create the repelling force of gravity. The system is in balance. The only thing to correct in the image above is to put the **Earth** where the question mark is and have the **sun** circle the earth. Gravity and both EM fields are still there, the path of the sun is still described perfectly and there is **no need** for mysticism or the occult. In other words, celestial movements are perfectly described when the **Earth** is at the center and the sun rotates around the Earth. This renders the heliocentric model as void.

5. There is another very obvious flaw of the heliocentric model that proves that the heliocentric model cannot work. When you ask yourself **how** the sun **captured** the earth, or any other object for that matter, you run in a huge problem.

As we have seen above, an object on an elliptical or circular path around another object has two components: A centripetal component which is the force towards the Earth, commonly known as gravity, and the tangential component that keeps the orbit in its place.

Gravity **does not** have a tangential component, so gravity **cannot** capture an object. What then?

There are two options: Either the earth was ejected from the sun or the Earth already had a tangential velocity vector when it entered the solar system.

The first option is impossible, because to be ejected by the sun, the Earth would have had **only** a centrifugal component and **no tangential component**. In other words, the Earth would have been propelled into space never to return.

The second option is even less likely: For a capture to be possible, the velocity vector of the Earth had to be **so perfect**, with **no perturbations**, with the **perfect angle**, and **without** any malformations of the shape of the Earth (perfect round). The possibility of that is statistically zero.

From 'modern science' we know that the Earth is not perfect round. So the chance that the perfect angle and vector would arise, for an object as the Earth to 'fly past' is **zero**.

More specifically, 'modern science' has no explanations **how** orbits are formed, or how planets get to orbit a sun. There is zero explanation, because it would expose the **fraud** that is the **heliocentric model**.

For the Earth to be captured by the sun, with all the Earth's imperfections of its shape, the Earth has to be **self-adjusting**. In other words, the Earth has to be able to correct any perturbations to align itself in the perfect orbit. For an orbit to be stable, it needs to have a mechanism built into it to **correct itself**. Of course, planets are not self-adjusting, so any object that needs to be captured by a larger object is impossible. So again, this renders the heliocentric model to the dustbin.

Like stated before, a gravity field **cannot** impart tangential velocity. It is a unilateral field directed towards an object. Theoretically a unilateral field involving an object only applies centripetal or centrifugal components, i.e. there is no force to rotate another object through the gravity field.

There is something else needed for this, which is an rotational EM field, which **does** have tangential components. But this is categorically avoided by the scientific community, which proves their heliocentric model to be corrupt and a lie.

When you add perturbations into the mix, like Earth having a moon, then the whole dynamics of the solar system falls to pieces due the fact that the tangential components and centripetal components need to vary to keep the whole system stable. **Gravity alone cannot do that.**

The moon will alter the orbit of the Earth so how is it possible then that the Earth doesn't incinerate into the sun or fly off into deep space? It is because the heliocentric model is a lie.

Also, for the Earth to have been captured by the sun, it **had to slow down**. It had to decelerate. Why? Because if it accelerated, it would never be captured by the sun. If it would have a constant speed, then that speed would have to be so perfect in all aspects, that the chance for that - as we have seen - is **zero**. Modern science explains this with a 'fortunate' collision that knocked the Earth in a perfect position. The usual gaslighting.

But there is a problem with a **decelerating** motion: It cannot happen: If the Earth is getting closer to the sun, it is **accelerating** due to the pull of the sun. So this whole capturing this is an obvious fumble and lie.

## **Solution**

What is the solution? Like I said before. Put the Earth where the question mark is and then you have an EM field (of the earth) with the EM field of the sun, working together to create a centripetal pulling gravity field that is counter-acted by a rotating pushing EM field.

Am I saying the sun rotates around the sun? **YES**. I am saying that the Earth is the center and the sun rotates around the Earth.

That is the only way to explain the irregularities in the heliocentric model. The orbit is the prime example to expose the **impossibility** of the heliocentric model.

More proof will build upon this in subsequent articles.