



The Jesuit's Scientific Revolution

The scientific revolution began with the Jesuits claiming the world and universe are billions of years old - the pagan old earth - when the Bible says God created the earth heavens and everything 6000 years ago. Here the Jesuits set the stage for Satan's endtime deception - that God did not create, thus does not even exist!

Founding of the Jesuits

"After months of dispute, a congregation of cardinals reported favorably upon the Constitution presented, and Paul III confirmed the order through the bull *Regimini militantis ecclesiae* ("To the Government of the Church Militant"), on September 27, 1540, but limited the number of its members to sixty. This is the founding document of the Jesuits as an official Catholic religious order."

"Membership limitation was removed through the bull *Injunctum nobis* **March 14, 1543**. Ignatius was chosen as the first superior-general. He sent his companions as missionaries around Europe to create schools, colleges, and seminaries."

The Scientific Revolution

"The majority of scholars date the beginning of the Scientific Revolution to the publication of two epochal scientific works in **1543**: Nicolaus Copernicus's *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres) and Andreas Vesalius's *De humani corporis fabrica* (On the Fabric of the Human body)."

"[Galileo](#) played a major role in the Scientific Revolution. His achievements include improvements to the telescope and consequent astronomical observations, and support for Copernicanism."

[Heliocentrism](#), like 'big-bang' and evolution theory, is an ancient [Babylonian belief](#) predating the Scientific Revolution. [Copernicus and Galileo](#) fit the profile of Jesuits.

The Scientific Revolution and the Jesuit's Counter-Reformation are one and the same - an attack on the Holy Bible that caused the Protestant Reformation and the loss of the Holy Roman Empire.



In 321 AD a [decree from Emperor Constantine](#) banned commandment keeping biblical Christianity. Only the Roman Church with its sun worship was allowed. All others were persecuted as "[Judaizers](#)" and "heretics".

“On the venerable Day of the Sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed.” (*Codex Justinianus, lib. 3*)

These dark ages of persecution and [banning of Christian scripture](#) continued with few exceptions until 1517 when Martin Luther translated the Bible into the German language. This would develop into the Protestant Reformation. Before the Reformation only the Church priests were permitted to possess the Bible. Luther had obtained copies of [Bible manuscripts from Byzantine](#) that contradicted the Latin version. These preserved Greek Byzantine manuscripts would be translated into the English language King James Bible.

Before the Protestant Reformation the Inquisition was ran by the Dominicans. In response to the Reformation the Jesuits were formed by some military knights who served during the Crusades.

The [Jesuits' Counter-Reformation uses education](#). Specifically, Jesuit education attacks the Bible that caused the Protestant Reformation. Society has been, and is being, [brainwashed](#) of Christian beliefs by the Roman Church, the beast empire and great apostate [antichrist religion](#).

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to your trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith." 1 Timothy 6:20

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Colossians 2:8

"But the natural man receives not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Corinthians 2:14

Genesis 1:1-5 "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the *first day*."

The earth created on the first day does not go around the sun created on the fourth day!

When a smoker exhales and walks away the smoke does not follow. This basic law of physics also applies to the atmosphere of earth, were the earth moving earth would lose atmosphere. The earth does not move.

The velocity from earth rotating would cause objects to weigh less at the equator than towards the poles due to centrifugal force. Fuel and travel time would be less in one direction than the other when traveling east and west. The earth does not move.

Geocentrism vs Big Bang

Geocentric Universe - Celestial Poles

with [Dr. Neville Jones](#)

([video](#))

Hundreds of experiments have failed to detect even a smidgen of the purported 67,000 mph translational and 1000 mph rotational velocity of the Earth. Not only can it not be disproved that "the Earth stands forever" (Ecc. 1:4) and has no velocity; it cannot be disproved that the Earth is the center of the universe.



Georges Lemaitre: "Father of the Big Bang"

Lemaitre started devising his theory to further push evolution, redefining the way people think. The Bible has been, and always will be the most threatening weapon against the Roman Church. They must dispose of it with any means possible.

Claim: Billions of years ago something close to nothing exploded forming everything in the universe including you and I.

Reply: This enshrined pagan belief is pure dogma. There are many conflicting and contradicting data not even addressed making the entire theory or belief in 'big bang' impossible.

What we see in the universe is great order not disorder that come from explosions. Planets with moons and galaxies are round and rotate in an orderly fashion.

