

than using calculations based on the Copernican System, they use the fixed Earth calculations because they are the ONLY ones that will get the job done. They have no choice; they *must use a fixed Earth!*

So the sum of all this is that when this GOES-7 Satellite was instructed to go West $\frac{1}{4}^\circ$ per day in 42 days, it moved from a *stationary* position

Exactly, Vern. And the same thing happened when it was returned to its Eastern location.

And they both worked!

Of course they did! And both re-positionings worked because that Satellite is hung right in place in that circular electromagnetic band and is as still as a rabbit in a brushpile, going nowhere at no speed until it is instructed to do so


And if *it* is not moving, the Earth is not moving

And that means it's back-to-the-Bible time, folks!

Footnote: A careful reading of the two paragraphs after #3) in NASA's reply of 11-22-89 will reveal a glaring error in speed and distance determinations. This error is not pertinent to anything said herein as far as I can tell, but it bears noting, nonetheless. Obviously, the distance from one longitude to another can not be the same on a 165,100 mile circle as it is on a 25,000 mile circle. Nor would a 42 day journey at the speeds given get the satellite from 97.45 W. longitude to 107.2 W. longitude! In fact, the satellite had to be moved about 4,449 miles at 4.41 MPH for 42 days to get to its destination . . .

PART VI

THE TELLTALE ZODIAC



ZODIAC. Wherever the sun stands in the sky, it hides some constellation of stars with its light. As the earth moves around the sun during the year, the sun seems to move eastward against the background of constellations. The planets and the moon also seem to shift gradually around the sky, past the same constellations.

Y'know, Vern, there is a lot of confusion about the Zodiac. Everybody has been taught that *Astrology* is unscientific, superstitious junk (WHICH IT IS!), but at the same time people learn this they also learn that the *Zodiac* is essential to *Astrology* (which it is), and if we are of a mind to throw out *Astrology*, many automatically throw out the *Zodiac*.

I can see how that can happen

Well, this is where a bad mistake is made and it is a mistake that relates directly to the point of whether the Earth is moving or not.

Whachu talk'n 'bout?

Let's get some things straight here first, and then we can see the connection. Fair enough?

I'm all ears

Good. First of all, the Bible does not condemn the Zodiac

It doesn't?

Nope. In fact, the Zodiac is a Bible in the sky when used as God intended. The problem is the same as it is with all God's Truths, namely, that Satan has devised a counterfeit of the real thing and deceived the world to such an extent that people have either thrown out the baby (the Zodiac) with the bath (Astrology) or they believe in the counterfeit astrological horoscope stuff which a bunch of lies from beginning to end.

Where does the Bible say the Zodiac is OK?

Check this, Vern:

“. . . Job speaks of Mazzaroth which is the way stars move in the sky, including the signs of the Zodiac. And Job speaks of His witness in the sky in Job 16:19. Job 9:9 speaks of Orion, the Bear, and the Pleiades. These are mentioned again in Job 38:31. Job speaks of the dragon in the sky in Job 26:13. These are all part of the signs of the Zodiac, and since Job clearly says God made them, they can not be evil. The first purpose for which God made the stars in Genesis 1:14 is for 'signs'.”¹

I remember that part about the *signs*

A lot of people remember that part. And there is Psalm 50:6 which says:

“. . . The heavens shall declare His righteousness”

And Psalm 97:6 says:

“The heavens declare His righteousness, and all the people see His glory.”

“Declare” is pretty strong. . . .

You bet it is! The Hebrew word for “declare” is *nagad* which means “. . . to stand boldly out . . . to manifest . . . to announce . . . explain . . . fully expound . . . show forth . . . speak surely . . . tell” So the author we've been quoting is on quite safe ground when he says further that:

“This means that somehow the heavens *declare* the Gospel Thus it seems to be clear that the signs of the Zodiac can be used in a Christian way, based on the Bible.”²

But *astrology* is another kettle of fish. . . .
Absolutely! Note:

“Astrology preaches that planets possess a consciousness of their own. . . . Astrology, in its final analysis, teaches that the solar system possesses a super consciousness that operates without God”³

In other words, astrology teaches that our destiny, our fate is determined by the location of the sun and moon and planets and stars?

That's the main idea

. . . and that these orbs are in different parts of the Zodiac with different stars in the background during the various months of the year?

Yep.

. . . and these different locations are called “houses” and are given names like “Aries, Taurus, Gemini,” etc.?

