

the following brief summary.

On December 2, 1983 he networked a paper⁶ in which he pointed out the fundamental error in Goldstein's paper that changed the result from $\pm 0.5\%$ to -8% (slower than) $\pm 9\%$. Mammel rightly asks 'Why didn't a referee spot this?'

On December 7, 1983 he networked a further paper⁷ pointing out that there was yet another error in Goldstein's paper that changed the result to $+6\%$ (higher than present) $\pm 8.6\%$. This, as far as I know, is still the present position. It should be noted that Mammel is a critic of Setterfield's c decay theories and is therefore hardly likely to be looking for errors that would support his thesis.

When we then read Bounds' postscript to his article, in trying to set out the correspondence, he makes confusion worse confounded. Goldstein makes two more misleading statements. Firstly, he misleads Bounds and Setterfield when he says in his letter to Humphreys that what he '*had meant to say was the speed of light according to Roemer's data was 2.6% slower than it is now.*'

Secondly, in his letter to Bounds he says '*. . . the light travel time in 1668 to 1678 was $-2.6 \pm 2.6\%$ compared to the modern value.*' Now it is obvious that if the light travel time was **less**, then the speed was **higher**. But he then continues with the misleading comment, '*An increase in the light travel time (if it is real) means that the velocity was lower.*' This is a statement that is quite the opposite of what his previous figures show. To then claim 'Thus, I have not found any support for Setterfield's theory' is quite baseless, for the evidence **does** give him support.

Bounds, not having received a response from Goldstein pointing out this error, seems to have initially drawn the correct conclusion as I have done above. However, from the letter that Humphreys quotes from Goldstein, Bounds reverses his opinion without any other justification than Goldstein's plain statement that it **was** 2.6% slower than now. He then concludes with yet another unwarranted suggestion that there is a **possibility** of no change in c

in his quotation from Humphreys letter.

What all these critics seem to be unaware of is the fact that Mammel's second correction of Goldstein's work reverses the results to **support** Setterfield.

Reviewing all these bewildering changes, I would ask two questions:—

- (1) Both Goldstein and Bounds have made very sophisticated calculations on Roemer's data. Why then can neither of them state categorically whether the speed was faster or slower by the acknowledged percentage difference that was found? Surely Bounds should have been able to check Goldstein's work independently to set out his own conclusions for the reader, and not have to rely on Goldstein's say-so on whether his results were plus or minus the present speed.
- (2) Can neither Goldstein nor Bounds write in clear concise language what the conclusions are from their studies without misleading each other - and their less erudite readers doubly so? It is perhaps noteworthy that each time an erroneous statement is made, it is always in the direction that claims c was slower in the past. I would not of course accuse any of the participants in suggesting that this was the real intention, but some readers might tend to draw this conclusion with at least a modicum of justification.

Comment

I have watched a number of exchanges of correspondence between Setterfield and his critics for many years, and as a result of being able to hear both sides of the arguments, I have supported Setterfield by publicising his ideas and evidence where I can. This has not been a blind acceptance of all that he says, but generally speaking I consider his line of argument to be far more convincing than that of his opponents. Although, like many, I am unable to check atomic formulae or quote astronomical data, I try to see if the line of arguments on either side are reasonable and not distorting the evidence.

Bounds' lengthy article is to me far

from convincing. Indeed, it has quite the opposite effect, for it suggests that with such a weak case to defend, an unjustifiable method of argument seems to have been resorted to.

Malcolm Bowden,
Bromley, Kent,
UNITED KINGDOM.

REFERENCES

1. Bounds, V. E., 1984. Towards a critical examination of the historical basis of the idea that light has slowed down. **EN Tech. J.**, 1:105–107.
2. Setterfield, B., 1984. Towards a critical examination of the historical basis of the idea that light has slowed down — a reply. **EN Tech. J.**, 1:118–125.
3. Bounds, V. E., 1990. Further towards a critical examination of Setterfield's hypothesis. **EN Tech. J.**, 4:163–180.
4. Bounds, Ref. 3, p. 163.
5. Bowden, M., 1989. Speed of light — corrected Roemer's values. **Creation Research Society Quarterly**, 26:32–33.
6. Group - net.astro
From - lew@ihuxr.UUCP (Lew Mammel. Jr.)
Message-ID: <795@ihuxr.UUCP
Date Rcd - Fri. 2-Dec-83 23:40:50
7. Group - net.astro
From - lew@ihuxr.UUCP (Lew Mammel. Jr.)
Message-ID: <800@ihuxr.UUCP
Date Rcd - Wed. 7-Dec-83 23:33:37

ANNOUNCING THE CREATION RESEARCH INDEX . . .

Dear Editor,

To help researchers easily find research articles a computer based **Creation Research Index** is now available. The Index lists the contents of the following creation sources:

- * **Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal**, Vol. 1 through Vol. 7 (1993).
- * **Creation Research Society Quarterly**, Vol. 1 through Vol. 30 (March 1994)
- * **ICR's Impact**, #1 through #251 (July 1994)
- * **Origins Magazine**, Vol. 1 through Vol. 20 (1) (1993)
- * **Proceedings of the First International Conference on**

CEN Tech. J., vol. 8, no. 2, 1994

* **Creationism**, 1986, Vol. I and II
Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism, 1990, Vol. I and II

The **Index** lists the entire contents of each publication (articles, letters, article and book reviews, each item in Panorama of Science, News and Comments, Annotations from the Literature, quotes, etc.). Each entry provides the title, author, source, volume number, issue number, page number, year published, and type of entry (that is, article,

letter, etc.). There are over 3,900 entries.

The **Index** is available on a 3.5 inch double sided high density disc (1.44MB format). The **Index** is powerful when used with a software program having a search capability. The **Index** is ready to use with the latest (and previous) versions of Microsoft™ Word for Windows™ and Excel for Windows™ formats. *The **Index** is not a software program, but data.*

Researchers will find the **Index** a

tremendous help in finding what has been published during the last 30 years by others in the scientific creation community. For more information about the **Index**, including costs to obtain it, write to:

R. D. Holt,
P. O. Box 456,
Cedar Crest, NM 87008,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

QUOTABLE QUOTE: The Consequences of Darwin

'It is the consequences of Darwin that are grave. He joins the mockers with his reduction of man to a plaything of Nature. Within evolution man is merely a passing part of a continuum between the amoeba and some futuristic mutation. His ancestor is neither Adam nor Brutus, but the monkey. . . . (Darwin laughed) at mankind and its veneration of the past, saying if you really want to know where you come from, go to the zoo, and study that parody of yourself, the great ape. He is your true father. . . . Man exists because he does what every creature does, struggle to survive. So far the environment has been kind to him, so his species has flourished. This is temporary, as is his position at the top of the evolutionary scale. At some point in time it is inevitable that some chance mutation or some chance change to the environment will exterminate him. There is no place for free-will. Nor is there much dignity: in terms of the new sacred, Biology, the amoeba has greater distinction than man, for it has survived far longer than he. . . . Not only is there no free-will, there is no responsibility, no morality, only power. Darwin himself argued that man's moral code has evolved from primitive forms in lower species, from the social instincts that are necessary for the survival of some species. This means that any law is provisional, to be kept while it is useful, entirely relative to the moment of evolution. No such law can be incontestably binding. If such utility is the foundation of the law, men will soon stop obeying it, for one man's use is another man's nuisance. Everything can be disputed, for everything is relative. There are no absolutes.'

— Carroll, John, 1993. **Humanism: The Wreck of Western Culture**, Fontana, London, pp. 145–146.