

READERS' FORUM

Hello Mr. Bouw,

I wanted to say that I have received and viewed, without problem, the new DVD that you sent. Thank you so much! Geocentricity is literally rewriting and 'reforming' everything I've understood about God's universe up until now. It really does bear incredible weight on understanding God Himself, as well. Plus, I never thought that I'd be able to comprehend such sophisticated philosophical writings on cosmology, which proves in a great way to myself that the Spirit of God is bearing witness to your materials. I hope that you find encouragement in this, because it is true. No wonder why the first disc didn't work. It never fails - where there is great Truth, there will also be great resistance!

For Christ,
Ryan

On Marshall Hall

Dear Dr Bouw,

I would like to have your opinion on the cosmology of Marshall Hall. I refer especially to his "The size and structure of the universe according to the Bible and non-theoretical science" available on his site. I have not found in my collection of Biblical Astronomer any reference to his works...I find his description of the "waters above" quite appealing...if true!! Shall we also believe that most—if not all—of the wonderful pictures sent by NASA are just "fabricated" by smart programs of their computers??

I know we live in a world of lies, but are there limits somewhere???

Sincerely
C. E.

Dear C. E.,

Marshall Hall is a man driven by feelings, not by reason. That is not unusual; about 80% of us put emotion above reason. (Personally, I think the number is closer to 90%.) Theologically, he is a charismatic Calvinist. Even though in his heart he strives to stand for the truth, he has made a career from his conspiracy theories, writing books first about the creation-evolution controversy, which was followed by a series about Bible prophecies and the end time; then he wrote his book

about the geocentric-heliocentric controversy, and now about the size of the universe.

Common sense should tell us that 6,000 stars cannot produce enough reflections to account for the Milky Way. Indeed, if the universe conceived of by Hall were real, then over the last 6,000 years the sun's light reflecting back and forth off the mirror-like surface should uniformly illuminate the sky in the same way as envisioned in Olbers' paradox. At 40 light-days distance, the sun's light would reflect back and forth a minimum of four times a year. If the sun were at the exact center of that universe, then almost all of its light would come back to it, focused on it like a magnifying glass focuses the sun's light to start a fire. If the earth were at the center and the sun were off center, then that focal point would shift to the opposite side of the earth, thus creating a hot spot on the other side of the earth but opposite where the sun was 80 days before. Also, we should see a reflection of the sun moving with it but 80 days (a bit more than 90 degrees) behind the sun's present position. Clearly, see no such phenomena.

Common sense should tell us that the star trail photos would look the same whether the earth rotates or the firmament rotates. And common sense should also tell us that a conspiracy to fake mathematical and experimental results to cover up the evidence against heliocentrism cannot possibly be hidden from everyone except Marshall Hall, who has little to no personal knowledge of science, mathematics, or scientists.

I do believe in the waters above, even if these are billions of light-years away instead of light-days away. The face of the deep is frozen, and if the speed of light were much higher at the creation than it is today, and if God created the celestial bodies *in situ* by nucleosynthesis, and if the radiation were thermalized by the stretching out of the heaven, then we have a ready-made creationist explanation for the cosmic background radiation. Though I would like to know what water is like when frozen to a temperature of 3 Kelvins. As far as I know, no one has done that. Note the "ifs" in the previous sentence; there are about as many in it as there are in the big bang model critiqued by Hall for its many "ifs." These are characteristic of any theory about an origin.

Insofar as the NASA hoax is concerned, go to the <http://www.geocentricity.com/ba1> site and click on the "Did we go to the moon" link on the right. That article appeared in the *Biblical Astronomer* a few years ago.

You are right, there are limits somewhere. In your work, do you lie about all the things that may be wrong with your employer's practices? Did your parents lie to you to cover up all their shortcomings as

parents? According to Hall, everyone who believes other than he is involved in deliberately falsifying data or else is taken in by the forgers. Even though in my astronomical training I have repeated the experiments criticized as forgeries by Hall (e.g., parallax, radial velocity measurements, spectral analysis, star counts, etc.), I am told that I have been deceived by the professional astronomers into thinking that what my senses showed as real measurements were phony. Of course, I could be suspected of lying in the minds of some, but then why am I a creationist and a geocentric? Surely, if I were a liar, it would be to my advantage financially and professionally to turn away from such contrary beliefs. If scientists come out of the scientific community repudiating evolutionism and heliocentrism, why are there none affirming Hall's claims of conspiracy, or even his small universe model?