Uh huh. For example: Recently one of those supermarket “trash magazines”, as some call them, had a full color “Starscope” page with a “Starmeter” for August. All twelve “signs” were elaborately set forth with pictures, dates, and astrological signs. August had a lion's head, the dates July 23 to August 22, and was captioned “LEO”. Under the caption was the supernatural message:

“Good job opportunities could come your way. Problems you thought were dead and buried come back to haunt you. Avoid arguments over money. You may be forced to change or cancel plans for the weekend.”⁴

Wonder how many people believe in that sort of thing,
Bo Bo?

The most recent Gallup Pole I've seen said there were 32 million people in the USA alone who said "yes" to the question:

"Do planets rule our lives?"⁵

The same source

"... estimated that 1200 out of 1750 daily newspapers carry an astrological column."⁶

That's over 80% of the newspapers! This is a BIG religion!

You better believe it is! But before anybody writes it all off as goofy nonsense, let them be reminded that it's only nonsense *because* it has been twisted and jerked around until it is merely a clever counterfeit of God's real signs in the Zodiac.

So the Bible says that God put some real signs in the sky that carry a real message from Him to all the world, but that those signs have been changed to all this animal horoscope stuff not only to block out God's message but also to get people hooked on the counterfeit??

Yes.

But I thought the Bible was dead set against any kind of horoscope stuff!

It is! It is! It is!

I'm about to get confused

Well, don't get confused. Just don't do it! This thing is a little bit tricky to understand, but it is not at all confusing when you get a grip on it

Prove it

All right; let's go one step at a time

Duh Let's dodat

Very funny. Number One: We've seen that the Bible teaches that there are signs in the sky that God put there, and that these signs tell about His righteousness and glory

Number Two: All the horoscope stuff is a Satanic counterfeit of God's real signs, and millions of people are hooked to one degree or another on the counterfeit

Number Three: The Bible condemns all horoscope type stuff.

Scripture please on that number three

Fair enough. As you know, the Bible teaches that God destroyed the Tower of Babel. Well, this Tower was

"... a ziggurat or astrological tower on top of which priests could conduct the viewing and worship of the sun, moon and planets."⁷

So *that's* what that Tower was!

Sure. And there are numerous places in the Old Testament which show that

"... astrological worship competed with the worship of YHWH (Jehovah God) for the hearts of the people. [Indeed:] ... Israel's final doom was linked *directly* to its people's involvement with astrological planet worship."⁸ (Emph. added)

And think about this too, Vern: We can see bulls called gods in I Kings 12:26-29. We can see that

"... They bowed down to all the starry hosts. . . ."⁹

We can see that one of the kings of Judah erected images of Taurus the Bull and Aries the Goat in II Chronicles 11:15 and Leviticus 17:7. In II Kings 23:4-7 we read about those who

"... burned incense to Baal, to the sun and moon, to the constellations and to all the starry hosts."¹⁰

More, the worship of "Raphan" (the planet Saturn) is condemned in the New Testament in Acts 7:43. Acts 19:23-41 deals with a big rebellion against the Apostle Paul by worshippers of the Moon Goddess Diana. And on and on we could go showing where worship of the stars, Venus, the sun, the moon, etc. are condemned in the Bible. There is no doubt on this point.

Yet at the same time the Bible also teaches that there are messages for mankind in the sky which were put there by God to declare Himself to the world and to be used as signs Right?

Exactly. In fact, Vern, we can appreciate God's message in the sky more when we realize that the message is nothing more nor less than *The Gospel In The Stars*. And that reminds me of a wonderful book by that very title which I loaned out and can't get back. . . . Anyway, it was written by a Danish astronomer named Seiss over a hundred years ago, and I'm here to tell you, I don't believe anyone can read that book and not *know* that the Gospel is written in the stars! But anyway . . . where was I?

Then there is really, really really a great message for people everywhere in the Zodiac, plus some useful, practical signs

Verily, verily. Let's call that point Number Four, OK? What's next?

Well, the next thing a person needs to understand about this deceptive counterfeit horoscope religion is, once again, fairly tricky, but all-in-all, it's not too bad

I've heard that before

I'm talking about the Copernican connection

I was beginning to think you had forgotten about that

Actually it's sort of a double-jointed, two-edged business that starts with the fact that the bad horoscope stuff was all based on a belief that the Earth was standing still at the center of the universe and everything was going around it

But that's what the Bible teaches!

That's right! And that's part of what makes this matter a little tricky! Think about this, Vern: Because of Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, Einstein, etc., the whole world no longer believes that the Earth is motionless at the center of the universe with everything going round it. Right?

Correct. So?

So this: Modern "science" can say and all "educated" people can agree that the horoscope stuff is just superstitious nonsense *because* it was (and for the most part, still is) based on a non-moving Earth.

