

READERS' FORUM

Of Geocentrism and Stem Cells

Robert J. Bennett, Ph.D., coauthor of the book and CD, *Galileo Was Wrong*,¹ made the following observation: “We are asked, ‘Why does *Galileo was Wrong* bother with a triviality like geocentrism, which has neither moral significance nor any relevance to the modern world?’ Here’s one reason why....”

The Senate opened debate on embryonic stem cell research on Monday with a ferocious battle between those who want to spend federal taxpayer funds on embryonic stem cell research and those who say adult stem cell research provides more hope for patients suffering from a wide range of diseases. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, who brokered the agreement that led to today’s debate and tomorrow’s vote, said he supports a bill to overturn President Bush’s limits on tax funds for embryonic research.

“I feel that the limit on cell lines available for federally funded research is too restrictive,” Frist said. Sen. Arlen Specter, a Pennsylvania Republican, also led off the debate Monday by attacking pro-life advocates who say embryonic stem cell research is morally wrong because it entails the destruction of human life.

Specter likened pro-life advocates and opponents of the funding bill to science skeptics of centuries past that denied the Earth revolved around the Sun or thought electricity wouldn’t have much promise for mankind. He did that “to show how attitudes at different times in retrospect look foolish, look absolutely ridiculous.” But pro-life lawmakers who oppose the funding bill said adult stem cell research science is showing plenty of results and human embryos don’t need to be destroyed—especially since it has yet to cure a single patient.²

Is the Universe Expanding Today?

Dear Dr. Bouw,

I hear some people say that the universe is still expanding. Is this true? Since God finished the creation on the seventh day, how then is it

¹ Sungenis, R. A., & R. J. Bennett, 2006. *Galileo was Wrong, Vol. 1: The Scientific Evidence*, (Catholic Apologetics International Publishing: www.catholicintl.com).

² “Senate Opens Fierce Debate on Embryonic Stem Cell Research Funding Bill Washington, DC.” LifeNews.com.

possible for the universe to continue to expand? And what are the basic assumptions of an expanding universe? Please help.

Thank you and God bless!

Yours in Christ,
Timothy.

Dear Timothy,

The Bible speaks of the stretching of the heavens. Sometimes it speaks in the past tense (giving support for an inflationary period during the creation week, when stars would age very quickly and radioactive particles would decay rapidly). Other times it is in the present tense, suggesting that the heavens are still stretching, though possibly not as fast as before. The Bible likens the heaven to a curtain, implying a fixed amount of material that is now being unfurled.

The modern expanding universe is based on light emanating from similar galaxies. When galaxies are fainter and smaller, their light is Doppler shifted into the red, meaning they look like they are moving away from us. The "further" out we look, the faster they are moving, just as the pleats of a curtain unfurl faster at the leading edge of a curtain and slower at the trailing edge. The expansion would be into the third heaven.

Yours in Christ,
Dr. Bouw

The Geocentric Murderer

The following is an exchange of emails in which your editor was not in the least involved. It starts with an email sent on 4 September 2006 from Michael Thayer of North Carolina to Creationist astronomer Dr. Danny Faulkner. Mr. Thayer wrote to express his opinion of Dr. Faulkner's attack on geocentricity published in the *Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* in 2001.³ Mr. Thayer's original email went as follows:

I am amazed how you accept the literal interpretation of Noah's Ark, 6 literal days, etc....but scoff at Geocentric notions and swallow Einsteinian propaganda whole. I read your "refutation" of Dr. Bouw and also read his answers to you and found you wanting.

You are spinning around downstream on creation/evolution if you simply swallow heliocentrism.

Have you seen this recent work?

<http://www.galileowaswrong.com/>

³ Faulkner, D., 2001. "Geocentrism and Creation," *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, **15**(2):110-121. Pg. 110.

Dr. Faulkner's response:

And you believe that murderer, Gerry Bouw?

Danny R. Faulkner
a stellar astronomer

Mr. Thayer was understandably puzzled by the response and forwarded the above messages to Dr. Robert Sungenis (of the aforementioned web site). In his forward, Mr. Thayer asked:

Faulkner calls Bouw a "murderer." Do you know what this is about?

Michael Thayer

Dr. Sungenis, in turn, emailed your editor with a copy of the exchange thus far, asking:

Gerry,

Below, Danny Faulkner is answering an email from a Michael Thayer in which Thayer criticizes Faulkner's reticence to accept geocentrism.