The Big Bang Explosion

1. - The Big Bang theory is based on theoretical extremes. It may look good in math calculations, but it can't actually happen. A tiny bit of nothing packed so tightly together that it blew up and produced all the matter in the universe. Seriously now, this is a fairy tale. It is a bunch of armchair calculations, and nothing else.

The planets and solar systems would not be the logical result of any explosion, indeed, it has not been repeated in any lab.

2. - Such an equation would have produced not a universe but a hole. Roger L. St. Peter in 1974 developed a complicated mathematical equation that showed that the theorized Big Bang could not have exploded outward into hydrogen and helium. In reality, St. Peter says the theoretical explosion (if one could possibly take place) would fall back on itself and make a theoretical black hole! This means that one imaginary object would swallow another one!

3. - There is not enough antimatter in the universe. This is a big problem for the theorists. The original Big Bang would have produced equal amounts of positive matter (matter) and negative matter (antimatter). But only small amounts of antimatter exist. There should be as much antimatter as matter—if the Big Bang was true.

"Since matter and antimatter are equivalent in all respects but that of electromagnetic charge oppositeness, any force [the Big Bang] that would create one should have to create the other, and the universe should be made of equal quantities of each. This is a dilemma. Theory tells us there should be antimatter out there, and observation refuses to back it up." (*Isaac Asimov, Asimov's New Guide to Science, p. 343*) "We are pretty sure from our observations that the universe today contains matter, but very little if any antimatter." (*Victor Weisskopf, The Origin of the Universe, American Scientist, 71, p. 479*)

4. - The antimatter from the Big Bang would have destroyed all the regular matter. This fact is well-known to physicists. As soon as the two are produced in the laboratory, they instantly come together and annihilate one another.

Exploding the big bang!

Interview with [Dr. John Hartnett](#) in Creation magazine.

Facts vs their interpretation

When we view distant stars that are millions of light-years away from the earth, many folk, including Christians, have trouble accepting the biblical account that God created the universe about 6,000 years ago. But believing the Bible right from the start is not a problem for John, which puts him at odds with his evolutionary counterparts.

Often they will accuse him of denying reality, 'look, we can see it—it's obvious. But John explains that when looking at the universe, it's no different to looking at the fossil record. 'It's the interpretation of the evidence', he says. 'Sure, distant stars and galaxies might be millions of light-years away, but that doesn't mean that it took the light millions of years, by our standards, to get here. A light-year is a measurement of distance, not time. In other words, it's just an expression used to tell us how far away something is—not how long it took the light to get here.'

Big bang founded on unprovable assumptions

Interestingly, most people think that the big bang has already been worked out, but they don't realize that there are differing versions of the big bang model—and not everyone agrees. By inserting a few unprovable assumptions at your starting point, you can end up with virtually any model you like. The big bang assumes that the universe has no centre or edge. Not only is this not proven, some recent research on redshift patterns have badly damaged its credibility by indicating that our galaxy is at, or near to, the centre of the universe. 'What I really find amusing', he says, 'is the way people from various other fields of science often quote the big bang as if it's set in stone. I don't wish to sound unkind, but because they are not experts in this field, many of them have no idea what the big bang is really all about and misunderstand it.'

In fact, John thinks this is an exciting time to be a Christian, particularly in the area of cosmology. He thinks that Dr Russell Humphreys' book *Starlight and Time* has broken new ground for creation researchers in this area. 'What Humphreys has done', he says, 'is show us another parameter of something that most people view as a constant, and that is time itself. Using Einstein's Theory of General Relativity, he has shown how time can vary depending on your position in space—it affects your viewpoint. Time is slowed by gravitational forces. A clock at sea level has been shown to run more slowly than one on top of a mountain, because the one at

sea level is affected by more gravity. This is an effect known as [time dilation](#), and has been experimentally demonstrated.



While starlight seems to be a problem for the biblical model it is in fact a measure of distance not time, and can not be used to date the universe. The biblical account says God created Adam and Eve fully grown. The trees and animals were all mature, and starlight made visible on the fourth day. But can we date the event with empirical observations?

[According to astronomical observations](#), galaxies like our own experience about one supernova (a violently-exploding star) every 25 years. The gas and dust remnants from such explosions (like the Crab Nebula) expand outward rapidly and should remain visible for over a million years. Yet the nearby parts of our galaxy in which we could observe such gas and dust shells contain only [274 supernova remnants](#). That number is consistent with only about 7,000 years worth of supernovas.