I can see that, but since all the horoscope stuff *is* bad, isn't this a *good* effect of Copernicanism?!

But, Vern, when something that is bad has a good effect, it's wise to look behind the bushes for some trick Satan is engineering.

I guess so

Remember, we established that

" . . . the signs of the Zodiac can be used in a Christian way, based on the Bible."¹¹

Um hmmm.

And we established that the horoscope stuff is a distortion of God's real Zodiac messages and signs, didn't we?

Yep.

And we made clear that the old star reading systems before Copernicus were based on a non-moving Earth, did we not?

Yes.

But back before the distortions there was a system of signs and messages in the sky that was from God that pre-dated and corroborated the Bible

I see what you're getting at! A non-moving Earth *and* the true message in the heavens in the Zodiac are inseparately tied together Is that it?? I mean, we can't read the true messages unless we have a motionless Earth!

You're putting it together! But don't forget

I know, I know. . . . Don't forget the old bad horoscope system was also based on a non-moving Earth!

So what are you going to do with *that* fact?

Well, as I see it, Bo Bo, that doesn't cut any ice.

Now *you* explain please!

Well, it's true didn't it, that the bad horoscope stuff is still a big time business even though no one believes the Earth is standing still anymore?

Very true.

Well, doesn't that tell us that this particular system of lies is big business no matter whether the Earth is moving or not?

It would seem so, but, in all fairness toward the facts, it should be stressed that most of the horoscope stuff is *still* based on a non-moving Earth

So what! Just because the old horoscope system was wrong and bad doesn't mean that the non-moving Earth idea is wrong and bad! After all, the supernatural purpose behind the old horoscope system was to confuse and cover up God's messages in the heavens which were based on a fixed Earth too! So it looks to me like the real contest is between the true and false messages in the Zodiac whether the Earth is moving or not.

Very incisive there, Vern. And just what do you come up with when you do that?

Coming up with the heavy stuff is your department, Bo Bo; remember?!

OK. Whatever. We've seen that the horoscope business is both false and anti-Bible. But we've also seen that the Zodiac itself is a very real phenomenon and must not be thrown out just because horoscopes based on it are thrown out. Let's buckle down here and get a little better understanding of just what the Zodiac is. Notice this explanation given in a *Science Digest* article:

"... The Zodiac is a thin belt of fixed stars across the skies through which we see the sun, moon, and planets travel... These celestial bodies always traverse the skies within the bounds of the Zodiac."¹² (Emph. added)

And we can read elsewhere that the Zodiac belt is 18 degrees wide or one tenth of a perfect hemisphere from horizon to horizon.

So the sun, moon and the five "wandering stars", i.e., the planets Mercury, Venus, Mars, Saturn, and Jupiter move around inside that Zodiacal belt and do not go outside of it. In the second century B.C. the Greeks

"... organized the zodiac mathematically by calculating its 12 segments, or signs, as 30 degrees of arc each. The 12 arcs corresponded to the 12 constellations. Since most are represented by animals, the Greeks called the zone *zodiacus Kykles*, 'circle of animals'."¹³

So that's where we get Leo, Taurus, Pisces, and so forth....

That's where all that comes from, all right. The problem is, Vern, that this Zodiac which came to be called "Ptolemy's Zodiac"

"... is actually based on constellations which are only *optical illusions*. One look through a telescope shows that constellations such as Leo or Pisces or Sagittarius *do not actually exist*."¹⁴ (Emph. added)

So when those lines are drawn from one star to another to form a lion or a bull or a fish it's just pure imagination??

Or pull bull, you might say. And what's more, the imagined signs from which astrologers give horoscope readings are all off the mark by one full sign! Cavendish explains:

"On March 21 each year astrologers say that the sun is in Aries. In reality, the sun is not in the constellation Aries... but is in the constellation Pisces. When an astrologer today says the sun is in one sign of the Zodiac it is really in the preceding sign."¹⁵

Boy! That kinda jerks the final knot in the old horoscope caper, dudn't it?? I mean it's far out enough to actually believe and follow daily instructions made up for your life based on your birth date and where the planets and sun and moon are, but it must be a real bummer to be heeding such a guide and counselor and then find out you've been carrying out instructions in your life that belong to people born under the sign that precedes yours! Whew!

Whew is right! No wonder God put down as the number one commandment "Thou shall have no other gods before me"! Surely in his book, *Horoscopes and the Christian*, Morely rightly concludes:

"Astrology has always been, and still is, a branch of black witchcraft. [Therefore...] there is no place for astrology in the life of a Christian believer."¹⁶

So, once again, it is the "circle of animals" constellations, and the astrological horoscopes based on them that are totally imaginary and phoney. The Zodiac is real. The sun, moon, and five wandering "stars" do move around in varied and perfectly precise ways within its narrow boundaries.