Faulkner returns the favor by calling you a murderer. Is this guy insane or does it just appear that way?

Robert Sungenis

I asked Mr. Thayer to pursue the matter further with Dr. Faulkner, and he did so. Mr. Thayer wrote back:

Dr. Bouw,

I clarified this with him... he used it "tongue and cheek" because you say that Tyco was "murdered" by Kepler...I told him you did not state that unequivocally but point to evidence, circumstances, etc. That is why he used it.

However, as someone just asking him a question, this is quite irresponsible...saying, "why would you listen to that 'murderer' Gerry Bouw..."

The guy suffers from a bad case of ego casualty combined with scientism...quite a deadly combination.

Sincerely,
Michael Thayer

In presenting my reply to Michael Thayer below, I have elaborated on my actual response, clarifying some things and explaining others:

Thank you. Dr. Faulkner and I have butted heads before on the matter of Tycho's murder by Kepler. Faulkner is convinced that Kepler was a born-again believer of Scripture. I disagree, first because there is no clear statement by Kepler mentioning his rebirth and second because it is clear from Kepler's writings that he is a believer in the "Book of Nature" infinitely more than Scripture. ...

Faulkner maintains his stance because a man he greatly respects wrote a book claiming Kepler was a Christian. ...

I agree, it is irresponsible to give such a flippant answer, especially in an email without emoticons.

G. Bouw

I now elaborate on the ellipses in the above email.

Kepler was a staunch Lutheran even after he was excommunicated from the Lutheran church for what it considered was too much Calvinism, dabbling in the occult arts, and a heretical view of the nature of the bread and cup in the Lord's supper. Kepler's view was halfway between transubstantiation and the Lutheran Consubstantiation. He persisted in his Lutheranism even with the Counter Reformation on his doorstep. He refused to convert to Catholicism. Kepler's persistence may be mistaken by some for evidence of a rebirth, but if that were the case, then every Moslem suicide bomber can be said to be reborn. It can also be a case of deceit.

About my claim that Kepler murdered Tycho, it stems from comments I made in *Geocentricity* back in 1992. I noted that Kepler's attitude prompted Marshall Hall to suspect Kepler of murdering Tycho for his data. That is the comment that sparked Faulkner's accusation. However, a few years later, a forensic team at the University of Upsala, Sweden, first raised the question of Tycho's murder when they found evidence for a lethal dose of arsenic in Tycho's hair. The evidence against Kepler can only be circumstantial, but subsequent examination of Tycho's hair built such a strong case for poisoning that in 2004, the Guilders, an investigative couple, summarized it and indicted Kepler in their book, *Heavenly Intrigue*. And so it came to pass that yours truly was accused of murder.

More on the Gap Theory

Dear Bro. Gerry,

I would like to quote Dr. Peter Ruckman regarding his view on Genesis Chapter 1:1:

The last thing to notice about this opening verse in the Bible is that **THE DATE OF CREATION IS NOT GIVEN** [emphasis in original]. Although a “recreation” is described in verses 2-20, no date is given for Genesis 1:1. We should notice this, as most college professors and high school teachers display their ignorance at this point. They assume that the Bible teaches that the earth is only 6,000 years old.... This is quite typical of Bible-rejecting education (Very seldom do critics of the Bible have even a handful of facts with which to work). The earth could have been here a good 4,000,000 years before God “recreated” it in seven evenings and mornings. Read the text more closely, it is much more “scientific than the superficial guesswork of Einstein, Darwin, Huxley, Milliken, or Bernard Ramm.”⁴

That is his general view of the creation accounts of Genesis Chapter one without clearly stating anywhere that he is in favor of the “gap theory.” For this style of commentary, what is your response?

Yours in Christian love,
Bro. Erly Cemitará

Dear Bro. Erly,

How would I answer Ruckman? Here’s how.

True, there is no date other than the word “beginning,” which refers to an origin and thus means date zero, the start of the creation. The 6,000 years comes from Genesis 5 and subsequent genealogical and historic dates presented throughout the Bible. 6,000 years since Adam is a no-brainer.

In Exodus 20:11, God said that “...in six days God made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.” Heaven is singular, as it is in Gen. 1:1, not plural, because the second heaven, the firmament, was not created until the second day. The “open firmament of the heaven” is the place where birds fly (Gen. 1:20) and is commonly called the first heaven because it is closest to the earth. The firmament is the place

⁴ Ruckman, Dr. Peter, 1969. *The Book of Genesis, The Bible Believer’s Commentary Series.*

wherein the sun, moon, and stars are located (Gen. 1:17). It is commonly called the second heaven.