Respectfully,
Gerard Bouw

Location of God's Throne

Gerardus,

Can you please give me some insight as to the direction or location of God's throne or his actual dwelling place? It appears from Psalm 75:6-7 that perhaps God dwells in the north (wherever that is). Also, Isaiah 14:13 refers to the "sides of the north" (not sure what that is either).

If you can give me an insight I would appreciate it. I believe in a literal throne (right now). Yet others have pointed out to me that God is omnipresent. If "heaven" is his throne, perhaps I am incorrect.

Thank you,
Brent

Dear Brent,

As omnipresent, God is everywhere. But it is a mistake to assume that omnipresence disallows God to focus himself on one area or to incorporate himself into a body. Jesus was the Word incarnate, the Father as the Godhead was not incarnate (else why would Jesus cry "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" from the cross) and was still omnipresent.

Jacob saw the ladder to heaven from a place several miles north of Jerusalem. He called that place Bethel, the house of God. When the new Jerusalem descends from heaven (Revelation 21:2), its 1500-mile cube lands on Bethel (as well as Jerusalem). That city is called the tabernacle of the Lord in the fifth verse. Jerusalem is more than 30 degrees north. As seen from the north, if Jerusalem were on a roof, the

roof would have a 60-degree pitch from horizontal, steep, but doable with caution; hence “the sides of the north” and dwelling in the north; Jerusalem is in the northern hemisphere of the earth and God came in bodily form in the northern hemisphere. Scripture and the gospel are focused in the northern hemisphere and most of the land mass is in the northern hemisphere, especially the habitable land.

Currently God’s throne is in heaven (Psalm 11:4) and, as omnipresent, God can say the heaven is his throne and earth his footstool (Isaiah 66:1). (This is a peculiar property of omnipresence and omnipotence. The best way I can explain that apparent contradiction is to picture myself as if my head is all there is of me, but in truth I am larger than my head, that is, I think myself present only where my eyes are located. Thus the Godhead is on the throne, yet God is present everywhere. This is the focus I mentioned above.)

Finally, we are told that paradise is in the third heaven (II Corinthians 12:2) and that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (II Corinthians 5:8). It follows that the presence of God is manifest to man in the third heaven. Thus the throne of God is in the third heaven, located above Bethel.

Sincerely,
Gerard Bouw

Geosynchronous Satellites Disprove Geocentricity?

An argument I have been running into the most against geocentricity lately is geosynchronous satellites. One guy, an otherwise staunch KJB believer, insists:

It is still impossible for an object (satellite) to stay above the earth over one spot with out being in orbit. There is not now and there never has been and there never will be a satellite over the earth that is not in orbit. If you can find ONE satellite that is not in orbit please let me know. It can’t be done. There are hundreds of satellites in orbit over the earth now. Scores of them are orbiting at the same rate the earth is spinning.

How can I answer this? Are there any other examples or experiments with objects that behave as geosynchronous satellites would act in a geocentric situation?

—T.G.

Dear T.,

People seem to think that the surface of the earth plays a major role in determining the length of a satellite’s orbital period. There is an

effect, now barely detectable, but it is such a minuscule amount that the Gravity Probe B satellite was launched to measure it and failed because the earth's magnetic field messed up their gyroscopic spheres. Researchers involved with orbiting atomic clocks claim to have observed the effect, called the Lense-Thirring effect, so named after the two theorists (Lense and Thirring) who derived the effect using relativity, starting with a shell of mass (representing the universe) rotating about the earth once a day. Again, the effect is negligible although confirmation of its discovery could be claimed as proof of geocentricity but will be announced as proof of relativity instead. Again, the effect of the relative rotation of earth and universe is so small that it is not yet certain whether it has been measured.

For the moment, let us assume that the earth is not rotating relative to the stars. We launch a low-orbiting satellite which has a period of 90 minutes and always traces the same path through the stars.

Next, we orbit a satellite west-to-east about 22,300 miles into space and above the equator. It has a circular orbit with a period of 24 hours and orbits in the plane of the earth's equator. (Remember, the earth is still not rotating.)

