

The Copernican Revolution: Pagan Cosmology Reinvented

How Roman Catholicism's Opposition to the
Reformation Became the Conduit for Bringing Ancient
Paganism Back Into Christianized Western Civilization

a sermon / lecture in two parts
by Keith T. Comparetto

1 Timothy 6:20-21: *“O Timothy! Guard what was committed to
your trust, avoiding the profane and idle babblings and
contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge
— by professing it some have strayed concerning the faith.”*

Preface

In the year 2023, as of this writing, we find ourselves facing what Aldous Huxley called a “brave new world.” Huxley, viewing the world in 1932, did not use that expression optimistically. He was describing a futuristic world filled with what he saw as technological marvels, but much spiritual darkness. The trends Huxley viewed then have only accelerated, and so we must ask the question: how did we get to where we are today?

In 1945, when World War II ended, to many it seemed to be the victory of Christian civilization against fascism, atheism, antisemitism, and the imperialistic militarism that the world had been dealing with for most of the century up to that point. Among the general public, the virtues of faith and family, though admittedly not clearly defined, were being promoted even in mainstream news and entertainment. Around that time, noted pastor and author, A.W. Tozer, observed,

Religion is again legal in America. It is no longer necessary to whisper about it behind our hand. It is back in season. The secular press, which of course is always quick to sense trends and give the public what it wants, has found that religion is news. A sufficiently large number of those who buy newspapers and magazines are interested enough in religion to make it profitable to print increasingly generous amounts of religious copy. Religious books are among the best sellers. Prominent people are telling the world what they believe. Religion is woven into sports, politics, the theatre. It is frequently a part of night club chatter, and the radio and TV comedian has learned that a serious word about prayer and church going at the end of his routine will please most of his listeners.... Religious songs are in the repertoire of many professional entertainers. Religion is being plugged by night club entertainers, prize fighters, movie stars, and by at least one incarcerated gangster who has up to this time shown no

sorrow for his way of life and no evidence of repentance. Religion, if you please, is now big business.

While that illusion was being spread among the masses, a very different trend was underway in the secret chambers of the scientific and government elites — a secular revolution, if you will, involving some of the most demented scientific minds in the world. The end of the war in Germany had left many of the most infamous Nazis war criminals as free agents, for sale to the highest bidder. Despite the fact that these individuals had used their scientific knowledge to build and support the Nazi's horrific system of human experimentation, death camps and genocide, many of these unrepentant war criminals never stood trial at Nuremberg, and in fact over sixteen hundred of them were the beneficiaries of a secret program called "Operation Paperclip" to move them seamlessly from their enemy bunkers into the scientific establishment of the United States.

In that capacity, some of them made their way to the top, including a top Nazi rocket scientist named Wernher von Braun. According to Annie Jacobsen's book, *Operation Paperclip*, which carefully documents the war crimes of these scientists who were welcomed into the U.S. with open arms, Von Braun was actively engaged in building rockets for the Nazi war machine, and in acquiring the slave labor to work in the underground facilities, which were an almost certain death sentence for those who were sent to them. Once in the U.S. after the war, Von Braun and this cadre of Nazi scientists would significantly impact the ideological direction of postwar America, with von Braun as one of the new prophets of human achievement through the space program.

As a side note, the Nazis were very interested in the occult, which is also well documented by a number of authors including Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, (*The Occult Roots of Nazism*) and Peter Levenda (*Unholy Alliance: A History of Nazi Involvement with the Occult*). Thus, it should come as no surprise that the U.S. "space program," under the direction and guidance of its chief prophet,

von Braun, was founded almost like a secret society, with its own mystical priesthood, the most notable of whom was a rocket expert named Jack Parsons, a devoted follower of the occult master, Aleister Crowley. Even after Parson's untimely death at the age of thirty eight from a laboratory explosion, there was a cadre of individuals, which included a disproportionate number of high degree Freemasons, who seemed to function as a seamless network with other occult connections within America's scientific and intelligence agencies at that time. Again, much of this is well-documented.

Furthermore, added to that prophet and priesthood was a well-executed propaganda campaign. America's ambition to ascend up to the heavens, seemingly inspired by the builders at Babel, was promoted with the help of Walt Disney, who in the late 1950's teamed up with the former Nazi, Wernher von Braun, to produce a series of propaganda films promoting space travel as the next frontier that man must conquer. There can be little debate that by the late 1950's and into the early 1960's, a drastic cultural shift was underway in America, a new trajectory away from our Christian founding. Little boys went from wearing cowboy hats to wearing space helmets, and the popular imagination was redirected to what were believed to be the potential human possibilities of space travel.

At that time, television programs like *The Twilight Zone*, *The Outer Limits*, *Lost in Space* and *My Favorite Martian* responded to and encouraged the growing public interest in outer space. In 1966, a new TV program called *Star Trek* began with its opening line which would soon become famous:

Space: the final frontier. These are the voyages of the star ship Enterprise. Its five-year mission: to explore strange new worlds; to seek out new life and new civilizations; to boldly go where no man has gone before!

Notably, in this bold declaration of an optimistic future, there was no mention of God or His will and purpose for mankind. On July 20, 1969, when Neil Armstrong reportedly stepped onto the surface

of the moon, he said, "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind" — again, nothing about God. Just a few years later, in 1977, the *Star Wars* series would begin, one of the highest grossing film series of all time, with a new twist. God as the creator wasn't just absent from the discussion; He had been replaced by a mysterious power called The Force. "May God be with you" was now quaint and obsolete; "May the Force be with you" was cool.

Since that time, all of this high ambition has only accelerated. America as a nation, and Western civilization in general, have never turned back to the God who in the words of William Bradford, brought the spiritual founders of our nation over the vast and furious ocean, to arrive on our shores, where they blessed the God of heaven, and established what they believed was a Christian city upon a hill, which they must maintain as such, lest in the words of John Winthrop, the God who brought us here "withdraw his present help from us, we shall be made a story and a byword through the world; we shall open the mouths of enemies to speak evil of the ways of God." The arrogance of this human ambition evokes Alexander Pope's famous line, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." How did all this unbridled human ambition so thoroughly corrupt a civilization that once embraced the Holy Bible as its foundational document, acknowledged an intelligent divine Creator of all things, and confessed that the chief end of man is to glorify and enjoy Him forever? It didn't happen overnight, and certainly there is no simple answer, but at least one significant factor, and everything that flowed from it, is the topic of this little book.

Part One: Ancient Paganism, Reappearing

Emily Dickinson, the great 19th century poetess, was inspired on one occasion to write this clever little poem about the sun:

*I'll tell you how the Sun rose –
A Ribbon at a time –
The Steeples swam in Amethyst –
The news, like Squirrels, ran –
The Hills untied their Bonnets –
The Bobolinks – begun –
Then I said softly to myself –
'That must have been the Sun!'*

Mankind has always been fascinated by the sun, and with good reason. It gives us light and warmth, it causes the clouds and rains to depart, and the plants to grow. It's one of the miracles of God's creation, which He has made to sustain life on this earth. We thank God for the sun, and we have no desire to diminish its greatness, provided that God receives the glory for creating and controlling it. But unfortunately, man is incurably religious, and when he ceases to worship the true God of heaven, how easily he turns his gaze to the heavens themselves, and particularly to the greatest light God has placed there, which is the sun. In this little book, along with citing and examining a few relevant Scriptures, we will consider some historical facts that most of us were never told. After that, it will be up to you to wonder *why* you've never been told these things, and to determine their implications. My only request, dear reader, is that you will withhold judgment until the end of this presentation.

The kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament, in disobedience to God's repeated warnings, had a great and recurring problem with

idolatry. After the kingdom was divided following the reign of king Solomon, the northern kingdom of Israel, without a single godly king, went full force into idolatry, from which it never recovered until the kingdom's complete downfall in 722 B.C., when it was conquered by the Assyrians. The southern kingdom of Judah fared somewhat better, with a number of godly kings intervening at times to cleanse the land of its idols, which preserved the kingdom until it was taken into captivity by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.

Prior to Judah's collapse, a godly king named Josiah desired with all of his heart to root out the worship of idols from his kingdom. The story of Josiah's reformation is told in some detail, especially as recorded in 2 Kings 23, where we find one form of idolatry especially prevalent: the worship of the heavens, and particularly of the sun. Notice how the worship of the heavens, which was particularly associated with Mesopotamia and Egypt, is found multiple times in the following passage:

2 Kings 23:

*4 And the king commanded Hilkiah the high priest, the priests of the second order, and the doorkeepers, to bring out of the temple of the LORD all the articles that were made for **Baal**, for **Asherah** [the names of the pagan gods can have broad definitions, but in his most basic form, Baal was the sun god, the king of heaven, and Ashorah, Baal's consort, was the moon, the queen of heaven], and for **all the host of heaven**... 5 Then he removed the idolatrous priests whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense on the high places in the cities of Judah and in the places all around Jerusalem, and those who burned incense **to Baal, to the sun, to the moon, to the constellations, and to all the host of heaven**.... 10 And he defiled Topheth, which is in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, that no man might*

*make his son or his daughter pass through the fire to **Molech** [another name for Baal, the sun god]. 11 Then he removed **the horses that the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun**, at the entrance to the house of the LORD, by the chamber of Nathan-Melech, the officer who was in the court; and he burned the **chariots of the sun** with fire.*

It's also significant that one of the prophets who ministered during the time of Josiah was Jeremiah, who also rebuked the people repeatedly for their worship of the heavens, warning them that if they did not repent, God would bring them into judgment for it:

Jeremiah 7:30 — 8:2

*7:30 For the children of Judah have done evil in My sight," says the LORD. "They have set their abominations in the house which is called by My name, to pollute it. 31 And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire [the fire of **Moloch, a sun god**], which I did not command, nor did it come into My heart.... 34 Then I will cause to cease from the cities of Judah and from the streets of Jerusalem the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride. For the land shall be desolate. 8:1 "At that time," says the LORD, "they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of its princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, out of their graves. 2 **They shall spread them before the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven**, which they have loved and which they have served and*

*after which they have walked, which they have sought and **which they have worshiped.**...*

Now, most moderns would read the above words and say, “How primitive! Who would do that? Who would worship the sun?” On the topic of sun worship, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says,

Sun worship, [is the] veneration of the sun or a representation of the sun as a deity, as in Atomism in Egypt in the 14th century BCE. Although sun worship has been used frequently as a term for “pagan” religion, it is, in fact, relatively rare.