Notice that God did not say which heaven he created first. It could be the first heaven, or it could be the third heaven. Since he did not say when the heaven and the earth were created, it could just as well have been 6,000 years ago, as the simple reading of genealogical and historical dates say have elapsed since the time Adam was created. At least that idea has Scriptural support, whereas there is none for a pre-Adamic world unless one ignores the context in which the proof texts therefore are taken.

Finally, how do you decide that when the Holy Ghost said God created the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day, that he really meant to say he unveiled them or removed a mystical cloud which had been hiding them the first three days? God MADE them the fourth day according to Gen. 1:16 and then set them in the firmament (v. 17). That is what the A.V. says; it says nothing about them being revealed. Remember, anytime a man tries to correct the English of the AV with the Greek or Hebrew, he's trying to pull a fast one. Just because some carnal Christian claims a pre-Adamic world because some fool of a scientist (Psa. 14:1) claims the earth is millions of years old because he wants to pull a political fast one,⁵ that is no reason to abandon the plain text of the A.V. Holy Bible.

How Do You Do It?

Rick Krach asked:

Please tell me one more thing. How in the world have you been able to spend so many years accepting and believing geocentricity to be a fact of life, because I know and understand that the "facts," the physics, and the mathematics work the same for both models; so, why do you personally choose the geocentric one over the heliocentric one? Also, why do you and such a relatively small number of scientists want to fight for geo.? I compare it to me wanting to fight to have our school globes turned around so that the South Pole is on the top. It is just a point of view.

My answer:

I am a geocentrist because the Scripture teaches it and allows no other point of view. Consider Joshua 10:13, for instance. The Scripture says:

⁵ Bouw, Gerardus D., 1998. "A Brief History of the Theory of Evolution," *B.A.*, 8(85):9.

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.

This is a key geocentric verse. If God here writes in the common vernacular, then it means that he goes along with the commonly accepted theory although he really doesn't believe it. God here says that "the sun stood still." He could just as well have said: "And the earth stopped her turning so that the sun seemed to stand still...." If God knew that the earth rotated and, as here and in Isa. 38:8, insists on saying that the sun stood still, or the "sun returned," then he is not telling the truth and he cannot say that his word is truth (John 17:17). That is why I am a geocentrist and why I persist in persisting in that point of view.

As for why we fight for geocentricity, well, that depends on the person. I can only speak for myself. It is on heliocentrism that modern Bible criticism rests. It is the one doctrine where almost all self-professing Bible-believers fail in their belief in the Holy Bible.

The first time I read the Bible from cover to cover and came upon Amos 8:11 which speaks of a famine "of hearing the words of the LORD" I asked the Lord, "How can this be? We have so many copies in print, and so many different versions, it seems impossible that they'd all disappear." Well, the Lord answered my question. In effect, it is the new versions that are the direct cause of the famine. But these versions could not exist to distract and confuse people except for the underlying assumption that God gave us the truth once, in the originals, but did not bother to preserve it or allow its words to be preserved or translated. Thus all around the world these days, people search for the words (not "Word" or "word") of God but cannot find it for the "originals" no longer exist. The theory that only the originals were inspired and that no translation can consist of the words of God is only about 150 years old. Before that time, there was no such confusion among believers.

How did this come about? Well, it was the fruit of the Copernican Revolution. That revolution taught believers that the Bible could not be trusted in the realm of science. Later, this idea extended to history and now, the Bible cannot be trusted at all, about anything. Believers may insist that it can be trusted about salvation, but to a sane mind it makes no sense that a book that is wrong about everything except, maybe, one thing, is authoritative. Certainly, it cannot be inspired by the God of Truth.

“Scholars” may say that they can come “close” to the “originals,” but I ask you, if no one has ever seen, let alone had, all the original autographs in one place and at one time, what makes anyone think he is pleasing God by trying to recover (the “originals”) that God did not think worthy of preservation in the first place? Either he preserved the words (Psalm 12:6-7 in AV), or it wasn't that important to him. The key difference is this: until 150 years ago believers believed that God's word was revealed from heaven and the words were given by inspiration and preserved by God himself. Today, believers think that the word of God was lost and must be recovered. That latter is the fruit of the Copernican Revolution, and as one with an earned Ph.D. in astronomy, I bear witness against them that the Copernican Revolution was based on a lie, and that modern astronomy knows it. That is why my life's verse is Ephesians 4:14-16.