And, also, these movements and positions do have dual, God-ordained functions which are, namely, to

“... declare the glory of God and show His handiwork [and to]. . . be signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years. . . .”¹⁷

Well said, Vern. Now notice how all this bears on the Earth-moving question: Astrologers (much like Christian theologians) have tried to operate on two mutually exclusive beliefs about whether the Earth is moving or not. Early on, when everybody believed the Earth was *not* moving, astrologers went along with that concept and proceeded to base their Satan-inspired horoscope witchcraft on happenings in the Zodiac belt.

But the New Testament Christian Church was opposed to all the horoscope stuff from the beginning, wasn't it?

You better believe it was! But over the centuries that changed. During the 16th and 17th centuries when Copernicanism was on the rise, there were lots of folks in both the Catholic and Protestant churches who messed with horoscopes. Kepler himself made or cast horoscopes for royalty, for example. And we can read things like this about that period:

“The *astrologer Galileo* in 1609 drew up a horoscope for the Duke of Tuscany which indicated that the Duke would enjoy a long life. The Duke died two weeks later.”¹⁸ (Emph. added)

Nevertheless, the practice of making or heeding horoscopes has never been compatible with Bible teachings—

So the Bible-based Christian Church—which taught a non-moving Earth—also taught that horoscope related activities were wrong?

Yes. But then look what happened, Vern: After Copernicus, the churches slowly but surely began giving up the teaching that the Earth was stationary . . .

. . . which sent a big torpedo slamming into the Bible . . .

. . . and blew off half of the propeller and bent the drive shaft seriously. It sure did. It didn't sink (It can't be sunk!),

but it did cause serious damage. It took on some water, so to speak, and was listing noticeably. Indeed, It wasn't a perfect picture of God's power anymore in the churches' and Christendom's eyes. But It was, rather, stunned and reeling, even crippled to the point that confidence in Its power to triumph began to falter and erode and the sharks began to gather.

And all the while, Satan was preparing his “evolution torpedo” and aiming it to hit the crippled Bible amidships!

That he was; that he was. Now notice what was happening while all this was going on: Not only was the Bible torpedoed by the success of Copernicanism, guess what else was . . .

All that horoscope stuff?!

Certainly! Because . . .

. . . because it was based on a non-moving Earth too!

You said it! That's exactly right. But look closely and you will see a perfect example of how Satan uses *double deception* to achieve his ends . . .

Well, you'll have to shed some light on that, Bo Bo . . . I don't get that part about all this too clearly. It looks to me like Satan cut his own throat by pulling the rug out from under his powerful horoscope deception when he promoted the Copernican deception . . .

I see what you are saying, but don't forget that we are dealing with Mr. Tricky himself. He has lots of tricks, but only one goal . . .

And that is . . .

. . . to deceive the whole world into believing that the Bible is wrong, that it has errors in it, that it is fallible . . .

. . . then it can't be trusted to be telling the Truth about Jesus, about eternal life in Heaven, about anything really . . .

Precisely. So which of the two deceptions do you think the Devil could get the most mileage out of: Copernicanism or the horoscope stuff??

Copernicanism, I guess! It posed a direct slam at the Bible, didn't it, just like Martin Luther and all the other Bible

people recognized at the time?! And besides, it was a *new* slam! The other had been around throughout history

Sure it was new, and it was powerful. It did the kind of damage that is hardest to repair because it did four things:

- 1) It came disguised as Truth.
- 2) It challenged and seemingly knocked out that other claimant to be the Truth, namely, the Bible.
- 3) It only theoretically pulled the rug from under the horoscope business because those horoscopes were cast on a geocentric premise (and have continued to be to this day to a large extent). Copernicanism could, nevertheless, take credit for being the objective, rational enemy of superstitions based on the supernatural. This posture grew and expanded into the fourth and most deadly of its achievements, namely:
- 4) It equated unflinching faith in the Bible's teachings on all subjects with a superstitious, emotional, illogical cast of mind. This, in turn, came to be contrasted with the alleged objective, rational, dispassionate approach of the scientifically minded person.

. . . an appeal to "intellectual pride", the last one, eh, Bo Bo?