Though almost every culture uses solar motifs, only a relatively few cultures (Egyptian, Indo-European, and Meso-American [Aztecs, Mayans, Incas]) developed solar religions.”

It is possible that *Britannica*, which is at the very heart of the intellectual establishment, protests too much, for it is not difficult to prove that sun worship is still very much alive today, though much more subtle in its manifestations. I would like to make a bold statement, and then give you some evidence, looking over the history of the last five hundred years, to defend that statement, and then leave the implications of what I’m about to say, to you. My bold statement, for which I will provide evidence, is to say that the cult of sun-worship, even in our sophisticated modern age, is very much alive and pervades every aspect of our culture, because a significant portion of modern speculative science is built NOT on science, but on the ancient and mystical cult of the sun, which was given new life and credibility by the Copernican Revolution.

The Copernican Revolution

We live in a *scientific* age, when the discoveries of modern science have led to amazing technological breakthroughs. But we also live in an age when man’s boundless ego has brought about endless speculation, couched in scientific terms, about the origin of the universe, the origin of life, the age of the earth, the nature and

distances of the stars and planets. Real scientists, if they're honest, are bound in their studies by what is called the Scientific Method, which involves the following necessary steps:

- Step 1: Ask a question.
- Step 2: State a *hypothesis*, a supposition that's simply a starting point for further investigation
- Step 3: Conduct a series of experiments, with controlled conditions and methods of observation, to test your hypothesis.
- Step 4: Analyze the results, based on the replicability of the experiments, meaning when you reproduce or *replicate* the experiment with similar conditions, you will achieve similar results.
- Step 5: Based on all of this observation and repeated experimentation, draw a conclusion.

The above steps are impossible to follow when dealing with any of the speculative things just mentioned — the origin of life, the nature and distances of the stars and planets, etc. — which involve looking into a distant past which can't be repeated, or into a sky full of luminous objects that you can't reach and you can't touch, and thus, your observations will be very limited. Scientific author Gerrard Hickson, in his book, *Kings Dethroned*, written in 1922, demonstrates his belief that the claimed distances between the planets and the sun, which allegedly were “proven” centuries ago, have been based on faulty assumptions and methods. He refers to modern astronomy as “an amazing series of blunders founded upon an error made in the second century B.C.” The point is that when scientists wander outside the above parameters of the scientific method, their opinions are no longer “scientific,” regardless of their scientific credentials.

We must also add to this problem the spiritual element, which comes into play when man shakes his fist in the face of God by denying Scripture, God's revelation of Himself. In doing so, he welcomes in demonic deception, which can come in many forms, including the appearance of scholarship that seems so intelligent it

can't be questioned. "*The serpent was more subtle,*" or "*cunning*" or "*crafty,*" Genesis 3:1 says of Satan, depending on the translation. He's smart, and he's able to transform himself even into an angel of light, if by that means he can deceive those who may not be deceived by more direct means. There was perhaps nothing so crafty as to revitalize ancient paganism by bringing it into the Christian West under the guise of genuine learning, under the guardianship of a mother Roman church, and expressed in Christian terms by professing Christian scholars to an unsuspecting population eager to find its way out of mass ignorance and misery.

As for the mysteries of the lights in the firmament, the ancients had observed and calculated their movements, including the movements of those that wandered in relation to the others, which they called "planets," or "wanderers" (which included the sun and the moon), and from these calculations, they were able to determine "*signs, seasons, days and years*" (Genesis 1:14). Some of the ancients speculated about things such as the nature and shape of the earth and its relation to the heavens, but among the pagans there was no universal agreement. Among the Christianized populations of the world, there was general agreement that heaven is God's throne, and earth is His footstool (Isaiah 66:1), which implies that God is not light years away, but very near. They believed that the Bible doesn't give a lot of detail about such things, but when it speaks, it speaks truthfully.

Three "Revolutions"

But beginning about five hundred years ago, a revolution was in progress, on many fronts. In southern Europe, particularly in Italy, the seat of Roman Catholicism, the **Italian Renaissance** ("rebirth") was in progress. Its center was in Florence, where beginning in the 1400's, the Medici family began its rise to power with Cosimo de' Medici (1389-1464), who became rich and powerful through banking and intermarriage with other rich and powerful families. In fifteenth and sixteenth century Florence, the Medici family reigned supreme as patrons of the arts, benefactors

of the popes of Rome and financiers of the great Medici library, where ancient scientific, philosophical, mystical, quasi-religious literature was collected and stored, and made available particularly to scholars sympathetic to the Roman Catholic church. That library still exists in the same building, designed by Michelangelo, which it has occupied since the 1500's. According to one historian, "So extensive was the Medici Library's philosophical influence that even scholars today consider it the cradle of Western civilization." Its neo-pagan influence was especially powerful within Roman Catholicism, but emanating outward from there, it would change the direction of Western civilization.

In northern Europe, particularly in Germany, England and Geneva, Switzerland, another revolution was brewing, the **Reformation**, based on the revival of biblical learning. At the heart of it was a return to Scripture alone, *Sola Scriptura*, and it involved the reexamination of all of its teachings, and the attempt to lead the church back to the apostles' doctrine that it was built upon. Especially from 1517 onward, the year of Luther's Theses, *Sola Scriptura* would be at the center of an ideological and spiritual struggle between the authority of God and the powers of earth that is still with us to this day. And into this sixteenth century world of divided ideologies, a third revolution, a **scientific revolution**, was also beginning to thrust itself onto the world stage, and as it did, some amazing things happened, creating a perfect storm of *deception* which would become what's been called the "Copernican Revolution."

On the religious front, the most favorable "revolution," at least for non-Catholics, was the Reformation, with its return to Scripture. But on the Roman Catholic side of that debate, the return to Scripture wasn't a victory. The history of the world tells us that every time there is major move on God's part which is seen as a victory for God's people, which Luther's Ninety-five Theses certainly represented, there will be a counter move on Satan's part to counteract it. The Reformation was a great threat to the power of

Rome, whose calculated opposition to *Sola Scriptura*, called the *Counter-Reformation*, would reach into every area of human endeavor. It would extend even into the area of cosmology, man's beliefs about the nature of the world we live in, and its influence is still being felt today.

The key figure in this cosmological shift, which also had religious and philosophical implications, was a Polish astronomer-astrologer and mathematician named **Nicolaus Copernicus** (1473-1543). In 1543, shortly before his death, Copernicus stunned the scientific world with the publication of his book, *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres*, which placed the sun instead of the earth at the center of everything — thus, the term *heliocentrism* — and for the first time in history, attempted to give a detailed scientific and mathematical explanation for doing so. For my entire Christian life, I've heard Christian apologeticists place men like Copernicus, Johannes Kepler, Isaac Newton and others like them in the category of good Christian men who used the existence of an orderly universe to defend God's existence, and I've done it myself. I don't dispute the genuine Christian influence on modern science, but can we put these men, and others like Galileo, in that category?

It is true that Copernicus was a professing Christian, but in this great debate that the Reformation had set in motion, Copernicus was clearly on the Roman Catholic, anti-Protestant side. And perhaps more significantly, he was also a mystic, probably much more, it seems, than a Bible-believing Christian. It's rather interesting that just as the Catholic counter-reformation was establishing itself, it was the Roman Catholic pope, Paul III, who encouraged Copernicus to publish his book on the *heliocentric* or sun-centered cosmos. Just two years later, this same pope would initiate the Council of Trent, which would become an eighteen-year-long condemnation of the Reformation and everyone associated with it, and an attack on almost every major doctrine the Reformers stood for. That council took place during the lifetime of

John Calvin, and is the subject of Calvin's book, *Acts of the Council of Trent*, published in 1547.

The humanist scholar, Erasmus, was a Roman Catholic and an opponent of Martin Luther on matters of Protestant doctrine such as justification by faith alone and the doctrine of free will. But in other respects he was a man of integrity and honesty, and he did believe in making the Scriptures more available to those outside the Roman Catholic clergy. The clergy in his day had a virtual monopoly on the Bible. For the most part, the only available translation from the original languages was Jerome's Latin translation from the fourth century, and Roman Catholic clerics were about the only ones who could read it — Latin, after all, was the language of the Roman Catholic Church. That's why Erasmus, in order to broaden the reach of the Scriptures, published the first complete Greek New Testament called *Textus Receptus*, going back to the ancient Greek manuscripts that were available at the time. That Greek text would ultimately be used to translate the New Testament into the languages of the common people.