The Wager

The following exchange was communicated to me by a correspondent. I've reprinted it in full here.⁶

In the summer of 1975, an encounter took place between Rabbi F.R., a Lubavitcher chassid, and Mr. A.P., a “modernized” American Jew. Rabbi R. was seeking to influence Mr. P. toward a greater commitment to Torah (the Pentateuch, Ed.) observance, which the latter dismissed as “archaic” and dismally outdated. In the course of the conversation, Mr. P. said, “Are you telling me that every law and practice mentioned in the Torah, written thousands of years ago, must be accepted at face value today?”

“Certainly,” replied Rabbi R. “The Torah is eternal, and is equally pertinent to every day and age.”

“The Torah states that the sun revolves around the earth,” countered Mr. P. “Do you believe that as well?”

“Yes, I do,” replied Rabbi R.

“Well, you might believe that,” said Mr. P., “but no rational, self-respecting inhabitant of the 20th century does. I'm sure your rebbe, Rabbi Schneerson, doesn't!”

“I'm sure he does,” said the rabbi.

“I'm willing to wager anything that he does not,” said Mr. P. “In fact, I'll say this: If the Rebbe states that he believes that the sun revolves around the earth, I will become a Torah-observant Jew and convince everyone I know to do the same!”

⁶ Source: <http://www.chabad.org/therebbe/article.asp?print=true&aid=73253&iid=>

*“Would you put that in writing?” challenged Rabbi R.
 “No problem,” said Mr. P.
 Soon after, Rabbi R. received the following letter:*

Dear Rabbi R_____

As per our conversation of today,... I did say to you, and am submitting the same in writing by means of this letter, that if the Rebbe would make a public statement to the effect that... since the Talmud states that the sun revolves around the earth, it is therefore *his* firm belief that the sun does indeed revolve around the earth, that I will:

- (a) personally observe the laws of *taharat hamishpachah*, *tefillin* and *Shabbat*; and
- (b) influence my friends and colleagues to do the same.

It is, however, more than obvious to me that the Rebbe will not, in any way, make such a ridiculous statement, because

- (a) he does not wish to be labeled as a fool,
- (b) he himself is not as foolish as some of his ardent but hypnotized followers.

I predict, with no hesitation, that I will not hear any more about this matter from you or from the Rebbe...

I must tell you that I feel a deep personal hurt when people such as you make such asinine, ridiculous statements and then hide your abysmal ignorance behind the facade of “Torah.” Don’t you realize you can still be believers and not live 500 years behind the times?

Mr. P. received not one but two separate letters in reply from the Rebbe, plus a third, cover letter, which read as follows:

Greetings and blessings!

Your letter, addressed to Rabbi F_____ R_____, reached me ... In view of its content, I naturally take this first opportunity of replying to it.

Not knowing whether you are more interested in the practical implication, or/and in the scientific aspect, I am writing two separate replies, enclosed herewith, which you can read in the order you prefer.

With esteem and blessing,
 M. Schneerson

P.S. It is surely unnecessary to add-though I am adding it for the record-that I take for granted that you will keep your commitments with regard to the practical aspects of your letter.

One letter read:

... In reply to your question relating to the matter of the motion of the sun and the earth, whether the sun revolves around the earth or the earth around the sun. It is my firm belief that the sun revolves around the earth, as I have also declared publicly on various occasions and in discussion with professors specializing in this field of science.

In view of the above, I have no objection, of course, if you wish to make this view known to whomever you choose...

The other letter read:

... This is in reply to your inquiry on the question of the rotation of the sun and the earth in relation to each other, namely, whether the sun revolves around the earth, or the earth around the sun, and which view is to be accepted, etc.

I presume you have in mind the scientific view, i.e., what science has to say on this question, and I will address myself to this aspect.

It is well known that this was a controversial issue in ancient and medieval science. However, since about half a century ago, with the introduction of the theory of relativity, the latter has been *universally* accepted as the basis of modern science...

One of the conclusions of the theory of relativity is that when there are two systems, or planets, in motion relative to each other—such as the sun and the earth in our case—either view, namely the sun rotating around the earth, or the earth rotating around the sun, has equal validity. Thus, if there are phenomena that cannot be adequately explained on the basis of one of these views, such difficulties have their counterpart also if the opposite view is accepted.