According to astronomers' model the SNR should reach a diameter of about 300 light years after 120,000 years. So if our galaxy was billions of years old, we should be able to observe many SNRs this size. But if our galaxy is 6,000-10,000 years old, no SNRs would have had time to reach this size. So the number of observed SNRs of a particular size is an excellent test of whether the galaxy is old or young. In fact, the results are consistent with a universe thousands of years old, but are a puzzle if the universe has existed for billions of years.

Nikola Tesla's demise

Nikola Tesla held a more truthful view when he dealt with science – meticulously reading and comparing literature as well as concepts. Tesla's critique caused great discomfort for the Jesuits, especially against Lemaitre's work.

Tesla said: "...the relativity theory, by the way, is much older than its present proponents. It was advanced over 200 years ago by my illustrious countryman Ruder [Roger] Bošković, the great philosopher, who, notwithstanding other and multifold obligations, wrote a thousand volumes of excellent literature on a vast variety of subjects.

Bošković dealt with relativity, including the so-called time-space continuum..." ([Nikola Tesla, 1936 interview](#))

Tesla was right! The Jesuits were well aware that their tool "Roger Boskovic" (1711-1787) created the theory of relativity beforehand (Boskovic was a devout Jesuit). Tesla was caught in the past not realizing Boskovic was part of the Jesuits' plan. Georges Lemaitre expounds on how he uses the "theory of relativity" in minor detail for the Big Bang:

"The expansion of the universe is a matter of astronomical facts interpreted by the theory of relativity, with the help of assumptions as to the homogeneity of space, without which any theory seems to be impossible.

I shall not discuss the legitimacy of this interpretation, as I do not know any definite objection made against it and this is not the place; and it is not necessary to give a new popular version of the leading principles of the theory of relativity.

I shall rather try to show that the universe must be expanding, or rather that the most necessary processes of evolution are contradictory to the view that space is and has always been static." ([Georges Lemaitre, The Primeval Atom, page 81](#))

Tesla rejected Lemaitre's theory on how space could "curve" and create a "big bang":

“To say that in the presence of large bodies space becomes curved is equivalent to stating that something can act upon nothing. I, for one, refuse to subscribe to such a view.” (*Nikola Tesla, New York Herald Tribune, 11 September 1932*)

The 'big bang' theorists had to set aside Newton's Laws on Gravity in favor of their tool Einstein's Theory on Relativity, just to make their theory work.

Newton's law has been set aside in favor of Einstein's theory of general relativity. - [Wikipedia](#)

The Jesuits would eventually destroy Tesla's invention-streak (most notably free wireless power), causing Tesla to go into a deep depression. He died in poverty and dismay.



Georges Lemaitre directed the “puppet” Einstein. Lemaitre told Einstein his theory of the “Big Bang,” in which Einstein applauded and said: “This is the most beautiful and satisfactory explanation of creation to which I have ever listened.”




Another indicator of the age of the earth are base rock granites. Academia claims granite is an igneous rock, from when the earth was a molten mass billions of years ago. They have no proof of this, it is only a claim.

Granite is not igneous

The earth was never molten to cool down as the uniformitarian evolution theory claims. Base rock granites cannot be heated to a molten state, re-cooled, and remain granite. It is reclassified at that point to another mineral having lost its crystalline inter-mix. For this reason granite cannot be produced in a lab, even though all types of other mineral can be produced, even something close to diamond. Granite as found was created by God just 6000 years ago on the first day.

THE EARTH WAS NEVER MOLTEN COOLING DOWN

Granite was never molten and is not an igneous rock. It cannot be produced in a lab. Also interesting granite has radio halos, properties that scientists say shows granite was formed almost instantaneous. Published in science journals in 1974, yet to be refuted. ([Radiohalos in](#)