But there is another very interesting sentiment attributed to Erasmus. As Erasmus witnessed the revival of ancient literature, especially under the auspices of the Catholic church, he said, "I have a fear, and it is that, with the study of ancient literature, ancient Paganism will reappear." Erasmus was absolutely right. Most people today aren't aware that Copernicus wasn't just a scientist, he was highly influenced by mystical pagan writings, as were most of the major founders of the modern school of astronomy, including Galileo, Kepler, and Isaac Newton, though all of them were allegedly Christian men. Furthermore, their doctrine of heliocentrism, the belief that the sun, and not the earth, is at the center of our cosmos, was not a modern scientific belief at all, but a resurrected pagan belief.

The main conduit for this pagan corruption was the church of Rome, which claimed to be the guardian of our Christian faith. It should come as no surprise that one of the main targets of ancient

paganism on scientific study would be in the area of *cosmology*, the origin, development and nature of the world we live in. If you were the devil and you wanted to attack the authority of Scripture, you would probably begin right at its foundation, because in the beginning, according to Scripture, ALL of God's creative power is directed towards the earth: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the *earth*," giving the earth a place of prominence. Over the *earth*, He created the great firmament on high; on the *earth*, He gathered the dry land together; on the *earth*, He brought forth grass, the herb *that* yields seed, *and* the fruit tree *that* yields fruit according to its kind; for the waters on the *earth*, God created great sea creatures, and over the *earth*, every winged bird according to its kind, and on the land of *earth*, all the living creatures; over the *earth*, He made two great lights, the sun and the moon, and set them in the firmament. Why? to give light on the *earth*; and most importantly, it was on the *earth* that God created man in His own image, and placed Him in the Garden where He made every tree to grow that is pleasant to the sight and good for food, and rivers and streams to water them all.

In the 19th century, Ralph Waldo Emerson, the American transcendentalist, said "Astronomy taught us our *insignificance* in Nature." Yes, that is true — *astronomy* taught us that, but the *Bible* teaches otherwise. *Astronomy* taught us that the earth is the result of a random explosion in the middle of nothingness that miraculously created everythingness; but *Scripture* teaches that the heavens and the earth were the deliberate act of an intelligent Creator who made man in His image as the crown of His creation. *Astronomy* taught us that the earth is constantly gyrating, revolving and flying through space; but *Scripture* says our Creator has established the earth and set it on a firm foundation so that it cannot be moved forever. (Psalm 93:1, 104:5; 1 Samuel 2:8; Job 9:6). *Astronomy* taught us that the sun was set in the center of our system, while the earth and planets revolve around IT; but the *Scripture* says it's the sun that moves and even "hastens" as it travels its circuit (Job 9:7; Psalm 19:5-6; Ecclesiastes 1:5; Joshua

10:12-13). Who are we going to believe? As for me, I'm going to need a lot of proof to place the teachings of "astronomers" above the *testimony* of my God, who tells me how He created it all, and how He keeps it all in place.

Pagan Mysticism and Sun-Worship

One need not go far into Copernicus' theories, any more than into evolutionary theory, to know that they contradict what the Bible says on such matters. What does the Bible say on the issue of cosmology? It actually says a lot of things that are difficult to ignore. First, the Bible says repeatedly that the earth does NOT move.

- The psalmist of Psalms 93:1 says, "*The LORD reigns, He is clothed with majesty; The LORD is clothed, He has girded Himself with strength. Surely the world is established, so that it cannot be moved.*"
- Psalm 104, refers to God as, "*You who laid the foundations of the earth, So that it should not be moved forever*" (Psalms 104:5).
- When Hannah came to dedicate baby Samuel to the Lord, she said in her inspired prayer, "*For the pillars of the earth are the LORD's, and on them he has set the world*" (1 Samuel 2:8).
- In Psalms 75:3, the psalmist says, "*When the earth totters, and all its inhabitants, it is I who keep steady its pillars*" (Psalms 75:3, ESV). The earth has pillars, not wings!
- Not once does the Scripture state or even imply that the earth, in its natural state, spins or rotates or flies through space. "But the scientists say..." one might protest. STOP! Man says this, and man says that, but I say, "*Let God be true, and every man a liar!*"
- Job 9:6: "*He shakes the earth out of its place, And its pillars tremble.*" If the earth is always spinning and moving, how can it have a "place," and why does it take a supernatural act of God to shake it out of its place?

And while the Bible says the earth doesn't move, it tells us repeatedly that **the sun DOES move**, as indicated in a number of passages including the following:

- Job 9:7: "*He commands the sun, and it does not rise; He seals off the stars.*" If the sunrise is caused by the motion of the earth, why does God command the sun not to rise, and not the earth?
- According to Psalm 19, the sun is "*Like a bridegroom coming out of his chamber... Its rising is from one end of heaven, And its circuit [its travels] to the other end*" (Psalm 19:5-6).
- Solomon, no ignoramus to be sure, says that "*The sun rises, and the sun goes down, and hastens to the place where it rises*" (Ecclesiastes 1:5).
- And on one particular occasion, Joshua "*said in the sight of Israel: 'Sun, stand still over Gibeon; And Moon, in the Valley of Aijalon.' ...So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and did not hasten to go down for about a whole day*" (Joshua 10:12-13).

Many Christians might respond to the above by saying the biblical authors merely wrote what appeared true to their senses. But that explanation should be a problem for those who believe in an infallible Bible that is "wholly true in all that it affirms," which is the classic definition of biblical infallibility. Others might respond to the above verses by saying they're just speaking metaphorically. Granted, the Bible often speaks metaphorically, but in this case, metaphorical for what? To use a metaphor to *illustrate* is one thing, but if the metaphor says the exact opposite of what is true, then what purpose does it serve? If Scripture says the earth doesn't move, but the modern scientists say it's spinning at 1,000 mph at its equator, and traveling 584 million miles around the sun every year (which, interestingly, calculates to 66.6 thousand miles per hour), shouldn't we at least have a very high standard of proof before rushing to believe them? "Well, everybody knows what the scientists say about such things is true." Do they? Or is that just what they and their advocates want you to believe?

Copernicus and the “Visible God” of the Sun

But let’s get back to Copernicus and his sun-centered ideas, and where they came from. As previously stated, Copernicus’ homage to the sun wasn’t a new idea, as even he acknowledged. Pythagoras, the ancient Greek philosopher and mathematician (570-495 BC), believed the earth was possibly a globe, and that the earth and the planets revolved around a central fire. In that regard, he was definitely ahead of his time, but that does not make him right. His lifespan coincides almost exactly with the period of the Jews’ Babylonian Captivity, increasing the likelihood that his ideas were heavily influenced by the occult practices of both the Egyptians and the Babylonians. Even in Pythagoras’ day, some of these same ideas were already being incorporated into Jewish Kabbalism. Later, through channels like the Medici library, they would influence the pseudo-scientific musings of Copernicus, Kepler, Newton and other early modern astronomers, and be given new life in the creeds of freemasonry and other secret societies as they sprang up all over Europe.

As for Copernicus himself, Italian professor Giancarlo Infante, in his book *The Esoteric [Occult] Roots of Modern Science*, says that Copernicus, in his book, *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres*, gives credit not to God or the Bible for his heliocentric theory, but to the pagan Greek philosopher, Aristarchus (310-230 B.C.). Copernicus also writes the following regarding the sun, words that sound more religious than scientific:

In the middle of all, however, resides the sun. For in this most beautiful temple, who would place this lamp in any other or better place than this, from where it can illuminate the whole universe all at once? Not unjustly, then, some call the sun the lamp of the cosmos, others its mind and others still its governor. Trismegistus calls it a visible god.

Trismegistus — who was this, and why does Copernicus quote him? This is an important question that needs an answer. Hermes Trismegistus, whose name means “Thrice great,” was a legendary pagan, almost a god-like figure, who, if he was an actual person at

all, probably lived in Egypt, the epicenter of sun-worship, during the time of the pharaohs, possibly even during the time of Moses. The work attributed to him is called the *Hermetica*, and thus, he is considered the father of *hermeticism*, which has parallels to, and perhaps is even the basis of, much that we find in Freemasonry. In Treatise XVI of the *Hermetica*, Trismegistus says, “For the Sun is situated at the centre of the cosmos, wearing it like a crown.... Therefore, the father of all is god; their craftsman is the sun; and the cosmos is the instrument of [His] craftsmanship.”

The Wikipedia article on Hermeticism includes the following interesting admission regarding the origins of modern science:

Hermeticism... is a philosophical system based on the purported teachings of Hermes Trismegistus (a legendary Hellenistic combination of the Greek god Hermes and the Egyptian god Thoth)... In 1964, Francis A. Yates advanced the thesis that Renaissance Hermeticism, or what she called “the Hermetic tradition,” had been a crucial factor in the development of modern science. While Yates’s thesis has since been largely rejected, the important role played by the Hermetic science of alchemy in the thought of such figures as Jan Baptist van Helmont (1580-1644), Robert Boyle (1627-1691) or Isaac Newton (1642-1727) has been amply demonstrated.”

What the article seems to be saying is that though Yates’ thesis about the influence of pagan ideas on modern science has been “largely rejected,” it has also been “amply demonstrated.” Is this a contradiction, or is it merely that scholars have trouble admitting what is true? And we should also add here that Trismegistus’ influence was not just on Copernicus, but also on Kepler, Galileo, Boyle, Newton, and others who have been set before us as the purveyors of “true science” as opposed to religious superstition.

