

it does not revolve round its primary but like the moon persists in a forward motion and a forward motion cannot be retrograde. You tell me "If your theory demands direct motion for this satellite, it must on your own admission be erroneous" This is a misconception, my hypothesis announces that if a satellite revolves round its primary, revolution in a counter-clock-wise direction would be in accordance with rule, and that revolution in a clock-wise direction would be an anomaly which the hypothesis could not tolerate, and since it could not tolerate it I examined the astronomer's statement and found it a false alarm. The astronomer is in the habit of referring to fiction in terms of fact, as when he tells us that the moon revolves round the earth, or as when he states that the orbit of the earth is a closed conic section, and if misconceptions result he is to blame.

Second. You tell me that horse-power is not energy but the rate of transfer of energy. This is playing up to my hand, for horse-power becomes the measure of the energy transferred, but what is energy? It is according to 20th Century concepts perpetual motion, and perpetual motion is according to 20th. Century concepts the fundamental entity of which all physical things are created. This is a new outlook and calls for modifications in the old. While these concepts may be premature they are sufficiently well understood to serve the purpose of an hypothesis, and I have a right to use these concepts with all their implications to trace the origin of the solar system, and by means of my hypothesis I have been able to co-ordinate the salient facts of the system, a co-ordination which has elicited from you no word of comment.

When you presented the readers of "Astronomy" with certain unsolved problems for solution, you naturely expected solutions