GEOLOGIC TIME SCALE					
ERA	PERIOD	EPOCH	SUCCESION OF LIFE	INDEX FOSSILS	
CENOZOIC Recent Life	QUATERNARY 0-1 Million Years Rise of Man	Recent Pleistocene		PECTEN NEPTUNEA	
	TERTIARY 62 Million Years Rise of Mammals	Pliocene Miocene Oligocene Eocene Paleocene		CALYPTRAPHORUS VENERICARDIA	
MESOZOIC Middle Life	CRETACEOUS 72 Million Years Modern Seed Bearing Plants, Dinosaurs		SCAPHITES	INOCERAMUS	
	JURASSIC 40 Million Years First Birds		NERINA	PERISPINCHTES	
	TRIASSIC 49 Million Years Cycads, First Dinosaurs		TROPHITES	MONOTIS	
PALEOZOIC Ancient Life	PERMIAN 60 Million Years First Reptiles		LEPTODUS	PARAFUSULINA	
	Carboniferous		PENNSYLVANIAN 30 Million Years First Insects		DICTYOCLOSTUS
			MISSISSIPPIAN 35 Million Years Many Crinoids	CACTOCRINUS	PROLECANITES
	DEVONIAN 60 Million Years First Seed Plants Cartilage Fish		PALMATOLEPUS	MUCROSPIRIFER	
	SILURIAN 20 Million Years Earliest Land Animals		HEXAMOCERAS	CRYSTIPHYLLUM	
	ORDOVICIAN 75 Million Years Early Bony Fish		BATHYURUS (Trilobite)	TETRAGRAPTUS	
	CAMBRIAN 100 Million Years Invertebrate animals, Brachiopods, Trilobites		PARADOXIDES (Trilobite)	BILLINGSSELLA	
	PRECAMBRIAN Very few fossils present (bacteria-algae-pollen?)				

Textbooks, science journals, encyclopedias and the controlled media show this geocolumn and it seems legitimate however nowhere on earth are fossils found in such a manner. It is claimed millions and billions of years as though it were fact, not just a theory or pagan belief. The fossil record is often cited as proof.

The fossil record could only happen with a global flood, around 4500 years ago


Due to decay and scavengers the only way to get a fossil is with [rapid flood or volcanic sedimentary deposition](#) that has captured every minute detail of even the most delicate creatures.

These fossils are found globally at geo-layers of the same age (Cambrian, ect). The only way to arrive at our fossil record is a global flood.

[Fossils are observed forming in months.](#) Were fossils millions of years old as claimed they would have [eroded away](#) at given erosion rates. [Polystrate fossils](#) found throughout conclusively demonstrating the geocolumn is a result of a single catastrophic event.

[Hydroplate Theory](#): The global flood with Dr. Walt Brown ([video](#))

Geology and the Global Flood with [Dr. Steven Austin](#)



NEW

The Waters Cleaved, with Dr Grady McMurtry ([video](#))

- [Earth crust missing in the Atlantic](#) exposing earth's mantle, supporting the catastrophic [continental sprint theory](#).

- [Noah's Ark](#) found long ago. ([video](#))

- [Evolution: Fact or Belief?](#) ([video](#))

Is the Theory of Evolution a scientific fact or a mere belief? Five world top scientific minds give their answer on Evolution. Featuring:

Prof M. Giertych, geneticist

Prof R. Fondi, paleontologist

Prof G. Sermoniti, molecular biologist

Prof. Boudreaux, inorganic chemist

Guy Berthault, sedimentologist

[Colorado State University flood modeling - Experiments on Stratification](#) by Pierre Julien & Guy

Berthault. Published by Geological Society of France, French Academy of Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences Journal, and others.

[Evidence for a Young World/Universe](#)

by Dr. Russell Humphreys, Ph.D ICR associate professor of physics

1. Galaxies wind themselves up too fast.
2. Too few supernova remnants.
3. Comets disintegrate too quickly.
4. Not enough mud on the sea floor.
5. Not enough sodium in the sea.
6. The earth's magnetic field is decaying too fast.
7. Many strata are too tightly bent.
8. Biological material decays too fast.
9. Fossil radioactivity shortens geologic "ages" to a few years.


10. Too much helium in minerals.
11. Too much carbon 14 in deep geologic strata.
12. Not enough Stone Age skeletons.
13. Agriculture is too recent.
14. History is too short.



Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, 1881-1955

Teilhard wrote many books pushing evolution, and of course, just as Georges Lemaitre, he kept his religious beliefs, remaining as a Jesuit for his entire life. These men were not here to bring light to any matters, they simply wanted to deceive!

Planet of the Apes!