How filled with inaccuracies is so much of the story we’ve been told! It is interesting that Copernicus, as well as other founders of modern astronomy, while posing as good Christians, were just repeating the ideas of the pagans, and attempting,

primarily through mathematical wizardry, to clothe it in pseudo scientific garments. It's also interesting, and probably no accident, that Copernicus' theory was supported and encouraged in its publication by the same anti-protestant pope who took Rome's counter-reformation to a new level, making the Copernican theory one of the first salvos fired against the foundational Reformed doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*. After all, Pope Paul III, the pope who supported Copernicus and purportedly encouraged him to publish his theory, also supported the burning of Protestant Christians and their Bibles, and evidently, Copernicus must have supported it also.

According to *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Copernicus referred to this pope, Pope Paul III (reigned 1534–49), as “the most eminent man in dignity of rank and in love of all learning and even of mathematics.” And lest there be any question as to where Copernicus stood on *Sola Scriptura*, his response to his protestant critics was,

If perchance there shall be idle talkers, who, though they are ignorant of all mathematical sciences, nevertheless assume the right to pass judgment on these things, and if they should dare to criticize and attack this theory of mine because of some passage of Scripture which they have falsely distorted for their own purpose, I care not at all; I will even despise their judgment as foolish.

Kepler's “Golden Vessels of the Egyptians”

The early leaders of the Reformation were quick to point out Copernicus' departure from the teachings of Scripture on that point, but culturally, they were up against something much bigger than a radical book by Copernicus. Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), the German mathematician-astronomer-astrologer, was also a student of hermeticism, the sun-worshipping ideas of Trismegistus. He admits in his book, *The Harmony of the World*, supposedly a scientific treatise explaining the motion of earth and the planets around the sun, that he received his ideas through occult experiences:

...a very few days after the pure Sun of that most wonderful study began to shine, nothing restrains me; it is my pleasure to yield to the inspired frenzy, it is my pleasure to taunt mortal men with the candid acknowledgment that I am stealing the golden vessels of the Egyptians to build a tabernacle to my God from them, far, far away from the boundaries of Egypt....I cast the die, and I write the book.

“I have taken the golden vessels of the Egyptians,” Kepler confessed, good “Christian” man that he was, “and boldly carried them into the Christian West.”

Isaac Newton: “Last of the Magicians”

Isaac Newton (1642-1726) was born about a hundred years after Copernicus’ death. He was a monumental figure, and for many reasons he became the perfect messenger to help carry the ideas of Copernicus into the next century. He was considered by many to be the father of the age of reason, and the father of Deism, the idea that God simply created the universe with its natural laws, and then retired from the scene and left it to run by itself.

According to Wikipedia,

Isaac Newton’s mathematical explanation of universal gravitation explained the behavior both of objects here on earth and of objects in the heavens in a way that promoted a world-view in which the natural universe is controlled by laws of nature. This, in turn, suggested a theology in which God created the universe, set it in motion controlled by natural law and retired from the scene.

It’s said that the French philosopher Voltaire, a religious skeptic, after spending time in England, was profoundly influenced by Newton, whose rationalistic ideas would have serious consequences. Upon returning to France, Voltaire’s influence upon others would, after his death, launch the disastrous French Revolution, with its temples to reason, its hatred of the Christian faith and its guillotines, all of which turned to mass slaughter and blood in the streets. Of Newton’s part in this tragic series of events, Professor John Lienhard from the University of Houston writes,

So Voltaire took the new English science, rationalism tempered with observation, back to France. Those ideas soon ran away from him and started a revolution beyond anything he'd ever intended. And so it was, at length, Isaac Newton who put the terribly disruptive engines of the French Revolution into motion." (John H. Lienhard, "No. 1168: Voltaire And Science," *The Engines of Our Ingenuity*, University of Houston)

But perhaps even more relevant to the topic of this book is Newton's pagan interests. Newton was especially fascinated by an ancient Hermetic text by Trismegistus called the *Emerald Tablet*, a fourteen-line pagan poem in praise of the sun as the creator, the father of all, and the power that penetrates everything. The *Tablet* is considered to be the primary source for the practice of alchemy, which was not merely an attempt to turn base metals into gold through chemical research — it was pagan black magic, and full of sun worship too. Moreover, the text is believed to be the source of the saying, "As above, so below," a slogan used by astrologers to speak of the influence of the stars and planets on the affairs of earth, and of the various so-called "planes" of existence on each other. The expression has long been used by occultists like Madam Blavatsky, the founder of Theosophy, and Aleister Crowley, the Satanist. It is also the meaning behind the odd pose of the Baphomet, a satanic figure with one hand pointing upward and the other downward, and a horned goat as its head.

We know that Newton's own friends and contemporaries, one of whom was Robert Boyle the chemist (also an alchemist), tried to keep Newton's interest in that pagan subject from the public, and they were quite successful. For several centuries, Newton's papers on alchemy were largely kept secret, but in 1936 they were purchased by John Maynard Keynes (the father of Keynesian economics), who after studying them, famously said in a lecture to the Royal Society, "Newton was not the first of the age of reason. He was the last of the magicians, the last of the Babylonians and Sumerians...[and] the last wonder-child to whom the Magi could

do sincere and appropriate homage.” In 2016, *National Geographic* magazine published a story titled “Isaac Newton’s Lost Alchemy Recipe Rediscovered,” which said,

Newton wrote more than one million words about alchemy throughout his life, in the hope of using ancient knowledge to better explain the nature of matter—and possibly strike it rich. But academics have long tiptoed around this connection, since alchemy is usually dismissed as mystical pseudoscience full of fanciful, discredited processes.” (April 4, 2016).

Newton’s most famous contribution to “science,” however, was his law of gravity, which was devised primarily to explain the new Copernican system of astronomy, with all of its rotating and revolving of what he perceived as massive heavenly bodies. One mustn’t let a good pagan idea go. The actual existence of gravity, however, has never been proven. It is one thing to claim to measure it, but no one could ever explain what gravity IS, and it has never been replicated on the *outside* of a spinning ball. In the twentieth century, gravity would be rather quietly thrown out and replaced by Einstein’s theory of relativity, which also was devised for the same purpose, and which also has never been proven.

Newton’s “law” claims that all things with mass or energy are mutually attracted to each other. The source for the idea was probably also the *Emerald Tablet*, which says of the sun that “Its force is above all force. For it vanquishes every subtle thing and penetrates every solid thing.” But let us ask a basic question: What is gravity, and how do we know that it exists, or do we? Perhaps what Newton called “gravity” was no less magical than alchemy. Some have hypothesized that it’s caused by tiny particles called “gravitons,” but there is no proof such particles exist. On the information-sharing website, Quora.com, which promotes itself as “the place to gain and share knowledge, empowering people to learn from others and better understand the world,” someone asked an interesting question: What is the definitive proof there is

gravity? The answer, by Simon Bridge, a scientist, is quite revealing:

What is the definitive proof there is gravity? There isn't one. That is not how science works. Gravity is the name we give to the phenomenon that objects accelerate towards each other when they are otherwise left to their own devices. The “proof” of gravity is the demonstration that the phenomenon happens. A casual demonstration would be to hold an ordinary object out in the air at arms length and let go. Watch it fall. The object and the Earth just accelerated towards each other when there was no other significant force acting.

Ordinary objects do tend to fall, yes, but there are other reasonable explanations, such as differences in density, causing objects denser than the air to fall, and those less dense to rise. To say that the fall of the “ordinary object” in the demonstration above is caused by “gravity,” *the object and the earth accelerating towards each other*, has no proof scientifically, and true scientists, of which there are many, are willing to admit it.

Newton claims to have proven gravity with mathematics, which is the case with most of astronomy’s claims. But as the German professor, Dr. C. Schoepffer, writes in his book, *The Earth Stands Fast*, published in 1900,

How little we know of this law [of gravity] which has been under observation for two hundred years!" We [must] caution against the supposition that ability to work out a mathematical theory for an hypothesis adds a single grain of real proof to that obtainable for the hypothesis from experimental observations of nature alone. [citing one professor Rowland:] “A mathematical investigation always obeys the law of the conservation of knowledge; we never get out more from it than we put in. The knowledge may be changed in form, it may be clearer and more exactly stated, but the total amount of the knowledge of nature given out by the investigation is the same as we started with.”

This principle has not changed. Strange it is that Isaac Newton, who involved himself in the occult for his entire life while claiming allegiance to the Christian God, still maintains his

reputation with many Christians of being a “good Christian” scientist.

The Reformers and Heliocentrism

All of this disguised paganism, though much of it was welcomed into the Christian West by a decadent Roman Catholic system, didn’t escape the discerning minds of the Protestant movement. The Reformers themselves, who lived during the time of Copernicus, were quite perceptive as to the pagan origin of his theory, and where it would lead. John Calvin, the Geneva Reformer, said,

We will see some who are so deranged, not only in religion but who in all things reveal their monstrous nature, that they will say that the sun does not move, and that it is the earth which shifts and turns. When we see such minds we must indeed confess that the devil posses them, and that God sets them before us as mirrors, in order to keep us in his fear.

Calvin’s opinion was based not only on his knowledge of Scripture, but on human observation, which suggests a stationary earth with the heavens moving above it. This of course is not scientific proof, but certainly a reasonable observation, of which Calvin said,

A simple survey of the world should of itself suffice to attest a Divine Providence. The heavens revolve daily, and, immense as is their fabric, and inconceivable the rapidity of their revolutions, we experience no concussion—no disturbance in the harmony of their motion. The sun, though varying its course every diurnal revolution, returns annually to the same point. The planets, in all their wanderings, maintain their respective positions. How could the earth hang suspended in the air were it not upheld by God’s hand? By what means could it maintain itself unmoved, while the heavens above are in constant rapid motion, did not its Divine Maker fix and establish it?... Yea, he hath established it.”