Secondly, the scientific conclusion that both views have equal validity is the result not of any inadequacy of available scientific data, or of technological development (measuring instruments, etc.), in which case it could be expected that further scientific or technological advancement might clear up the matter eventually and decide in favor of one or the other view. On the contrary, the conclusion of contemporary science is that regardless of any future scientific advancement, the question as to which is our planetary center, the sun or the earth, must forever remain unresolved, since both view[s] will always have the same scientific validity, as stated.

Thirdly, it follows that anyone declaring that a person who chooses to accept one of these systems in preference to the other is a fool, while one who accepts the other is a wise man—such a judgment

shows that the person making it is ignorant of the conclusions of modern science, or that he has not advanced beyond the science of Ptolemy and Copernicus...

A further point might be added, though perhaps not pertinent to our discussion. It is that every person, including modern scientists, actually has three options to choose from in this matter:

- (a) that A revolves around B,
- (b) that B revolves around A,
- (c) that A and B revolve around each other.

But such a choice cannot be dictated by science; it would be one's personal choice and belief.

What has been said above is-to repeat-the deduction of the theory of relativity, as it is expounded in various scientific texts, and it can be checked with any scientist who is thoroughly familiar with the said theory. Of course, on the elementary and high-school level, science in general, and the so-called Solar System in particular, is taught from relatively simple textbooks, and the change in the scientific attitude towards the subject under discussion is not emphasized. But, as stated, it would be quite simple to verify it with any scientist who knows this particular field...

Answers in Genesis on Geocentricity

Missionary Dean McClain wrote Answers in Genesis asking for its stance on geocentricity. In reply, they sent him this link:

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v8/i2/planets.asp>

After reading it, I sent the following reply to Mr. McClain:

This is hilarious! Without ever quoting a single Scripture, David Malcolm appeals to the ancient Greeks, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Brahe, and Einstein to dismiss (without mentioning any) the Bible-based arguments invoked by the Reformers against heliocentrism, and then he has the gall to say: "[I]t is a fool's paradise to base any understanding of the Bible on the currently accepted theories of scientists whether it be in planetary motion astronomy or the evolution in biology."

It is, of course, Malcolm who bases his understanding of the Bible on "currently accepted theories of scientists." The Bible still says "The sun stood still and the moon stayed" in Joshua 10:13 and "The sun also

ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose" (Ecclesiastes 1:5). One either believes it or not.

Malcolm's gaffe is an example of what I have come to call "the NIV syndrome," which I first observed at a creationist cosmology conference in Columbus, Ohio several years ago. It is an idiocy that the Lord inflicts on those who insist on holding in highest authority the most blatantly Satanic "Bible" ever produced. Even its owner, Rupert Murdoch, was tagged as "the prince of darkness" by the late Chicago columnist Mike Royko. Murdoch⁷ founded Fox News. Occult-savvy readers know that "fox" is a synonym for "666" to practitioners of the occult.⁸ Some even change their names to "Fox" as symbolic of their allegiance to Satan. Other examples of the NIV syndrome include British geocentrist and Bible critic, Neville Jones, who apparently has no mind left at all when it comes to soundness of reasoning. He is great at fooling the science and Scripture illiterati, however.

David Bergman on Geocentricity

David Bergman is a creationist physicist who has worked to develop the best theory of electromagnetism yet. Here follows his view on geocentricity.

I have not studied very much of Bouw's geocentric model, and I still don't have any extra time to do so; but I think it is absurd to think that

- 1) the mass of the earth is so much greater than the sun's mass that the earth is stationary,
- 2) that some rigid plenum constrains the sun to rotate about the earth, but allows other objects like the Voyager space capsule to move freely through the plenum,
- 3) that Ptolemy's epicycles are a realistic description of planet motions in the solar system,
- 4) that Newton's laws of motion, derived from Kepler's Laws, are wrong, or
- 5) that the annual variations of Arcturus' coordinates in the sky are anything else but the parallax effect from the earth's orbit about the sun.

Russ Humphreys wrote a more complete and detailed refutation of geocentricism some years ago.

⁷ *Murdock* is a title bestowed on those who are expert in casting spells.

⁸ F is the 6th letter in the alphabet. O is the 15th which is 1+5=6, while x is the 24th letter, 2+4=6; thus 666.

Best Regards,
Dave Bergman

My reply to Bergman:

The funny thing is I don't believe any of the things you believe I believe, Dave. I believe that the earth is at the barycenter of the universe, what I usually refer to as the dynamic center. It is the very laws of physics you point to as evidence against geocentricity that keep the earth at its station. The reason I believe that is because God said the sun stood still in Joshua 10:13 (forget verse 12, that's Joshua speaking). He could have said that the earth stopped her rotation, but he didn't.