Piltdown "man" skull

Piltdown man: Jesuit Hoax

“When Piltdown man was formally announced at the Geological Society in 1912, it was warmly welcomed by the press as the sensational missing link. It was also accepted by many, though by no means all, members of scientific circles. There were some who argued that the jaw and the skull parts did not belong to the same individual and that it was just fortuitous that they were found together. Nevertheless, this being just the evidence Darwin's followers so badly needed, objections were given little or no publicity. The actual remains were locked away for safe

keeping, but plaster casts were circulated to the major museums. In 1953, Joseph Weiner and Kenneth Oakley conducted a recently developed fluorine test on the original Piltdown material and discovered that the bones were in fact relatively recent. The suspected hoax was finally exposed. There was something of a national scandal, and the integrity of the trustees of the British Museum was questioned. Eventually it all settled down to become an embarrassing moment in the history of science. But just who was the hoaxer?" ([*In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order*, Chapter 8, by Ian T. Taylor, Fifth Edition](#))



[PEKING MAN](#) — "Peking Man emerged on the international scene in the 1920s. The finances of Davidson Black were just about running out, and he needed help, when in 1927 he found a tooth near Peking, China. The Rockefeller Foundation stepped forward and gave him \$80,000 to continue research on this colossal find. So Black continued looking and came up with a skull, copies of which are displayed today in biology laboratories. Black named it *Sinanthropus pekinensis* ("China man from Peking"), and received honors from all over the world for his discovery. After his death in 1934, the Jesuit that helped prepare Piltdown Man (Teilhard de Chardin) took over the work at the site. Then Franz Weidenreich led out until all work stopped in 1936, because of the Japanese invasion of China." (note: [All the fossils disappeared during World War II](#), so we cannot now examine them with modern methods to check their genuineness)

NEANDERTHALS — Caveman or Human? On a trip to view the fossil remains of the neanderthal Dr. Jack Cuozzo makes startling discoveries. Trained in orthodontic surgery Dr. Cuozzo was able to obtain scans of the skull and jaws that reveal often overlooked clues. ([video](#))

Scientists have known [neanderthal had speech](#), they just do not always report this.

Dr. Cuzzo's work confirmed!

Professor Reiner Protsch von Zieten lied about the age of neanderthal skulls and artifacts for 30 years. A German university panel exposed his frauds and he resigned Feb 2005. Protsch had dated the "bischof-speyer" skeleton at 21,300 years but testing at Oxford showed them to be 3300 years old.[\[1\]](#)[\[2\]](#)[\[3\]](#)

Numerous other fossil frauds [\[1\]](#)[\[2\]](#)[\[3\]](#) to support the [pagan evolution theory](#) [\[1\]](#)[\[2\]](#)[\[3\]](#).

Genetics: no friend of evolution

A highly qualified biologist tells it like it is.

by Lane Lester

Genetics and evolution have been enemies from the beginning of both concepts. Gregor Mendel, the father of genetics, and Charles Darwin, the father of modern evolution, were contemporaries. At the same time that Darwin was claiming that creatures could change into other creatures, Mendel was showing that even individual characteristics remain constant. While Darwin's ideas were based on erroneous and untested ideas about inheritance, Mendel's conclusions were based on careful experimentation. Only by ignoring the total implications of modern genetics has it been possible to maintain the fiction of evolution.



Even though the Romans were trying to eliminate Christianity they record Jesus and Christianity in those early years, none denied the existence of Jesus or Christianity at that time.

[CORNELIUS TACITUS](#) (55 - 120 A.D.) Tacitus was a 1st and 2nd century Roman historian who lived through the reigns of over half a dozen Roman emperors. Considered one of the greatest historians of ancient Rome, Tacitus verifies the Biblical account of Jesus' execution at the hands of Pontius Pilate who governed Judea from 26-36 A.D. during the reign of Tiberius. "Christus, the founder of the [Christian] name, was put to death by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea in the reign of Tiberius. But the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only through Judea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also." (*Annals XV, 44*)

What this passage reveals and how it confirms the Biblical account:

- Jesus did exist.
- Jesus was the founder of Christianity.
- Jesus was put to death by Pilate.
- Christianity originated in Judea. (with Jesus)
- Christianity later spread to Rome. (Through the Apostles and Evangelists)

Because of his position as a professional historian and not as a commentator Tacitus referenced government records over Christian testimony. There is not a surviving copy of Tacitus' Annals that does not contain this passage. There is no verifiable evidence of tampering of any kind in this passage. It simply provides evidence of Jesus' existence (a topic not debated at this point in history) and not his divinity.