Pure and simple Through Copernicanism, God's created and programmed Adversary, the Devil, ever so cleverly introduced mankind to the new god he was molding and grooming to be the truth with a capital "T", the new idol that man in his vanity would turn to for all his needs, the *Bible's replacement as the source of truth*, you guessed it

"Science"—

Exactly! Of course it was FALSE Science and not TRUE Science, because there is *no truth*—none whatsoever—in Satan, so none can come out of him. Everything—every single thing that Satan has the world believing is against what the Bible says and is a deception. All of it. But this particular False Science *heliocentrism deception* is his greatest masterpiece. It is *the crowning perversion of Truth* in a long career of fabricating supernaturally skillful counterfeits of God's Truths.

Haven't we run across that Biblical warning of the power of false science somewhere?

Sure we have. It's in I Timothy 6:20,21. It says plainly:

"AVOID oppositions of science falsely so called . . . which some professing have ERRED concerning the faith"

"Avoid" is a strong warning here!

And we need to recall again that foundational warning from God:

"Thou shall have no other gods before me"¹⁹

That includes a False Science god, doesn't it??

Sure it does Vern! You said *doesn't* instead of *dudn't*! I did?

You did! Anyway, the whole matter from beginning to end comes down to the question of what is Truth and what is deception. After all, God says that He can not lie and that Satan can not tell the Truth. HE says His Word is Truth and anything that contradicts It is a lie.

And His Word says that the Earth does not move, so if we believe His Word is Truth on every subject including this one, then the Earth does not move. Period.

Fine. But Satan knows all that also and his job is to palm off on mankind any and every deception imaginable that will weaken and remove the Bible as *the only source of Truth on all subjects*.

Then that's why the Devil was glad to risk some damage to his horoscope deception in order to bring in the Copernican deception

Sure! He knew the Copernican deception would not only slam Bible credibility hard but that it would lay the groundwork for the great evolution deception and ultimately the enthronement of "science" as *the source of truth* instead of the Bible.

And, besides that, the horoscope deception didn't die out anyway!

Shoot no! It's not only very much alive and well right now, but growing, as we've seen. The astrologers just change their stuff a little here and there and hundreds of millions around the world still look to that mess for supernatural

guidance instead of to the Bible which tells them *not* to fool with it.

So the Devil not only still gets a lot of mileage out of the horoscope deception, he also gets unlimited free mileage out of posing as the enemy of his own horoscope deception by being the champion of "science" which pooh-poohs such superstition! Yes sirree! That wascal is slick!

Positively oleaginous, Vern!

I'm not even going to ask. . . .

But there was another card up his sleeve all along where all this moving Earth deception is concerned. . . .

Oh no! What else can there be?!

Well, you will remember how I kept stressing the part about the horoscope stuff being phoney but the Zodiac being real?

Yeah.

The reason for that was this: That Zodiac out there is an astronomical fact that can not be ignored. . . .

Astronomical, not astrological, right?

Good point; good point. . . . And not only is the Zodiac an astronomical fact that cannot be ignored, it is also, as we have seen, a Biblical fact.

So it's a real fact and a Bible fact too. . . .

You might say so. And, Vern, that tells us something that confirms the Bible when it says the Earth doesn't move!

It do?!

Absolutely. Watch this: The same Bible that says the Earth is not moving also sets forth a Zodiac loaded with "signs" for man to read and benefit by and to declare God's Glory. . . .

So??

So this: The Zodiac and those signs are real things which no one including modern "science" can deny, and they are real and *they work because they are viewed from a fixed Earth!*

They wouldn't work if the Earth were turning on an axis and orbiting the sun??

How could they?! If the Earth were turning at a thousand MPH and whooshing around the sun at over sixty-six thousand MPH and careening around the galaxy at a half

million MPH as all the books say it is, then there would be a whole different ball game going on inside that Zodiac belt than if we are standing still!

Well, Bo Bo, I want to shout hallelujah but I've got this sinking feeling that some folks out there in the "science" world are going to insist that all that goes on inside the zodiacal belt would be the same if the Earth were rotating and orbiting the sun as it would be if the sun was going around the Earth every day. Whadaya say 'bout that?

I say *nonsense*, that's what! Anybody who thinks one minute *knows* that all the precise movements of heavenly bodies inside the zodiacal belt would not and could not appear the same from an Earth that is moving 30 times rifle bullet speed one direction and 250 times rifle bullet speed in another direction as they would appear from an Earth that is standing absolutely still! Be serious! The real choreography that goes on inside the Zodiac *must fit either* the fixed Earth model *or* the Copernican model. It can not fit both!

And here's the clincher, Vern; the hidden trick within a trick that has been pulled off so cleverly in all this: By setting up "science" as the enemy of astrology, the door has effectively been slammed on *real* scientific investigation into the workings of the Zodiac. Such investigation would certainly reveal multiple facts about star occultations and reverse orbital loops as with Mars (see Fig. XX), etc., which could not possibly be fit into the Copernican model.