In commenting on the first verse of Psalm 93, which says, “Surely the world is established, so that it cannot be moved.,” Calvin asks

the question, “Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?”

Martin Luther had a similar response to Copernicus and his new, anti-biblical idea:

People gave ear to an upstart astrologer who strove to show that the earth revolves, not the heavens or the firmament, the sun and the moon. Whoever wishes to appear clever must devise some new system, which of all systems is of course the very best. This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the *sun* to stand still, and not the earth.”

Likewise, Luther’s disciple, Philipp Melanchthon, a scholar not merely in matters theological but scientific as well, wrote in his treatise, “The Elements of Physics,” published just six years after Copernicus’s death,

The eyes are witnesses that the heavens revolve in the space of twenty-four hours. But certain men, either from the love of novelty, or to make a display of ingenuity, have concluded that the earth moves; and they maintain that neither the eighth sphere nor the sun revolves....Now, it is a want of honesty and decency to assert such notions publicly, and the example is pernicious. It is the part of a good mind to accept the truth as revealed by God and to acquiesce in it.

John Owen also, in the Puritan era, declared that the Copernican system was a “delusive and arbitrary hypothesis, contrary to Scripture.”

A Losing Battle?

Andrew Dickson White was an American educator, the co-founder and first president of Cornell University, and a liberal who always sided with “science” against “faith,” as if the two are actual enemies. In his rather well-known book, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*,” published in 1896, White points out that “All branches of the Protestant Church—Lutheran, Calvinist, Anglican—vied with each other in denouncing the Copernican doctrine as contrary to Scripture; and, at a later

period, the Puritans showed the same tendency” to reject heliocentrism and all that accompanied it. Nevertheless, according to White, the early Protestants were fighting a losing battle in defending Scripture against the anti-biblical claims of mainstream “science”:

In the latter half of the sixteenth century these evolutionary theories [theories of the origin and nature of the universe] seemed to take more definite form... For there came, one after the other, five of the greatest men our race has produced: Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, and Newton. “The spacious firmament on high”—“the crystalline spheres”—the Almighty enthroned upon “the circle of the heavens,” and with his own hands, or with angels as his agents, keeping sun, moon, and planets in motion for the benefit of the earth, opening and closing the “windows of heaven,” letting down upon the earth the “waters above the firmament,” “setting his bow in the cloud,” hanging out “signs and wonders,” hurling comets, “casting forth lightnings” to scare the wicked, and “shaking the earth” in his wrath: all this had disappeared. These five men had given a new divine revelation to the world; and through the last, Newton, had come a vast new conception, destined to be fatal to the old theory of creation... these men gave a new basis for the theory of evolution as distinguished from the theory of creation.

Part Two: Cosmology: “Settled Science,” or a Continuing Debate?

Isaiah 40:25-31

25 "To whom then will you liken Me, Or to whom shall I be equal?" says the Holy One. 26 Lift up your eyes on high, And see who has created these things, Who brings out their host by number; He calls them all by name, By the greatness of His might And the strength of His power; Not one is missing. 27 Why do you say, O Jacob, And speak, O Israel: "My way is hidden from the LORD, And my just claim is passed over by my God"? 28 Have you not known? Have you not heard? The everlasting God, the LORD, The Creator of the ends of the earth, Neither faints nor is weary. His understanding is unsearchable. 29 He gives power to the weak, And to those who have no might He increases strength. 30 Even the youths shall faint and be weary, And the young men shall utterly fall, 31 But those who wait on the LORD Shall renew their strength; They shall mount up with wings like eagles, They shall run and not be weary, They shall walk and not faint.

Carl Sagan (1934-1996) was an astronomer and cosmologist whose two main claims to fame were a TV show in the 1980s called *Cosmos*, which was the most widely watched show in public television history, and his interpretation of an alleged photograph

of earth from distant space looking like what he called a “pale blue dot.” At one point, waxing eloquent about that blue dot (which he did often), this is what Sagan wrote:

From this distant vantage point, the Earth might not seem of any particular interest. But for us, it's different. Consider again that dot. That's here. That's home. That's us.... Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark. In our obscurity – in all this vastness – there is no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves.

How sad it is that Sagan can look around at such a marvelous creation, and see NO evidence of God’s hand in it — what a dismal and hopeless view of the heavens and earth that God has created!

Sagan’s view, however, is what the “science” of astronomy has become. And sadly, most of it, pale blue dot and all, except for the absence of God, has been accepted by most Christians in our modern age. In 1901, David Wardlaw Scott would write in his book, *Terra Firma*,

The Bible order of the heavens has been completely subverted by our Astronomers; instead of the Sun revolving round the world, the world is declared to revolve round it, as a mere Planet of little note in Astronomic esteem, although the Blessed Son of God gave His own heart's blood for its redemption. Angels desire to look into that wondrous sacrifice, which Scientists like Huxley and Darwin regard only with cynical scorn, because of their ignorance of that in which the highest and truest science consists. The Greek heathen philosopher Pythagoras brought the Sun worship with him from Egypt, where he had resided for a considerable time, and had been initiated into its mysteries by the Priests. His system of Astronomy lingered for a while, till it was supplanted by that of Ptolemy, and for many centuries seems to have been forgotten, till Copernicus drew the fabled phoenix from its ashes. By Newton and his followers it has been skillfully adapted to suit the depraved taste of modern idolatry, for idolatry is far from being extinguished in Christendom, and still flourishes, in various forms, in this degenerate age under assumed names.

The purpose of the first chapter of this book was to give a brief historical summary of where Sagan’s view originated and how it was popularized, having been brought into the Christian West by means of a corrupt Roman Catholic establishment, and promoted by the intellectual class to the point that it became the dominant, mainstream view. In this chapter, we will attempt to show that such a view, far from being “settled science,” must still be challenged and held to a high standard of proof, both by true scientists who desire to be respected for their honesty and integrity, and by Christians who claim the Bible as their highest authority.

Institutional Entrenchment

Our previous chapter cited the claim of Andrew Dickson White, a liberal Cornell academic, in his book, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, (1896), who said the seeds that would spring up and destroy biblical Christianity were sown NOT in what we might consider the modern age of science, but in the latter half of the sixteenth century by five men in particular: Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, and Newton. By the end of the sixteenth century, White observed, “These five men had given a new divine revelation to the world; and through the last, Newton, had come a vast new conception, destined to be fatal to the old theory of creation... these men gave a new basis for the theory of evolution as distinguished from the theory of creation.” From a worldly perspective, White was correct, but how did it all happen? Some, lacking historical perspective, might answer that the truth ultimately won out — science proved that Copernicus was right. But that’s really not an honest, unbiased answer, in light of the facts available in Copernicus’ day, or in light of those that have come in over the centuries.

The Role of the Intellectual Class

What led to where we are today was the immediate acceptance, and even promotion, of the Copernican theory, not only by the Catholic church but also by the intellectual class of that time (only the Protestants protested). Copernicus himself was honest enough to say in his book's preface "To the Reader,"

Neither let anyone, so far as hypotheses are concerned, expect anything certain from astronomy, since that science can afford nothing of the kind; lest, in case he should adopt for truth things feigned for another purpose, he should leave this study more foolish than he came.

Yet the vanity of his contemporaries would take over where he left off. "Whoever wishes to appear clever must devise some new system," Luther had said, and none are more eager to appear clever than the academic establishment. This led, in turn, to the theory being absorbed into the curriculum of the universities, where theories can easily be presented as fact to impressionable young minds. Once in the halls of academia, it would ultimately become firmly entrenched even to the present day, as a "fact" that must not be questioned.

It should not surprise us that the same academic mentality that would later embrace evolutionism, marxism, freudianism, and a multitude of other anti-biblical "isms," would be eager to depart from the constraints of a biblical worldview in cosmology. Martin Luther, in 1522, about twenty years *before* Copernicus' book, had made a prediction, seeing the secular direction of the universities in Europe:

I am much afraid that the universities will prove to be the great gates of hell, unless they diligently labour in explaining the Holy Scriptures, and engraving them in the hearts of youth. I advise no one to place his child where the Scriptures do not reign paramount. Every institution in which men are not unceasingly occupied with the Word of God must become corrupt.

Luther was right — today, his words seem almost prophetic. It certainly appears that with mainstreaming of Copernicus' heliocentric theory, the arch deceiver succeeded in bringing the population to dispute the accuracy of the Genesis account of creation. This initial undermining would eventually evolve into a strong delusion over the succeeding centuries, carrying devastating effects for the intellectual classes of Christendom, and leading them to reject the Scriptures altogether in favor of 'reason.'" (Sparks, *The Cosmology Conflict: A Biblical and Historical Examination of the Shape of the Earth*). That's why it has been called "The Copernican revolution."

The Role of the Church

Over the next few centuries after Copernicus, the Roman Catholic church itself, through its many often conflicting institutions and voices, would vacillate in its *public* position regarding Copernicus' theory, while continuing to promote it behind the scenes. Depending on which way the cultural and religious winds were blowing over the years, they would take both sides of the issue, just as they've done on many controversial topics. But occult religion, whatever one chooses to call it — whether mysticism, gnosticism, "new-age spirituality," or any other name — can be very subtle and deceptive, and it's especially interesting how the secret knowledge of ancient pagan sun-worship has been carried down to our present day through *secret* societies, especially in their oaths and rituals, some of them even emanating from the Church itself.

