

EDITORIAL

Erratum

In the Spring 2002 issue of the *Biblical Astronomer*, on page 80, we quoted a sentence attributed to Dr. James R. Paulson, Prof. of Biochemistry at the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh. Here is the 2002 quoted version of the quote: “The evidence for heliocentrism is even weaker than the evidence for evolution.” It seems that the quote was out of context, for Dr. Paulson wrote this in rebuttal:

This “quotation” takes out of context something I wrote and constitutes a gross misrepresentation of my views. You may have even altered what I wrote, so I would be interested to know your source. [I do not recall who submitted the quote, —*Ed.*]

My view is that the evidence for Darwin’s theory of evolution is extraordinarily strong—it can be considered proven far beyond any reasonable doubt. It has been confirmed more often and more extensively than any other modern scientific theory except perhaps quantum theory.

By leaving out the context, you missed the sarcasm in my statement. My point was that if anyone is so unreasonable as to reject evolution, they ought to reject other scientific theories as well. This was a jibe at certain self-proclaimed “creation scientists” who reject the evidence for evolution totally on religious grounds but still pretend to be scientific. They become irate if anyone suggests that they are “flat earthers” or “geocentrists”—they feel that they are being made to look ridiculous, which indeed they are.

You too are free to persist in your ridiculous beliefs. Perhaps you get some comfort from them.

However, I request that you either remove my name from all of your websites and publications, or print what I wrote in full, instead of misrepresenting it by taking it out of context.

I am delighted to print Dr. Paulson’s explanation, and as far as I am concerned, Dr. Paulson is perfectly free to persist in his “ridiculous beliefs” that one day a lizard laid a clutch of eggs that hatched into birds, or that a mouse once bore a litter of rat pups. I, for one, do not hold my beliefs on “religious grounds,” as Dr. Paulson states it. My Bible teaches me that:

Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. (James 1:27.)

I fail to see how that definition of religion forms the foundation of my opposition to evolution or opposition to any other scientific theory. Nevertheless, we extend our apologies to Dr. Paulson for overestimating his intelligence.

A Double Issue

So far we have produced two issues of the *Biblical Astronomer* this year. We've always printed four since the renaming of *The Bulletin of the Tychonian Society* into the *Biblical Astronomer* in 1991. This year, we are two issues behind.

It is not for lack of material that we are behind, albeit support is down a bit. The money has been there nevertheless. The prime inhibitor delaying publication has been my work on the next edition of *Geocentricity*. New chapters have been added, material has been consolidated, new perspectives have been introduced, and wrong-headed science has passed away to the land of hopefully-forgotten-errors.

Introducing the History of Geocentricity Book Series

Some of the fruit of the revision of *Geocentricity* is evidenced in this issue with the introduction of the *History of Geocentricity Series*. Elsewhere in this issue we list the books we plan to reprint and make available. The first book, Tischner's 1885 book, *The Fixed Idea of Astronomical Theory*, is at the printer. The book should be available by the time you read this for \$20 including priority mail postage. For more information about the book, read the article.

The Definition of Force

Closing out this issue is an article by Jim Hanson. It is a highly technical but significant article. The article derives the generalized force equation. Whereas Newton introduced force as the product of mass and acceleration ($F=ma$), the geocentric definition of force includes that definition as well as adding the Coriolis, centrifugal, and Euler (spin) forces. These are usually derived using a technique that starts with a definition and then uses that definition in a circular fashion by substituting itself into its derivative. Doing so is a subtle form of circular reasoning. However, it works; it gives the observed result. Jim

gives an alternative derivation which he perceives as a bit better than what is in the classical literature, but still rather weak in proof or logic.

The problem Jim wrestles with is inherent in what *we do not know*. We don't know what constraints God created in the firmament that make the three "fictitious" forces (centrifugal, Coriolis, and Euler), visible to—but not felt by—an observer affixed to a different coordinate system. To solve the riddle we need to know more about gravity and its relationship to the firmament. What is gravity? And Einstein's answer, "curved space," is a side-step, not an answer to that question. All Einstein's curved space does is to change the question, "What is gravity?" to "What curves space?" The answer to the latter question is *gravity*. Perhaps the Lord will be gracious to us in this quest and give us the answer in this life. And maybe these things can only be perceived with spiritual eyes. As Dean Turner once asked,

The ultimate strategic question of modern science is this: At what point should one acknowledge that scientific explanation has gone as far as it can go? That is, at what point ought a theistic philosophical explanation be accepted as a satisfactory one where no merely empirical one appears possible?¹

If we answer Turner's question with "Never!" as today's science does, we shall never know anything for certain.

Word Wars

In both the Readers' Forum and in the article, "The Great Liar," I present an inside look at the kind of battle that is waged against some unscrupulous opponents of geocentricity. At thirteen pages, the latter article takes up more space than I would like but I would like you to see the lengths to which some people will go to escape the geocentric Bible. It may help you to pray better for me as I face my daily email inbox. I hope you will also get some insight into the minds of our opposition.

Some New Books

In addition to the historic reprints, we are offering a book entitled *Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture*. This book is the best I have read in defense of the King James Bible in the areas of preservation, revelation, and textual consid-

¹ Turner, Dean, 1979. In Turner and Hazlett, eds., *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers*, (Old Greenwich, Conn.: Devin-Adair Co.). "Einstein Myth," p. 93.

erations. The book is a collection of 22 papers, six of those papers are authored by Dr. Thomas Strouse who is well known to our readers as a defender of geocentricity from English, Hebrew, and Greek scriptures. The papers are separated into major categories which are titled:

1. Passages on Divine Preservation
2. Passages on Availability
3. God's Methods of Preservation
4. Passages on the Reality of Textual Attack
5. The Standards of Perfection: Several Passages as Examples of Doctrines Changed or Perverted by Textual Alterations
6. Other Pertinent Exegesis for Every Word Preservation
7. The Doctrine of Preservation as it is Related to the Doctrine of Separation
8. Addenda

One interesting perspective developed by the papers is the concept that traditional Bible believers see the Bible as a revealed book, a special revelation. Modern textual critics, on the other hand, see the Bible as a lost book that scholarship needs to recover and reconstruct by searching after the long-lost originals.

The price of the book is \$20 postpaid in North America and \$30 postpaid elsewhere.

Another book we have added to our list of books for sale is *Why Cumbereth It the Ground?* by Kenneth T. Brooks. This book, a critical evaluation of Fundamentalism from a scriptural perspective, examines its motives and methods and exposes why Fundamentalism has been ineffective in achieving its goals. The author is a graduate of Emmanuel Baptist Seminary of which Dr. Thomas Strouse is dean. His son, Aaron Strouse, wrote a supplement for the book. More information about both books may be found on the geocentricity.com web site. Pastor Brooks' book is \$17 postpaid in North America and \$27 elsewhere.