• **The Evidence for the Existence of Jesus** ([video](#))

Here is a quote from the *Encyclopedia Britannica* concerning the testimony of the many

[independent secular accounts of Jesus of Nazareth:](#)

"These independent accounts prove that in ancient times even the opponents of Christianity never doubted the historicity of Jesus, which was disputed for the first time and on inadequate grounds by several authors at the end of the 18th, during the 19th, and at the beginning of the 20th centuries."

Karl Marx's role

"We must war against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the state, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keynote of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed." - **Karl Marx**

Marxism Communism and Evolution Theory ([VIDEO](#))

"**Karl Marx**, the "Father of Modern Communism" was himself an occultist and high-level Freemason, intimately associated with Rome's Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), the most powerful Freemason on the Continent and founder of the Mafia, and Albert Pike (1809-1891), the most powerful Freemason in America and creator of the Klu Klux Klan. He was privately tutored by Jesuits in the huge Reading Room of the British Museum while writing The Communist Manifesto based upon the ten maxims or planks the Order had perfected during the French Revolution of 1789-1798. His writings were financed by the Society's wealthy cartel capitalists, Nathan Rothschild, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and J. P. Morgan, also Freemasons who, being in their doctrines and deeds, were in fact the revived old Order of the crusading Knights Templars." (*Vatican Assassins, Phelps, Eric, 2010*)

Science has been censored by peer-review at the Freemason's [Royal Society](#), London. Among the members were the [Darwins!](#)

"No one will enter the New World Order unless he or she will make a pledge to worship Lucifer. No one will enter the New Age unless he will take a Luciferian Initiation." (*David Spangler, Director of Planetary Initiative, United Nations*)

Spangler alludes to graduating with an education in pagan theories, that God did not create or even exist! Spangler is educational adviser with Findhorn Foundation, a U.N. NGO financed by the Templar's Rockefeller banking family.

"The Findhorn Foundation has been collaborating with different UN departments, conferences and agencies since 1992 and is registered as an associate member of UNED-UK, and as a member of UNESCO's Planet Society Network." ([Global Education](#))

U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt felt that: "A thorough knowledge of the Bible is worth more than a college education."

U.S. President Herbert Hoover stated: "The study of the Bible is a post-graduate course in the richest library of human experience."

And the American educator William Lyon Phelps once said: "I thoroughly believe in a university education for men and women, but I believe a knowledge of the Bible without a college course is more valuable than a college course without the Bible."

"It is impossible to mentally or socially enslave a Bible-reading people. The principles of the Bible are the groundwork of human freedom." -Horace Greeley

[An Introduction to the History of Evolution](#)

by [Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D](#)

It will come as a surprise to many to learn that evolution is not a modern idea, spawned by the pressure of scientific evidence.

Evolution's roots go back several millennia; back to ancient Babylon and Sumer. The word "evolution" means "unfolding." When applied to the creation of the universe it tacitly supposes that God, at best, had a more-or-less passive role in the history of the creation.

By "God" I mean, of course, the God of the Bible. The ancients had other gods which they held accountable for the creation. The earliest surviving extra-Biblical account of the creation came to us from the ancient Babylonians.

The Babylonian creation accounts are typified by that found in the Epic of Gilgamesh. From said epic we learn that the Babylonians believed the universe to have had a chaotic beginning. Some centuries later, under Alexander the Great, the Greeks inherited the Babylonian culture, complete with its mythology.

In the Greek writings we find a strong reinforcement of the superstition of evolution: that the world as we now know it was not created in its present form and that the life it bears evolved into its present forms through tens of millennia.

To the Greeks the creator of the universe was the god, Chaos. The most prominent Greek advocates of evolution were Thales, Anaximenes, Aristotle and Lucretius.


Although the Greek myths of the creation were interpolated from the Babylonian before we can still find the same myth in modern "science." Today, "scientists" no longer share quite the same animistic theological bent as held by the ancient Greeks and so it is that modern "science" does not claim that the god, Chaos, created the universe. So as not to smack of the supernatural, "science" instead drops the title "god" and writes the "god's" name with a lower-case letter. Hence modern "science" claims that the cosmos came into being, by chance (or chaos) and that it had a chaotic beginning (that is, it exploded into existence).

Though other terminology may be used today, the idea is still basically the same as that held by the ancient Greeks; the only difference being that the modern version of cosmogony avoids using the words "god" and "creator".