Some of these groups have been more blatantly occult than others, such as the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn, which attracted actual Satanists like Aleister Crowley, the rebellious son of an evangelical preacher, and Jack Parsons, an influential figure in the early days of the American space program. In such groups, one might find terms like hermeticism, rosicrucianism, esoterism and Kabbalah being used openly. Other secret societies have presented themselves almost like a legitimate trade guild. The

alchemists in the days of Copernicus and Isaac Newton said they were about turning base metals to gold (what's wrong with trying, they said), but their rituals were right out of Egyptian sun worship.

The Freemasons also bear a name that sounds like a brotherhood of builders with stone. Their symbols are the square and compass, symbols of the building trades, but some claim their name is traceable to the early rebels who joined forces at the tower of Babel. Their god, which becomes evident when one examines their literature and rituals, is anything but Christian. The Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn, mentioned above, though openly espousing occult practices, was also known to have close associations with the Freemasons, whose god is actually Lucifer, a sun-god whom they call "the light bearer." Some years ago, a weekly Masonic publication called *Lucifer, the Light-Bearer*, ran a blurb on its front page rejoicing in what they saw as the decline of the church in the world, saying

As the night of theology wanes, and as the Daylight of Science advances, the grand old name [of Lucifer] will regain its pristine significance. Again will "Luciferus" be hailed "Son of the Morning!"; "Herald of the Dawn!"; "Harbinger of the Good Time[s] coming!

Other secret societies hide their sun rituals behind a facade of intellect and reason, like the Illuminati, a Masonic cult founded in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt (1748–1830). The group's stated goals were to oppose superstition and abuses of state and religious power; but when one looks behind the mask, one finds the same sun-cult that is evident in other branches of Freemasonry.

Perhaps the most deceptive of all the secret societies are those that hide behind a facade of Christian charity. Certainly, traditional freemasonry has done this, with its affiliated charity organizations like the Shriners. The deception is sometimes openly admitted by their intellectual leaders who write their literature and devise their strategies. Probably the most prominent secret organization with a Christian facade is the Jesuits, the "Society of Jesus," with its charity drives, educational initiatives and alleged dedication to the

betterment of humanity. Behind it all, however, has been political intrigue, subversion, and yes, secret rituals containing the occult cosmology of ancient Babylon and Egypt.

But just who were, and who are, the Jesuits? They were founded, interestingly, in 1540, just three years before Copernicus' death, by Ignatius Loyola, a Catholic mystic who during recovery from wounds suffered in battle, immersed himself in mystical and occult experiences. In 1539, Loyola appeared before Paul III, the same counter-reformation pope who would promote Copernicus. In that meeting, Loyola said in essence,

Let the Augustinians continue to shut themselves up in their cloisters for study and meditation; let the Benedictines continue to pursue lines of literature; let the Dominicans continue to hunt down and drag heretics before the inquisition; be we the Jesuits will raid Protestant universities and colleges; we will take control of the institutions of law, literature, science and every branch of education; and we shall weed out from their minds anything injurious to Roman Catholicism. Through our instruction, we will recast the minds of youth after our image; yea, will infiltrate enemy territories as doctors, lawyers, poets, authors, scholars, reforming theoreticians, archaeologists, philosophers, financiers, scientists, or whatever guise the church may demand or require for her ends, secretly climbing into the courts of heretical kings we will direct the course of nations, thus in time, the New Testament of Erasmus will fade into insignificance, and all shall again give heed to the engines of our mother church.

After Loyola's presentation of his idea, which the pope eagerly received as being "the finger-stroke of God," Pope Paul III officially ordained the Jesuit order on Sept 27, 1540.

Soon, the authority of the head of the Jesuits became as great as the pope himself, giving rise to the name, "Black pope." The Jesuit order was established as an army of ideological warriors, in the service of the Catholic Church, to root out Protestantism by open opposition or by stealth. To get some idea of the intentions of

the Jesuit order at its founding, consider the Jesuit oath, which says in part,

I now in the presence of the Almighty God, the blessed virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist... and my ghostly father, the superior general of the Society of Jesus, founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, do by the womb of the Virgin... swear that His Holiness the Pope is Christ's vice-regent, and is the true and only Head of the Catholic or Universal Church ... I do now renounce and disown any allegiance is due to any heretical King, Prince, or State, named Protestant or Liberal, or obedience to any of their laws or magistrates, or officers. **I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, and Scotland, and of Calvinists, Huguenots, and others of the name of Protestant or Liberal, to be damnable, and themselves to be damned, who will not forsake the same....** I do furthermore promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage **relentless war secretly or openly, against all heretics, Protestants, and Liberals**, as I am directed to; extirpate them from the face of the earth...

Over the centuries, the Jesuits would infiltrate one institution after another, promoting their agenda often by stealth. One could fill volumes with the diatribes that have been spoken against them by those who were in the position to know, including Charles Spurgeon, who said of the Jesuits, “after having so often beheld the depths of Jesuitical cunning and duplicity... the sooner we let certain Archbishops and Cardinals know that we are aware of the designs, and will in nothing cooperate with them, the better for us and our country.”

But probably the greatest conquest of the Jesuits was to infiltrate the professions and the universities, and through them, they have contributed a disproportionate number of astronomers. It is quite reasonable to ask what an allegedly Christian charitable organization would have to do with astronomy, and particularly with the veneration of the sun? Their official seal is referred to as a Christogram, but surrounding it, the sun is displayed rather prominently:



Now this alone doesn't prove anything, of course, but could the Jesuits, who claimed to be a religious order, have had a secret *anti-scriptural* agenda on cosmology and astronomy? Absent historical perspective, it would make no sense, but in the context of the Church's campaign against *Sola Scriptura* at the time of the organization's founding, it is a reasonable assumption. Just as a chronological reference point, Copernicus didn't publish his complete theory until 1543, three years after the Jesuit order was established, but he had published an abstract of it in 1531 and other portions of it over the next ten years. Thus by 1540, the cat was out of the bag, so to speak, so it is certainly reasonable to ask whether the establishment of the Jesuit order at that precise time in history, so closely connected through pope Paul III to the ideas of Copernicus, was merely a coincidence.

In response to that question, the following points are certainly worth pondering. Consider Isaiah 40:22, which in the NKJV translation, reads, "*It is He who sits above the circle of the earth...*" Though many Christians will use this verse to say the biblical authors knew the earth was a ball or globe, the word here for circle, which is the Hebrew word *chûg*, clearly means "circle" and not "ball." We know this, at least in part, because Isaiah 22:18 uses a different Hebrew word, *dur*, to mean "ball." Another reason we can assume that *chûg* means "circle" and not "ball" is that almost every translation, old and new, translates it this way:

- NASB: "*It is He who sits above the **circle** of the earth...*"
- NIV: "*He sits enthroned above the **circle** of the earth...*"

- ESV: “*It is he who sits above the **circle** of the earth...*”
- Holman Christian Standard Bible: “*God is enthroned above the **circle** of the earth...*”

In comparing at least thirty different translations, I found that almost without exception, the word *chûg* is translated as “circle,” not “ball.”

But there is a particularly notable exception, the Douay-Rheims translation, which says, “*It is he that sitteth upon the **globe** of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as locusts.*” The Douay-Rheims was translated not from the Greek text but from Jerome’s fourth century Latin Vulgate translation, but for that word, Jerome rightly uses the Latin word *gyrum*, which also refers to a circle and not a ball. We should keep in mind that the Douay-Rheims was the official Roman Catholic translation of the counter-reformation. It was published, with the blessings of the Church itself and of the Jesuits, between 1582 (New Testament) and 1610 (Old Testament), just as the Copernican Revolution was taking root, and just as the secret societies mentioned above, with all of their pagan cosmology, were establishing themselves all over Europe. But interestingly, there was at this time *no* consensus whatsoever that the earth was a globe, not even after Columbus, who though believing the earth could be “circumnavigated,” as in going around a *circle* with the north pole at its center, does not seem to have believed in a globe earth. So much history has been distorted on these matters of cosmology.

For one more example of what appears to be a forced rendering in the Douay-Rheims, consider Proverbs 8:26, which in the NKJV reads, “*While as yet He had not made the earth or the fields, or the **primal dust** of the world.*” The KJV has “*highest part of the dust,*” but most translations see the Hebrew word *rosh* in that context as conveying the idea of “beginning,” “first” or “primary” dust. But again, the most puzzling outlier is Douay-Rheims, which reads, “*He had not yet made the earth, nor the rivers, nor the **poles** of the world.*” Now, the Hebrew word there for poles can mean ashes,

dust, earth, ground, mortar, powder, rubbish... but “poles”? Again, it seems the Douay had an agenda behind their rendering, to promote the globe earth which would soon become inseparable from Copernicus’ and Kepler’s heliocentric model of the cosmos.

As for the Jesuits and their interesting history on cosmological matters, let’s fast forward to the present. According to space.com,

The Big Bang Theory is [today] the leading explanation about how the universe began. At its simplest, it talks about the universe as we know it starting with a small singularity, then inflating over the next 13.8 billion years to the cosmos that we know today.

Father Andrew Pinsent serves on the Faculty of Theology at Oxford and holds advanced degrees in theology from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome; a doctorate in philosophy; and a doctorate in particle physics from Oxford. In 2015, Pinsent made the following significant statement regarding the Catholic Church’s views on cosmology:

Being both a priest and a former particle physicist... I am often asked to give talks on faith and science. Quite often young people ask me the following question, ‘How can you be a priest and believe in the Big Bang?’ To which I am delighted to respond, ‘We invented it! Or more precisely, Father Georges Lemaître [a Jesuit priest] invented the theory that is today called the ‘Big Bang,’ and everyone should know about him.’