Likewise He said the sun went back in Isaiah 38:8. Did God speak absolute truth or didn't He?

In Genesis 19:23 we read, "The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar." A figure of speech right? "NOT literally true," you would say. Then there is Mark 16:9,

Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.

Literally true? "No way!" you have to say. It, too, has to be a figure of speech if you are to be consistent. After all, the second law of thermodynamics "proves" that no man can arise from the dead, certainly not after three days and three nights; even as Kepler's and Newton's laws "prove" that the earth goes around the sun. Yet, most cosmologists consider the geocentric model less of a miracle than the resurrection from the dead.

The heresy of Copernicus was that he assailed the resurrection and the lordship of Christ (Psalm 19:1-5, Mal. 4:2, Eccl. 1:5, etc.). He knew it, too; that is why he waited 30 years to publish. It was, finally, the premise of Aquinas—that only the will of man, not his mind, had been affected by the fall—that persuaded Copernicus to think men in general, and he in particular, could know better than Scripture. After all, he reasoned, is it not the Holy Mother Church (RCC) that decides what God meant to say but somehow could not frame to say correctly in the first place? Besides, in 1535 had not both the head of the Inquisition and the Pope encouraged him to publish his theory?

Russ Humphreys' "Act and Facts" article was carefully written and well thought out. In it, he actually allowed geocentrists their points. All he did was say he did not believe it and stated why. He did not say geocentrists are wrong. It was Danny Faulkner's CENTJ arti-

cle, not Humphreys', which pronounced the geocentrists wrong. That is critiqued at the web site cited earlier, viz.

<http://www.geocentricity.com/ba1/fresp/index.html>

The worst Humphreys and Faulkner could say is that I am King James only, and they smeared the entire geocentric movement with that tar-brush. But that is not true. Certainly, I find the AV a most sure foundation, but others prefer science, philosophy, or theology. To see this at work, check out

<http://www.galileowaswrong.com>

especially chapter 12 (bottom of the left column). No KJB-only there. Anyhow, that gives you a quick look at the issues.

Respectfully,
Gerry Bouw

Let me put it another way, dear reader. If all the versions that now exist were out there but there were no King James Bible, I would never have been anything other than an agnostic heliocentric evolutionist. Not one of those versions is inerrant enough to have been authored by the God who created the universe and man. The "originals," we do not have. So God would have created the universe and left us no operating manual. Yet, new-version Christians claim that God holds us responsible for obeying what he did not think worth his effort to preserve from corruption. Do you still not understand why I think the bulk of today's Christians are insane? You would strip from me the Book that brought me to faith and then insist that I am insane for not drinking the strychnine-laced Kool-Aid of modern scholarship that could never bring me to faith in Jesus.

The Critics Raved (R-rated, all sic)

Several times a year we receive an email that really encourages us. This one arrived 13 February 2007:

On Feb 13 the anniversary of the church forcing Galileo to renounce his discovery id like to ask you, what the hell, how dumb are you. Pull your head out of your religion and join us in the real world.

ps. people aren't heliocentric, nobody thinks the sun is the center of the universe.

pps. nobody gives a shit where the ‘center’ of the univers is

ppps. stop giving the bible a bad name

“brian G” <bgmed8@hotmail.com>

My reply:

“Thank you for your kind comments. I am heartened with your concern over the Bible’s name. I’m certain you will read and keep it, that is to say, the Bible (commonly called the “KJV” these days), even as it commands you to do.

I will print your comments in the “Readers’ Forum” of the *Biblical Astronomer*. Thanks again for your encouragement.

My reply was not meant to be facetious, just to get him to think about it. In all fairness to Brian, he did apologize for his rashness:

I would like to apologize for the insults, peoples beliefs should not be ridiculed and i was wrong to do so.

Quotable Quotes

Liberals are for killing innocent babies but against killing convicted murderers; Conservatives are for killing convicted murders but against killing innocent babies. For the latter, liberals accuse conservatives of inconsistency.

COMPREHENDING ENGINEERS

The graduate with a Science degree asks, “Why does it work?”

The graduate with an Engineering degree asks, “How does it work?”

The graduate with an Accounting degree asks, “How much will it cost?”

The graduate with an Arts degree asks, “Do you want fries with that?”