

is it? Confusion continues in his letter by the early statement that ‘it is nice that science happens to support ... [his] position’, but in his final paragraph he says ‘geocentricity is not really a scientific matter but rather is philosophical or theological’. This contradictory message is repeated in his book—absolute motion cannot be determined scientifically, but science can prove that we are not moving. Again, which is it?

On this issue of my alleged failure to understand models, Bouw has misrepresented me. He stated in his letter that I insist ‘that the phases of Venus disprove geocentricity once and for all’. I never said anything of the sort. In discussing the phases of Venus, I wrote that the modification of the Ptolemaic system that Bouw suggested to explain the phases of Venus would have destroyed the Ptolemaic system as much as what Galileo was doing. Further in that paragraph I stated that Bouw correctly pointed out that Venereal phases do not distinguish between the Tychonic and heliocentric models. I cannot understand how Bouw could completely confuse my very clear writing on this question.

I can only conclude that he did not carefully read what I wrote or that he is deliberately engaging in misrepresentation, all the while accusing me of the same.

Danny Faulkner
Lancaster, South Carolina
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Bouw, pp. 186–187. In his book, Bouw references Marshall Hall’s book on this matter. I briefly discussed this in my earlier review of Hall’s book. Bouw could claim that he was merely quoting Hall, but such a scurrilous charge is best made with confidence or not made at all.
2. Mulfinger-Orozco, J. M., Mulfinger, G. and Mulfinger, M., *Christian Men of Science: Eleven Men Who Changed the World*, Ambassador Emerald International, Greenville, 2001.

Away with the nothingness

In his letter to *TJ*,¹ Stowell shows that I have failed to explain part of

my cosmology well enough. While commenting on Newton’s article, Mr Stowell briefly remarked about my article, saying, ‘Humphreys’ bounded universe has a sphere of space, matter, and energy surrounded by nothingness ...’¹

That’s not what I was trying to say. My cosmology has a (three-dimensional) sphere of space, matter, and energy surrounded by (three-dimensional) space. That space is empty of matter and energy (at least for a considerable distance beyond the matter), but it is the same sort of space that is in the matter-occupied region. And, as I tried to explain,² space is some kind of material, not a ‘nothingness’.

The confusion may come from my attempt (in both the video and the book) to clarify the usual ‘balloon’ analogy describing the big bang theory. That analogy confines our normal three-dimensional space to the surface of a hypersphere expanding in a *hyperspace* of four spatial dimensions (none is time). But even there, hyperspace would not really be a ‘nothingness’. It would merely be a space different than the one to which we are confined.

I don’t blame anyone for being confused about these things. Cosmology is a confusing subject. Many of the practitioners thereof have neglected to try to explain key parts of their own theories to the rest of mankind. Perhaps that is because even they are confused. But let’s not add to the confusion by injecting ‘nothingness’ into my theory!

D. Russell Humphreys
Albuquerque, New Mexico
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Stowell, W., Nothingness, *TJ* 15(3):55, 2001.
2. Humphreys, D.R., *Starlight and Time: Solving the Puzzle of Distant Starlight in a Young Universe*, Master Books, Colorado Springs, p. 67, 1995.

Uranus turns up the heat

I enjoyed the paper on the thermal condition of Uranus very much.¹ I

hadn’t realized that, unlike Jupiter, Saturn or Neptune, Uranus emits essentially no excess heat. After reading this report, I can see why this is a problem for the standard evolutionary model for the origin of our solar system, based, as it is, upon planetesimal accretion.

Evolutionists are confronted with possibly three options here:

1. Uranus formed in the past with no heat energy from accretion and thus does not radiate any real excess heat from internal sources today. I.e. Uranus formed via planetesimal accretion *cold* and has stayed cold ever since.
2. Perhaps Uranus is just too old. Uranus formed first, long before our Sun and thus has lost all its heat. Jupiter, Saturn and Neptune radiate excess heat so these planets are much younger than Uranus.
3. Uranus was created during the Creation week described in Genesis chapter 1:1–2:3 and its recent origin did not involve a lot of heat of accretion from a nebula disk revolving around our Sun.

Ouch! Evolutionists would not like any of these options, I suspect.

Rod Bernitt
Upper Marlboro, Maryland
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Henry, J., The energy balance of Uranus: implications for special creation, *TJ* 15(3):85–91, 2001.