We might also note that Pope Francis, who happens to be the first Jesuit pope, in his address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, said that “the Big Bang theory is compatible with the Catholic Church’s teaching on creation.” Remarkably, the Roman Catholic Church, along with the vast majority of Protestants, has capitulated for centuries on matters of cosmology to the evolutionary view of modern “science, falsely so-called.”

Also, let us also note in passing that the Vatican owns observatories, and is intimately involved in the field of astronomy, which means that other than NASA, they are one of the greatest disseminators of cosmological propaganda in the world. The

website, vaticanobservatory.org, makes the following statement at the top of its home page:

The Vatican Observatory is one of the oldest active astronomical observatories in the world, with its roots going back to 1582 and the Gregorian reform of the calendar. The Vatican Observatory stands at the forefront of scientific research covering a broad range of topics, from an examination of the tiniest specks of interplanetary dust to the origin and structure of the universe. Headquartered at the papal summer residence in Castel Gandolfo, outside Rome, this official work of the Vatican City State supports a dozen priests and brothers (Jesuits and diocesan) from four continents who study the universe utilizing modern scientific methods. The Vatican Observatory works with the Vatican Observatory Foundation to promote education and public engagement in astronomy, and constructive dialogue in the area of faith and science.”

Heliocentrism: Still an Open Debate

Despite what the scientific establishment will tell you, the nature of the earth, even its shape and its relation to the lights in the heavens (sun, moon, stars and planets) should still be, almost five hundred years later after Copernicus, a matter of legitimate scientific debate for those who have the honesty and courage enough to take it on.

Michelson–Morely and Einstein’s Relativity

Let’s jump forward a few hundred years from Copernicus and Loyola, to the later nineteenth century. By that time, heliocentrism and the globe earth were firmly established in the universities, as well as in much of popular culture. Even among scientists, however, there were still many holdouts, as there are today. In 1887, the academic world was very eager to deliver a final blow against the deniers of heliocentrism, and so a series of sophisticated experiments were conducted by two physicists at what was then called Case Reserve Western University in

Cleveland, Ohio. If the results had been what the two men hoped for, it would have provided an important piece of evidence for believing, among other things, that the earth is revolving on its axis and moving around a central sun, just as the heliocentric theory would require. But the experiment failed show any movement of the earth whatsoever. The experiment has been redone multiple times with the same result.

In the aftermath of that experiment, Albert Einstein, admitting the results of Michelson-Morely were “embarrassing,” said, “Since [those experiments] I have come to believe that the motion of the Earth cannot be detected by any optical experiment” — an admission since acknowledged by other scientists including EdwinHubble, Arthur Eddington, Wolfgang Pauli, and even as recently as 2007 by Stephen Hawking. Einstein then made a valiant attempt to save Copernican theory by proving, through mathematics, the earth’s motion, at least in a relative sense. Einstein called it his “theory of relativity,” expressed as what would become one of the most famous, yet perhaps meaningless, mathematical equations: $E=mc^2$. At one point, Einstein actually made the bewildering claim that motion is *only* relative, one object in relation to another. But because his thesis provided a key piece of evidence to keep the heliocentric theory alive, the academic world immediately praised it and embraced it, just as they accepted and praise an endless parade of academic nonsense today, if it fits their political and philosophical ends. Once the academy adopts an idea, regardless of how ludicrous or inconclusive the evidence, they will run with it and insert it into textbooks as if there is no intelligent opposition, and so they did with Einstein, whose name would become synonymous with genius.

The theory of relativity — a proven fact, and accepted the world over, right? Not quite. Lord Ernest Rutherford (1871-1937) was a New Zealand born physicist and Nobel prize winner in chemistry. He is considered the father of nuclear physics, and chemical element 104 is named rutherfordium in honor of his work. Rutherford, certainly an intelligent fellow, called the theory

of relativity simply “nonsense.” In 1922, Gerrard Hickson, after examining Einstein’s Relativity on multiple levels, stated his opinion that

The whole hypothesis of Relativity has failed, both in the mass and in detail, under our examination, so that, unable to support itself, it can no longer aspire to support any theory of the universe. Therefore our judgment remains unaltered.

Copernican Astronomy stands condemned, and has lost its last, and perhaps its ablest, living advocate. (*Kings Dethroned*)

On one occasion, Einstein was asked what it felt like to be the most intelligent man in the world. Einstein said, “I don’t know, go ask Nicola Tesla.” Tesla, the inventor of remote control and the electric induction motor, a pioneer in radio technology and AC current, was one of the greatest inventors in American history, but speaking of Einstein’s theory of relativity, he said,

Today’s scientists have substituted mathematics for experiments, and they wander off through equation after equation, and eventually build a structure which has no relation to reality. ... The theory [of relativity] wraps all these errors and fallacies in magnificent mathematical garb which fascinates, dazzles and makes people blind to the underlying errors. The theory is like a beggar clothed in purple whom ignorant people take for a king... its exponents are very brilliant men, but they are meta-physicists rather than scientists.

As for a more recent skeptic of Einstein’s theory, Herbert Dingle (1890-1978) was a British scientist, professor of natural philosophy, physicist and astronomer. From 1951-53, he was the president of the Royal Astronomical Society, his academic credentials beyond question. Dingle was once a great believer in Einstein’s theory of relativity, writing two books on the subject, about twenty years apart, which would become standard textbooks on the subject. Upon Einstein’s death in 1955, so loyal a follower of was Dingle of Einstein that the BBC asked him to narrate a tribute to him. But just four years later, in 1959, Dingle became

convinced that the theory was flawed, not supported by observation and experiment but by mathematics alone, which cannot by itself prove anything. At that time, Dingle wrote,

With the apparent success in 1919 of Einstein's general theory, with its then quite new and terrifying mathematical machinery... [Physicists] gave up trying to understand the whole business, surrendered the use of their intelligence, and accepted passively whatever apparent absurdities the mathematicians put before them.

What Dingle is saying is that the acceptance of Einstein's theory of relativity would become an obstacle to true science in general, which previously required the realities of observation and experimentation.

It is worth noting that all of the early astronomers, like Copernicus, Kepler and Newton, ALL depended on mathematics to "prove" what could not be proven by observation — in fact, astronomy at that time was merely branch of mathematics. Even to this day, despite our great advances in technology, many have admitted that the "science" of astronomy has progressed little beyond wild speculation. Michio Kaku (b. 1947), professor of theoretical physics in the City College of New York and CUNY Graduate Center, and a popular modern spokesman on topics of scientific interest, admits that "Nobody in my field uses the scientific method. In our field it's by the seat of your pants, just leaps of logic. It's guesswork."

Professor Dingle, after discovering in 1959 what he believed was a fatal flaw in Einstein's theory, spent the next thirteen years questioning other scientists in his network to find a satisfactory answer to his concerns, but without success. Dingle, according to Edward Hendrie,

tried to publish the paradox, but was refused all access to scientific journals. Finally, in 1972, Dingle decided to publish his conclusion in a book titled *Science at the Crossroads*. He explained in his book that he only published it because he was

denied access to scientific journals to present his evidence.
(*The Greatest Lie On Earth*)

This is a common story. When Dingle was useful in promoting the modern “scientific” orthodoxy, he was a respected member of the intelligentsia, but as soon as he deviated, he was out.

The Heart of the Problem

So let’s get to the “heart” of the problem. *The heart of the problem is the problem of the heart.* There is no question about the fact that we live in a “scientific age.” We are surrounded by technological marvels that work because the world was created by a God of great power, intelligence and order. When the *genuine* sciences of discovery, observation, and experimentation acting upon that created order are employed, man has been able to make great progress in easing human suffering and improving man’s quality of life. But the scientific world has become arrogant, and intruded into things that are beyond their observation and beyond their scope. While presuming that the God of the Bible is a myth, they have determined that any evidence brought forth to the contrary must be put down.

Therefore, I ask the question — if everything we’re told about science is curated, selectively chosen or rejected by those whose world view is the exact opposite of ours, then how much trust are we to put in the evidence they put in front of us, whether it’s archaeology (the study of human history through excavation of historical sites and artifacts), or paleontology (the study of the fossil record) or cosmology, or a multitude of other “ologies,” if the highest authority God has given us, the holy Bible, is cast aside and made an item of mockery and scorn? George Wald, Nobel Prize winning scientist, said once made the following remarkable confession of his own bias:

When it comes to the origin of life, we have only two possibilities as to how life arose. One is spontaneous generation arising to evolution, the other is a supernatural creative act of God. There is no third possibility...

Spontaneous generation was scientifically disproved one hundred years ago by Louis Pasteur, Spallanzani, Reddy and others. That leads us scientifically to only one possible conclusion — that life arose as a supernatural creative act of God... I will not accept that philosophically because I do not want to believe in God. Therefore, I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible, spontaneous generation arising to evolution. (Wald, “Origin of Life,” *Scientific American*, Aug. 1954)

The question we’ve grappled with in this little book isn’t just what revolves around what, or if that question is even relevant. The question is whether we live on an earth that was created by God or not, a place where we as His creatures were placed as evidences of His creative power, and where the heavenly lights are a continual and faithful witness to the God whose throne is not far above us; where man, as the crown of God’s creation, was placed as a reflection of God’s image; and where after man fell from that position of favor, the Redeemer would come to tabernacle among us, and then to die for us and redeem us by His blood. Or, do we live on a spinning ball flying through the vastness of space, revolving around a sun which they now tell us is just a small one of many, in an expanding universe surrounded by thousands of more suns, all set in motion, we know not how, by impersonal, natural forces — or even if you bring God into it, He is so far from us that He has become irrelevant to most of the fallen and lost human race. How much science fiction are we as Christians willing to accept? The answer for some, even many who claim the Bible as their highest authority, is that the science is what it is, and because we’re not scientists and the Bible is not a scientific book, we just need to bend our understanding to “the science” on certain matters, and trust our (extremely diminished) Bible only when it speaks on spiritual matters.