FIGURE XX. Path of Mars Near the Favorable Opposition of 1956.

Satan's false science god says the horoscope signs are pure baloney, and they are! But in the same breath the message comes through that there are *no* signs in the Zodiac and that anybody who looks for signs there is the same kind of superstitious nut as someone who believes in horoscopes

. . . so what you are saying is that the science establishment has effectively painted out God's signs in the Zodiac with the same brush that it has painted out the horoscope stuff

Sure. And this strategy has worked beautifully for a long time—appealing, as it does, to man's intellectual pride, for *assuredly, as we saw with eclipses, some of the signs that God put in the intricate motions of the heavenly bodies through the Zodiac are there specifically to prove that the Earth is not moving.* Nevertheless, God's Great Drama, as spelled out in the Bible from A to Z, is finishing up "Y" and the world is being prepared for the Final Act with its several Scenes. As momentum for the exposure and destruction of Satan's heliocentric counterfeit builds amongst those who love and will follow Truth whatever the price, just so will Satan play his last cards in exactly the way God knew he would when HE created him. Satan was created as the embodiment of all the evil that man had to experience throughout history so that the record of what evil does will be complete in every detail for those on the eternal New Earth to study and abhor just like God does. This is clearly seen in the last three verses of the last chapter of the Prophet Isaiah, a passage that is destined to play a vital role in the destruction of powerful false doctrines about both Heaven and Hell.²⁰

. . . and again the Zodiac

. . . The Zodiac is for *God's signs*, Vern, and all of Satan's trickery has not removed that *fact*. Nor have his deceptions removed the fact that all sorts of calculations based on the moon and stars that have always worked and still work have always been and *still are* based on a non-moving Earth! They are based on a non-moving Earth because they must be so based in order to work. Navigation, eclipses, planting, har-

vesting, on and on . . . these things all work and are real and they are all based on a non-moving Earth. Take the "Harvest Moon" for example: Here is but one of many real phenomena that is an *obvious sign* that God put in the heavens not only to help at harvest time but also to clearly show man that he was *the reason* for the infinite care and love He has put into His Creation.

I've heard of a "harvest Moon", Bo Bo, but

. . . It's a real interesting fact Usually, the moon comes up about 50 minutes later each 24 hour period. However, as we can read:

" . . . The retardation of time varies a great deal. In the fall, moonrise can occur only about 22 minutes later each night, while it may be 80 minutes later in the spring-time."²¹

Wow! An hour's difference! That *is* interesting

It's a built-in *sign* to help farmers, *obviously*. And there is extra light for the hunters too as we can see:

"The harvest moon occurs in September, around the beginning of fall when the sun is in Libra and the moon is in Aries. The hunter's moon is the full moon that follows the harvest moon"²²

" . . . when the sun is in Libra and the moon is in Aries" The sun and moon are in very specific places in the Zodiac when these things happen

They certainly are! They are signs from God, pure and simple. Forget the dumb horoscope names and just remember that they are signs that work for man just exactly like the Bible says. Then remember that the same Bible on the same page says that the Earth was created three days *before* the sun was created. The Earth wasn't going around the sun, obviously, because there was no sun to go round the first three days! But there was light the *first* day! there was light before there was a sun and there was a non-moving Earth before there was a sun (or moon or stars).

In other words, the Zodiac (and the heavens outside that narrow band) were not created until the fourth day of the Creation Week, according to the Bible

... Not until light was created, and the atmospheric system, and the water and land were separated, and grass and trees with their reproductive seeds in them were created . . .

... and then the sun, moon and stars . . .

... going around the Earth, the center of God's Creation where man would be created on the sixth day in the image of God the Father and the pre-incarnate Jesus; that non-moving Earth where Jesus would be born of woman, defeat death and make a way for all men to defeat it and live eternally on a New Earth; a New Earth freed of Satan's presence and located right where this old Earth now is at the center of the universe!

But all this sounds like the stars are a lot closer that we are taught they are, Bo Bo. I mean . . .

I know what you are saying, Vern, but all those distances of zillions of light years *are not fact*; they are only more evidence that anything which can be twisted to support Copernicanism will be so twisted.

Like what?

Like *parallax* . . .

Make this short, will ya?

Webster says: "Parallax: The apparent displacement . . . of an object, as seen from two different points . . ."

Displacement . . . ?

You're sharp, Vern. Let's check old D. W. again: "Displace: To remove from the usual or proper place . . ."