Now a satellite stays in orbit because the outward force (called the "centrifugal effect") balances the gravitational attraction of the earth (the "centripetal force"). In the modern view, the outward, centrifugal effect is considered a "fictitious force" but in the geocentric model it is a real, gravitational force. Advocates of both models confess that the outward force is due to inertia and that inertia is caused by the gravitational field of the universe resisting any change in motion. But witness how, in the modern view, inertia is thus dismissed as a fictitious "effect," while the geocentric model can only exist if centrifugal force is a gravitational force. Anyone who has ever slung an object on a string can attest to the fact that the centrifugal force feels real enough. Although this may seem largely a matter of semantics, there is a real difference in the underlying philosophies; for in the heliocentric view real, measurable effects may be consigned to fiction while the philosophy underlying the geocentric universe says that real effects must have real causes.

Having said that about orbits and their underlying forces, let us return to our 24-hour orbital model with a non-rotating earth. Our prior model has the earth not rotating with respect to the stars and we have a satellite moving west-to-east over the equator with a period of 24 hours. Now let us start the earth spinning in the same west-to-east direction as the satellite and let's let it rotate once every 24 hours relative to the distant stars. The spin of the earth has a minuscule effect on the satellite (Lense-Thirring effect), meaning that the centripetal force (the

earth's gravitational force) is not changed by its spin. The satellite is now in a geostationary orbit and this is the modern interpretation thereof. The universe is content because as far as it is concerned, the satellite is still orbiting earth from west-to-east with a period of 24 hours so its centrifugal effect (inertial pull) is not changed and still balances the earth's gravitational pull.

Now let us return to the case where the earth is not rotating in the universe. This time, let us assume that the universe starts rotating from east-to-west with a period of 24 hours. That means that the gravitational field of the universe, which is its inertia, rotates with it. If we now want to launch a satellite from west-to-east to a height of 22,300 miles above the center of mass of the earth we launch it eastward, into the rotating inertia of the universe and raise it up until its orbital period lengthens to 24 hours. In that position, the satellite stays above the same place on the equator, having exactly overcome the westward motion of the firmament's rotation. The earth's gravitational field is still the same and the starry universe perceives the satellite as orbiting once every 24 hours, so the centrifugal and centripetal forces cancel each other out to zero and the satellite stays aloft. This is the geocentric case and it is kinematically the same as the heliocentric explanation presented just before this case.

The only case in which a geostationary satellite would fall to earth is if there is no relative rotation of earth and universe. But we do have relative rotation so there is no case where a geostationary satellite would fall to earth.

The problem with your friend's claim is that he thinks the universe can be ignored in such matters and has not done the math. It cannot be ignored, the universe's tension/pressure about the earth is stupendous, to say the least, and even that is dwarfed by the firmament's mass. In the final analysis, if your friend claims that the heliocentric system has been proven, then geocentrists equally can claim that the same evidence proves geocentricity.

A Small Universe?

A few years ago, through the influence of Neville Jones, who at the time believed the universe was slightly larger than the moon's orbit, the issue of an ultra-small universe arose as it commonly does among geocentrists. The proposal was that the universe is 12 light hours in radius. What follows is the evidence your editor offered against the small universe.

You are wrong in imagining that the stars are within 12 light hours. Twelve light hours is just under 8 billion miles. We would have

detected that with telescopes by now. The Pioneer 10 space probe's nuclear fuel ran out when it was 8 billion miles from earth in February 2003. These crafts use certain stars to find the earth and point their antennae. If the universe were 8 billion miles in radius, then the guide stars would have shifted so much that the craft could no longer find earth. Being that close to the edge of the universe means that most of the guide stars that were in front of it would long have passed behind it. To show you this is true, Pioneer 11 lost its ability to point its antenna to earth in 1995. It could not adjust its sights to allow for parallax of the guide stars. It was designed assuming a large universe, and its success is consistent with that and runs contrary to your model and even Walter van der Kamp's 40 light-day model. In a small universe like yours, Pioneer 11 would have lost that ability before it got to Jupiter, yet it went on to Saturn and kept in touch from 5 April 1973 until 30 September 1995. Pioneer 10's guidance mechanism did allow adjustments to point to earth from further out.

Then there are the Voyagers. Voyager 1 is now 9.5 billion miles out. Voyager 2 is 7.5 billion miles out. Voyager 2 is receding from earth at 291,090,000 miles per year. Voyager 1's recession speed is 332,940,000 miles per year, about a billion miles every three years. Both are still "alive" and communicating with earth.