The speculation that the universe had a chaotic origin is not the only place where modern "science" partakes of the fables of the ancients. Hinduism was born with its belief in the life cycles of reincarnation. The Hindus extrapolated the reincarnation theme to the very universe itself. To them the universe was reborn only to die, only to be reborn, only to die, and so on and so on.

Today we find the same whim alive and well in modern "science" here some variations of the "Big-Bang" have the universe exploding into existence and then collapsing back onto itself only to blaze forth again in another "Big-Bang" only to die again only to be reborn and so on and so on.

Lest the reader think it merely a coincidence, we submit that the original model for the "oscillating Big-Bang" ("gnaB-giB") had a "reincarnation" life-cycle of about 50 billion years. This "happens" to be the same cycle time held by the Hindus. Furthermore, at the time that the "gnaB-giB" model was proposed, the universe was held to be about 7 billion years old -- the same age the Hindus hold for this present reincarnation.



[Geocentricity: It's Time to Face the Facts](#)

by Dr. Philip Stott

In his useful little book "Better Thinking and Reasoning", Ron Tagliapietra gives a good introduction to how one should approach evidence and draw reasonable conclusions. But he unwittingly gives an even better example of how one can be completely misled by starting with erroneous information to reason about.

There are two topics in particular, dear to the hearts of secular humanist scientists, which have been used repeatedly to "refute" the Bible--topics on which it is difficult to find genuine, unbiased, undistorted information, and unfortunately most Christians have not taken the trouble to search out the truth in either case, possibly because they have never realised they had been fed red herrings in stead of real meat.

Evolution

The prime example is, of course, evolution, which was no more than a dubious hypothesis when Darwin popularised it. It has needed to be repeatedly propped up by half-truths, fraud and self-deception--as peddled by Ernst Haeckel, Theilhard de Chardin, Henry Fairfield Osborne and numerous others--to maintain that status. It is being supported today by refusal to face hard facts of well established science such as the second law of thermodynamics, of informatics, and astounding findings of microbiology.

Such difficulties are brushed over with red herrings. A favourite these days is variation within a kind; dark or light peppered moths, fish with this or that colour gills, change in allele ratios. Variation within a kind has little or nothing to do with evolution in the sense that we are led to think of--the progress of molecules to men. It also has nothing to do with what the Bible tells us--creatures are to reproduce "after their kind" while little is said about how much variation is possible within each kind.

Evolution, in the sense that we are supposed to accept, teaches reproduction from one kind to another, which is a process totally unknown to science.

The Copernican Revolution

It is even more difficult to find the truth when it comes to the second favourite topic, the story of the Copernican revolution. It was such an important milestone in the fight against the Bible that few secular humanists are keen to allow the facts to actually emerge, and all is usually so skillfully disguised by half-truths, ridicule and obfuscation that even reasonably serious scholars like Ron Tagliapietra have been kept from even suspecting the reality.

We see the first red herring in the very first sentence of his discussion: "Copernicus is credited with the heliocentric theory. He proposed that the sun is the centre of the solar system."

Now, the solar system is a recent concept which Copernicus never mentioned. Neither did Galileo, Ptolemy, or any of the other players in the drama. The solar system is irrelevant to the discussion - the Bible makes no mention of the solar system.

It is a concept which could only be proposed once Newton's theory of gravity made such an idea possible. The solar system can be thought about, but never actually isolated. One can write equations about it, but nothing absolute can be verified about their conclusions.

One can make models of it, but they are deficient models, they ignore the vastly more massive and gravitationally important remainder of the universe.

Biblically it is foolish to talk about the "solar system" as any kind of reality since we know that Jesus is "upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb 1:3). To examine the solar system and see how it would work on its own we would have to take that part of creation out of his hands.

From a purely "scientific" point of view it might well collapse if it could be removed from the surrounding universe. One can, however, convince oneself quite easily that in a purely hypothetical mathematical model of the solar system (where the rest of the universe is of necessity ignored completely) the sun would be at its centre and the rest of the system, the earth included, would revolve around it.

Why is the irrelevant solar system sneaked in to the Copernican discussion at all? Copernicus held that the sun was the centre of the entire universe, as did Galileo and the rest of the protagonists. Scientists assuredly do not believe that today. To admit that the heroes of the fight against Biblical inerrancy were wrong would not be good for the cause.

The next and equally popular deception passed off upon us comes in Tagliapietra's next sentence. "The competing geocentric (or Ptolemaic) theory that the earth is the centre of the solar system."

