

## EDITORIAL

We wish our readers a happy and prosperous 2006 in the Lord and in his service. This past year has been truly eventful and fruitful all around. Though both memberships and subscriptions are down, there is an intensified interest emanating from the Internet. The questions posed are becoming more sophisticated and involved. They are so sophisticated that sometimes I think they may be from scientists and philosophers trying to find a chink in our arguments. But that's good, not bad. Contrary to many, we are not afraid of the truth. Should we fear the truth in light of John 14:6? Why should we fear the one who died for us?

### **Aberration-parallax revisited**

As promised, Prof. Hanson has again tackled the observational problems faced by the strict-geocentric model. The strict model holds the earth at the center and all motions, including the yearly one, must be about the earth. This time Jim proposes that space itself refracts light, just as glass does in a lens to produce a rainbow of colors or to produce an image on a photograph.

Prof. Hanson admits that there are problems with his model. The two main problems that a strict geocentric model must meet are aberration and parallax. Aberration is the observed path that every star in the sky exhibits throughout the course of a year. Each star traces out an ellipse whose shape depends on how far north or south of the ecliptic (the belt of constellations called the "Zodiac") lies. The major axis of every star's ellipse is the same size. Related to this phenomenon is a yearly Doppler shift observed for stars. This is indirectly addressed by Jim's models.

The second problem is that of parallax. Not all stars exhibit parallax, but those that do trace out an aberration-like ellipse in the course of a year. Unlike aberration, their ellipses are not all the same size. Aberration and parallax are also 90-degrees out of phase. Some stars, like Alpha Centauri, have a large parallax while others show no parallax at all.

In his model, Prof. Hanson does not speculate on the nature of the medium pervading space, but he assumes that it refracts light. His analysis shows that he can derive two perpendicular terms (that is, they are 90-degrees out of phase) and that potentially they can explain the two phenomena if the  $C$ s in his last equation of his paper are matched to the major axis of the corresponding ellipse.

Believe it or not, his paper explains aberration in a natural way, but there is still a problem with parallax. If his model is correct, it would require that all stars in the same region of space should exhibit the same parallax, more or less. The solution is to posit that parallax is due to properties of the star itself, and its immediate environment. That is, for example, that the parallax is produced by a star's atmosphere. However, if that were the case, we would expect that all stars with the same spectral type should exhibit the same parallax. This is not observed.

The strict geocentric model is a hard one to reconcile with the appearances. In that respect, it finds itself in about the same position today as geocentrism was in the mid-1800s. All the evidence seems to be stacked against it. It was not but two or three decades later that the evidence was reversed. Perhaps the evidence for the strict geocentric model is now poised in the same position.

---

### Gleaned from the Internet

Last week I purchased a burger at Burger King for \$1.58. The counter girl took my \$2 while I pulled 8 cents from my pocket and gave them to her. She stood there, holding the nickel and 3 pennies, while looking at the screen on her register, I sensed her discomfort and tried to tell her to give me two quarters, but she hailed the manager for help. While he tried to explain the transaction to her, she stood there and cried. Why do I tell you this? Because of the evolution in teaching math in America since the 1950s:

**Teaching Math In 1950:** A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is  $\frac{4}{5}$  of the price. What is his profit?

**Teaching Math In 1960:** A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is  $\frac{4}{5}$  of the price, or \$80. What is his profit?

**Teaching Math In 1970:** A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is \$80. Did he make a profit?

**Teaching Math In 1980:** A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is \$80 and his profit is \$20. Your assignment: Underline the number 20.

**Teaching Math In 1990:** A logger cuts down a beautiful forest because he is selfish and inconsiderate and cares nothing for the habitat of animals or the preservation of our woodlands. He does this so he can make a profit of \$20. What do you think of this way of making a living? Topic for class participation after answering the question: How did the birds and squirrels feel as the logger cut down their homes? (There are no wrong answers.)

**Teaching Math In 2000:** Un hachero vende una carretada de madera para \$100. El costo de la producción es \$80....