On Creationism and Geocentricity

This was in response to a letter critical of geocentricity and, to a lesser extent, of creationism. The woman was a geocentrist and creationist until she got involved with the Yahweh occult movement.

Your first paragraph states: "I don't believe that creation was necessarily completed in six twenty-four hour days because in the first creation period the motion necessary to begin the day/night cycle was created last." I take it that you mean the creation of light, the first day. The Scripture says, "The evening and the morning were the first day," (Genesis 1:5) which implies 24-hours. Nothing is said about motion. Besides, Exodus 20:11 says: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." The six-day count includes the first day and so counts as a 24-hour day in the count in Exodus 20:11. Not to take that literally is like taking out a loan for six days and then, after 144 hours, telling the bank that the first day had not yet come to an end and will not end for another 12 billion years.

You invoke James 1:23¹ as an example where the Bible should not be taken literally about nature and science. Who since Adam would mistake that for a face literally embedded in glass and not recognize that the verse refers to a reflection in a mirror? Common sense says this verse is literally and scientifically true.

You refer to the “arising” of leprosy in the skin as a reason why the “arise” in Malachi 4:2² should not be taken literally. This is only a problem in modern versions. The A.V. thrice uses “a rising” (two words) to describe one of the symptoms of leprosy (Leviticus 13:2, 28; and 14:56). That is not the same word—in English or Hebrew—as the “arise” in Malachi 4:2. Since the meanings of Scriptural terms were redefined by casting them into a secular context in the mid-eighteenth century, I put very, very little store in dictionaries such as Strong’s. Since the Bible (whether Greek, Hebrew, or English) defines its own terms, I will stick with them.

Quotable Quotes

Punctuated equilibrium is a form of manipulation in science. Lord Bertrand Russell wrote that evolution in science was an application of the writings of Malthus and utilitarians in economics and not vice versa. It was a fraud.

—D. K. Lifschultz

We’ll know our disinformation program is complete when everything the American public believes is false.

—William Casey, CIA Director
(From his first staff meeting, 1981)

Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne.

—James Russell Lowell
This Present Crisis

We are all God’s poor; let us therefore acknowledge the poor who ask of us, that God may acknowledge us, when we ask our needs of him. Who are those that ask of us? Those who are poor, and feeble, and mortal. Of whom ask they? Of those who are poor, and feeble, and mortal. Except the possessions, alike are those who ask and those of

¹ James 1:23—For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass.

² Malachi 4:2—But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.

whom they ask. How canst thou for shame ask anything of God, if thou refuse to thy fellow that which thou canst most easily grant him?

—Sermon of St. Ælfric (955-1020)

A true Bible believer has no trouble discerning when a man is taught of the Lord versus taught by man. The former never criticizes or corrects the scriptures and will not knowingly contradict them. The latter will twist the scriptures to suit his own opinion of what he thinks God *should* have said, but lacked the wits to say. The man taught by God knows what it means when David wrote in Psalm 119:99, “I have more understanding than all my teachers” and can honestly claim the same; those taught by men deem it sheer arrogance so to claim and congratulate themselves for their humility. The former knows that he is taught by the word (“testimonies” in the context of Psalm 119), the latter relies on tradition or scholars or other means to learn truth and pats himself on the back for not leaning on his own understanding. To the former, the Bible is a revealed book, inerrant and preserved. To the latter the Bible is a book corrupted by the ravages of time, a long-lost book in need of recovery by godly scholars. The former thinks that when II Timothy 2:15 says “Study to shew thyself approved unto God,” it means that through study God will teach him what it means to stand approved before God, thus strengthening his faith. The latter thinks his study wins God’s approval. Indeed, the latter would rather the verse were omitted because he doesn’t know where to find the words of God, for the “inerrant original autographs” are nowhere to be found. To make it possible for the latter to obey the verse, he changes “study” to “be diligent.” That way, he can, by his diligence in works—whether right or wrong—please God by how diligently he “handles” the word of truth in his efforts to restore that which he believes God thought not worth preserving in the first place.

—Name withheld by request

Half of our troubles come from wanting our own way—the other from being allowed to have it.

—Anonymus

Light travels faster than sound. This is why some people appear bright until you hear them speak.

—Anonymus