So what we are dealing with here is a fact which tells us that when we look at an object in the distance, such as a star, from one location or point it will appear to be in a certain place, but . . .

... but when we look at the same distant object from another location or point it will appear to have moved, though it really didn't move at all.

You've got it, Vern; that is what *parallax* is all about. Now let's apply this definition to a specific example. Let's determine the distance to the star *Alpha Centauri* from the Earth and from the sun and see how great the difference can be even for this closest of stars. Note:

"Looking at the star *Alpha Centauri* from an Earth circling the Sun, parallax measurements and trigonometry would assure us that the two are 1.3 parsecs, or more than 4.2 light years apart. *But looking at an Earth circled by the Sun the distance turns out to be less than one twenty-fifth of that amount.* Now these values cannot both be true . . ." ²³ (Emph. added)

Hmmm. That's *real* interesting . . . What it adds up to is that the stars could be a *whole lot* closer than we are indoctrinated to believe!

A WHOLE LOT CLOSER is right! Note again:

"... in the Copernican estimation we observe the stars where they were from four to many thousands of light years ago. According to the geocentric conviction we see the starry dome in the position it had almost two months ago. Or less if light's travel slows it down!" ²⁴

That's a bigggg difference!! All the way from thousands of light years at 186,282 miles per *second* to two months at the same speed! So how thick is the shell of stars if we calculate from a non-moving Earth, I wonder . . . ?

Van der Kamp tells us:

"... a simple trigonometric calculation gives us the radius of the *Stellatum*, the shell in which the stars have been placed. That radius turns out to be about 58.1 light days, i.e., one twentieth of a parsec." ²⁵

Howfarszat in miles?

About one trillion . . .

That's a loooong way; but at least it's a figure that a person can get some kind of grip on . . . And that would be the whole starry dome including the Zodiac Belt??

Yes.

That helps a lot, Bo Bo. I think one of the biggest problems anybody can have with believing in a non-moving Earth comes from not being able to believe that the stars could go around the Earth every day if they are as far away as we are told they are. But with this *parallax* factor in the equation there's nooo problem . . .

It helps us to understand the motive behind this cover-up of the parallax factor, that's for certain. And another thing that comes into play here, Vern, and is used very deceptively is all this business about the *speed of light* and how, according to Einstein, it is the highest speed possible in the universe.

Brother Albert wasn't too flexible on that idea, was he?! No way! As Nordenson bluntly states:

"With regard to the fact that the absoluteness of the velocity of light is the fundamental ideal of Einstein's Theory of Relativity it would be much more accurate to call this Theory 'Einstein's Theory of Absoluteness'."²⁶

So, basically, Einstein's Theory of Relativity can't exist without the absolute speed of light?

That's right. And y'know, Vern, it's a funny thing, isn't it, that if a Christian takes God's Creation as set forth in the Bible to be an Absolute Truth, the "scientist" scoffs and says one can't do that and be scientific. Yet, Einstein and the science establishment after him could declare the speed of light to be an absolute truth and that *is* scientific! Very funny thing But, of course, the science establishment long ago locked onto Einstein's Theory of Relativity as a means of escaping forever from the specter of a Biblical non-moving Earth, so Absolute Truth becomes whatever it must become! I like what Nordenson said again:

"... Einstein's Theory of Relativity is not only among the most sensational fancies, but also one of the most serious logical incoherences in the history of science."²⁷

Whomp! . . . But wasn't there something else "incoherent" about Einstein's absolute speed of light idea that we touched on in another place? Wasn't there something else that shows how all this wild theorizing is just part of a coordinated deception to make the universe so vast that the Earth can't be its center?

It's *all* incoherent, Vern, just like Nordenson and a bunch of others we've seen have discovered. The concept of the speed of light as the limiting speed in the universe has to do with determining

"... all measurements of time, for the designation of the measure of time, and even for the *measurement of space*. . . ." ²⁸ (Emph. added)

In other words, our modern concept of distances and thousands of light years is all tied into Einstein's theories about light??

That's right. And he made his own rules, his own definitions (as we've seen) of things like simultaneous events, and his own mathematics to uphold the theories. Consider this classic distortion of reason and you will see why all modern teaching on time and distance in space is *obviously* built on sand:




FIGURE XXI

"A light signal is sent out from A at 12 o'clock (Fig. XVI); it is then reflected and returns to A at 10 minutes after 12 o'clock. At what time did it reach B? According to Einstein, this cannot be determined by experiments; we can only establish it by definition. We may, for instance, record it as having occurred at 12:05; but we think of it also as occurring at 12:02 or 12:08 . . . any number within the stretch of time between 12:00 and 12:10 can be chosen" ²⁹

Holy mackerel! This is the way Einstein got around the results of light travel which the Michelson-Morley experiment produced?!