Now, not only was Ptolemy concerned with the entire universe (not the solar system), but his system is not, as implied, the one and only model for geocentricity.

Several have been proposed, some have never been refuted. It was Aristotle's model which Galileo sought (successfully) to refute, it was Tycho Brahe's against which Galileo was called to defend the Copernican. Galileo was unsuccessful, he could not demonstrate any fatal flaw in Brahe's model, nor superiority in that of Copernicus.

Two further deceptions about Ptolemy's method are found in the rest of the discussion. Firstly Copernicus' model was neither more accurate, nor less complicated than Ptolemy's.

Copernicus had to use considerably more epicycles than Ptolemy. What those who would pull the wool over our eyes do is to compare an early version of Ptolemy's method of calculation not against that of Copernicus, but against that of Kepler and Newton after improvement by many years of research and refinement. Secondly Ptolemy and his epicycles are not the primitive and outdated objects of fun the humanists would have us believe.

The most convenient means of calculating planetary positions today is still Ptolemy's, though his method has been modernised into "Fourier analysis", and his "epicycles" are now "terms in an infinite series." The most improved versions of Kepler's method are still not superior in accuracy and convenience.

Is the Bible True?

Now, most Christians, Ron Tagliapietra included, are side-tracked by the red herring of the solar system (where the earth clearly cannot be stationary at the centre), fail to look any further, assume that the geocentric position is utterly untenable, and search for ways to "excuse" the Bible for its "mistaken" stand and interpret it to say something different.

Copernicus said: "surely it is more reasonable to assume that the earth rotates once each day than that the entire universe rotates around it." But to the Bible-believers of Copernicus' day there was simply no doubt about the Bible's geocentricity.

Calvin countered with: "The heavens revolve daily; immense as is their fabric, and inconceivable the rapidity of their revolutions" (commentary to Psalm 93:1) in deliberate scripture-based contradiction.

Luther, speaking of Copernicus's idea said: "Even in these things which are thrown into disorder I believe the Holy Scriptures."

Galileo was so confident that the Bible puts the earth stationary at the centre of the universe that

to disregard it he had to say "In matters concerning the natural sciences Holy Writ must occupy the last place."

Why were they so certain of the Bible's stand?

Well for one thing Genesis 1 tells us that God created the unformed watery waste of the earth on the first day. On day two He separated the waters above from the waters below by an expanse called the "firmament," and on the fourth day He set the sun moon and stars in this firmament.

Where is the possibility for the day-one-created earth to be circling around the day-four-created sun? And why should the Bible say "He hangeth the earth upon nothing." (Job 26:7) if in fact the earth is not hanging on nothing, but whirling around at a hundred thousand kilometres per hour on the end of a gravitational cord of billions of tons of attraction from the sun? And again Psalm 19 says of the sun, he "rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it:"

Giving the sun a circuit round which to run, not the earth. It is fairly clear why the Bible believers of the era saw Copernicus, Galileo, and their heliocentric theory as a challenge to Biblical authority.

What is not so clear, until one looks a little deeper, is why today's supporters of heliocentricity have to resort to red herrings and an avoidance of the truth.

Unfortunately for their case many experiments were performed specifically to demonstrate and measure the motion of the earth around the sun.

To everyone's surprise and grief all of them gave the speed of the earth's movement through space to be a stunning zero. No significant movement could be measured at all.

The most famous of the experiments was done by Michelson and Morely. Typical of comments on their results are those of Bernard Jaffe: "The data were almost unbelievable. There was only one other possible conclusion to draw, that the earth was at rest. This, of course, was preposterous."

As "preposterous" as the measurements of Arago, Trouton and Noble, Airy, Thorndyke and Kennedy, Theodore de Coudres and several others. They also found the earth to have a zero velocity through space.

One of South Africa's most highly respected scientists, world-renowned cosmologist Professor George Ellis, noted: "I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its centre, and you cannot disprove it based on observations." (Scientific American, 273(4):29).

To disbelieve the Bible's geocentric stand takes just as much faith as to accept it--it cannot be disproved by any known observation.

<FIN>

[Email This](#)[Blog This!](#)[Share to Twitter](#)[Share to Facebook](#)[Share to Pinterest](#)

Labels: [creation](#), [evolution](#), [freemason](#), [genesis](#), [geocentric](#), [heliocentric](#), [jesuit](#), [marxism](#), [new world order](#), [templar](#)
[Home](#)