But sometimes “the scientists” are surprisingly honest, especially when they think people like us aren’t looking, and they admit the fact that they don’t always know the things they claim to

know. On the question of geocentric vs. heliocentric, Edwin Hubble (d. 1953), considered to be one of the great astronomers of the 20th century, said

the idea that we occupy a unique position in the universe, analogous, in a sense, to the ancient conception of a central Earth... cannot be disproved, but it is unwelcome and would only be accepted as a last resort... the unwelcome position of a favored location must be avoided at all costs... such a favored position is *intolerable* [emphasis added].

Even more recently, George F.R. Ellis, the great South African cosmologist, said he could construct a geocentric universe that fits all observational criteria, but that science is based partially on philosophical worldviews, which determine the model they choose to use.

A number of years ago, Michio Kaku, appearing in an interview in the Robert Sungenis 2016 film, *The Principle*, a defense of geocentrism, made an interesting admission about astronomy:

Usually in science, if we're off by a factor of 2 or a factor of 10, we call that horrible. We say, something's wrong with the theory. We're off by a factor of 10! However in cosmology, we're off by a factor of 10 to the 120[th power]. That is 10 with a hundred zeroes after it. This is the largest mismatch between theory and experiment in the history of science.

Consider one more example. In 2019, *Scientific American* published an article in its April 30 issue called "Cosmology Has Some Big Problems," subtitled, "The field relies on a conceptual framework that has trouble accounting for new observations," By Bjern Ekeberg. This is what Ekeberg admits:

Modern cosmology is in serious need of a reboot. Compounding this problem, most observations of the universe occur experimentally and indirectly. Today's space telescopes provide no direct view of anything — they produce measurements through an interplay of theoretical predictions and pliable parameters, in which the model [that is, the presuppositions assumed to be true, but which may not be] is

involved every step of the way. The framework literally frames the problem; it determines where and how to observe. And so, despite the advanced technologies and methods involved, the profound limitations to the endeavor also increase the risk of being led astray by the kind of assumptions that cannot be calculated. [For example,] a key piece of the big bang paradigm [called inflation theory] relies on *ad hoc* contrivances to accommodate almost any data, and because its proposed physical field is not based on anything with empirical justification. ... So, is it science or a convenient invention? ... in order to maintain a mathematically unified theory valid for the entire universe, we must accept that 95 percent of our cosmos is furnished by completely unknown elements and forces for which we have no empirical evidence whatsoever.

Conclusion

How did we get to where we are today? The sexual revolution, which has just about destroyed us, wouldn't have been possible without evolution, with its claim that humans are just animals, not a special creation of God subject to His moral laws. A pervasive, societal belief in evolution wouldn't have been possible without an ancient origin of the universe to provide the millions and billions of years needed to make evolution appear more believable. The ancient origin, accompanied by the claim that even if God created the world, He is irrelevant to us, wouldn't have been believable without first dismantling the public's faith in the Genesis record, which declares that God created the earth, and placed the lights of the sun, moon and stars in the firmament above, where they faithfully serve man in providing for signs, seasons, days, and years. And, as has been pointed out in this book, the Genesis account was dismantled in the minds of many, including most of the professing Christian world, by Copernicus and those who followed him.

That five hundred year old campaign against *Sola Scriptura* has now been so successful that the late Stephen Hawking could

confidently make the following statement, completely unaware of the false foundation that so much of modern “science” rests upon:

Before we understood science, it was natural to believe that God created the universe. But now science offers a more convincing explanation. What I meant by ‘we would know the mind of God’ is we would know everything that God would know, if there were a God, which there isn’t. I’m an atheist.
(Interview with the Spanish newspaper, *El Mundo*)

Stephen Hawking has passed on to his eternal reward, but one thing is now certain: whatever his view was before he passed, he is no longer an atheist.

We are not telling anyone what to believe about the earth and its place in God’s creation. All of the purveyors of so-called “science” can boast of all their “evidence” for a godless origin and providence of the universe, making the Bible no longer relevant to many, and Christians who prefer not to think beyond what the scientific orthodoxy has pronounced to be true, will believe as they wish. Included in that number are many good people who simply don’t have the time, inclination or ability to explore the issue. But the work of David Wardlaw Scott, in his book entitled *Terra Firma: The Earth Not a Planet, Proved from Scripture, Reason and Fact*, published in 1901, is well worth our consideration. In this book, Wardlaw presents a broad, forensic argument against the prevailing modern cosmology, calling for a higher level of discernment, at least among those who claim the Bible to be their highest authority:

The Bible order of the heavens has been completely subverted by our Astronomers; instead of the Sun revolving round the world, the world is declared to revolve round it, as a mere Planet of little note in Astronomic esteem, although the Blessed Son of God gave His own heart’s blood for its redemption. Angels desire to look into that wondrous sacrifice, which Scientists like Huxley and Darwin regard only with cynical scorn, because of their ignorance of that in which the highest and truest science consists. The Greek heathen philosopher Pythagoras brought the Sun worship with him

from Egypt, where he had resided for a considerable time, and had been initiated into its mysteries by the Priests. His system of Astronomy lingered for a while, till it was supplanted by that of Ptolemy, and for many centuries seems to have been forgotten, till Copernicus drew the fabled phoenix from its ashes. By Newton and his followers it has been skillfully adapted to suit the depraved taste of modern idolatry, for idolatry is far from being extinguished in Christendom, and still flourishes, in various forms, in this degenerate age under assumed names.

In some respects, the hesitancy of the modern Christian regarding the implications of this book seems reasonable. Haven't we walked on the moon and developed technologies to probe the mysteries of space that are sophisticated enough to prove that Copernicus was right? As for the moon walks, a little historical perspective can be helpful. They all took place during the cold war with the Soviet Union, when projecting superiority, even by deceptive means, was an especially powerful motive. Those of us old enough to remember those times are aware that a significant segment of the population was skeptical as to whether the moon walks had actually taken place, and much of the public remains so today, especially outside of the United States where patriotism hasn't been an obstacle to impartial judgment.

Over the years, legitimate questions have been raised as to why we haven't been to the moon since 1972. Is it possible that the technology available now even to the general public makes it more difficult for massive hoaxes to be perpetuated without being discovered? The moon walk claims are certainly worthy of skepticism, especially considering NASA astronaut Don Pettit's statement a number of years ago that we "destroyed the technology" to send astronauts to the moon (does this ever happen?), and that it would be a "painful process to build it back." There is also NASA's incredible claim that all of the calculations and data used for the mission were erased and taped over due to budget cuts in the 1970s, and that even if we still had it, we would

no longer have the technology to read it. To these we can cite the testimonies of whistleblowers, as well as late-in-life confessions, that still demand answers, though they were ridiculed and marginalized at the time, and are now muted by the memory hole of history. The bottom line is that even if we did walk on the moon, no information was left behind that is convincing enough to silence legitimate skepticism, even over fifty years after the mission was shut down.

As for the other claims of modern astronomy, we've already pointed out the disparity between appearance and reality, especially in a field of study with far more unknowns than most of its defenders are willing to admit. Nevertheless, in many respects, a reluctance on the part of Christians to pursue the questions raised in this book is understandable. Serious cosmological questions that challenge the "settled orthodoxy" of the scientific establishment and all of its propaganda organs, including academia and government-funded entities like NASA, are brushed over and generally remain unanswered. Opposing opinions are ignored or mocked by the national media, left unfunded by official agencies, and censored or shadow-banned by the big tech information platforms. Moreover, the void has been filled with attempts to "debunk" the very arguments which, oddly enough, have already been removed from the public square. If the banned opinions are so unfounded and foolish, one wonders why they aren't allowed to remain in public view, where they will receive the ridicule they deserve? Perhaps the answer is implied in the question. As for me, I will believe the Scripture first, and the so-called science second.

In the book of Job there is a conversation between Job, who had lost everything he had including his health, and several of his "friends" regarding the deep things of life. We often criticize Job's friends as "miserable comforters," but even Job himself had spoken as if he were an expert regarding things he did not know — sound familiar? Let us not forget how God, in Job chapter 38, answered Job when it came to questions about the world which

God alone is able to answer, and may God give us all the wisdom to be discerning in these matters.

Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said: "Who is this who darkens counsel By words without knowledge? Now prepare yourself like a man; I will question you, and you shall answer Me. Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth? Tell Me, if you have understanding.

Who determined its measurements? Surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? To what were its foundations fastened? Or who laid its cornerstone, When the morning stars sang together, And all the sons of God shouted for joy? Or who shut in the sea with doors, When it burst forth and issued from the womb; When I made the clouds its garment, And thick darkness its swaddling band; When I fixed My limit for it, And set bars and doors; When I said, 'This far you may come, but no farther, And here your proud waves must stop!'

Have you commanded the morning since your days began, And caused the dawn to know its place, That it might take hold of the ends of the earth, And the wicked be shaken out of it? It takes on form like clay under a seal, And stands out like a garment. From the wicked their light is withheld, And the upraised arm is broken.

Have you entered the springs of the sea? Or have you walked in search of the depths? Have the gates of death been revealed to you? Or have you seen the doors of the shadow of death?

*Have you comprehended the breadth of the earth?
Tell Me, if you know all this.*