Crazy but true, Vern.

But the light could have got to "B" half a second after 12:00 and still fit the definition in the theory!

So it would. Or one thousandth of a second after 12:00!

And this is the same “thinking” that gives us those incomprehensible distances in space?!

Yep 'd yep yep.

I'm gonna tell my mother—

Tell her, I dare you! And while you're at it tell her that, even though relativistic “thinking” permeates practically all that has passed for learning and education in this century, Einstein's biggest fans must agree with Reichenbach's declaration that

“His [Einstein's] assumptions cannot be justified in a purely logical way”³⁰

If something is not logical it has to be illogical, doesn't it, Bo Bo?! Or have I gone completely squirrely listening to all this stuff these pseudo-scientific flakes have palmed off on the world?!

You're OK, Vern. What is not logical *IS* illogical. And here is what *illogical means*: “unreasonable, without reason, irrational, unsound, unsubstantial, invalid, faulty, UNSCIENTIFIC, untenable, self-contradictory, self-annulling, groundless”

What absolutely marvelous words! They describe beautifully everything connected with the Copernican and Einsteinian views! “Unreasonable, self-contradictory, groundless, *unscientific*” I love 'em!

Me too

Now, Vern, there is one other classic example of illogic that I wanted to get in here that will help anybody see that the distances in space have been intentionally stretched beyond all comprehension for one reason, and that reason is to make it impossible to believe that the Earth is standing still at the center of the universe

. . . because if the universe is as endlessly big as we are told it is it couldn't be turning round the Earth every day and only the Copernican idea could be possible?

Exactly. That's the purpose of the deception for that means, you see, that the Bible is irretrievably and forever wrong which is the *real* purpose behind the purpose.

What's the other illogical thing we can see working to that end?

Well, holding off on the connection of all this to the Zodiac matter a little longer, let's go back to Einstein's speed of light ideas for a minute. . . . Let's say that light does have a speed and that speed is 186,282 miles per *second*, as all the books assure us it is. All right? Now, imagine yourself on a train with ten cars going faster and faster through space and you are in the tenth car. Finally the train reaches a speed of 186,281.999999 miles per second. Then you start running toward the front of the train as fast as you can go

So now I'm going faster than the so-called limiting speed of light, right?

Wrong, says Einstein. Nothing can go faster than that. Then how fast an I going?

Just as fast as you can run

But I'm already moving 186,281.999999 miles per second

It doesn't matter. When you get to the speed that would put you even with the speed of light you will be just as far away from the speed of light as you would be if your train were going 20 MPH and you were sitting still reading the sports page. Einstein's relativity theory contends:

“... that for every uniformly moving frame of reference the velocity of light is equal in all directions”³¹

In other words, no matter how fast one goes or in what direction, he will always be just as far from attaining the speed of light as he would be if he were in his living room watching Star Trek??

Yep. Real logical, isn't it? Here's another quickie along the same lines, Vern, by the famous atheist-philosopher-mathematician on whose books I wasted many hours as a young man. Note his two part statement, the first part of which is totally logical and “everybody knows”:

“Everybody knows that if you are on an escalator you reach the top sooner if you walk up than if you stand still”³²

Then note how he attaches that logical statement with which no one would argue to an absurdity demanded by the Einstein Myth:

"... But if the escalator moved with the velocity of light you would reach the top at exactly the same moment whether you walked up or stood still."³³

Yipe! That means that if a person was riding that escalator and fired a rifle straight ahead the bullet could not even leave the chamber or the barrel could it?

That's what it means

. . . and actually, when you get right down to it, this person couldn't even raise the barrel or lift a hand to blow his nose because that would involve forward motion over and above the speed of light

That's what the theory demands

Well, it's obvious that if the distances to the stars in the Zodiac Belt or outside it are determined by this cast of mind (coupled with the parallax factor!) then what we are told about these distances has no bearing on reality

No bearing at all, Vern. The astronomical "sciences" (like the biological "sciences") are in a never-never land where absurd, senseless, and impossible hypotheses have been layered over one another for so long that the reason why they came into being has been buried and all but forgotten

But, forgotten or not, the reason has been to remove the Truth of a non-moving Earth (and the Creation of Man and all else in six days) as set forth in the Bible, and thereby undermine its trustworthiness on all that it teaches about Jesus and everything else

What else could explain all this deception, Vern?! There can be no other reason!! Look at Fig. XXII.

This is the way the *Stellatum* and the Zodiac used to be represented before the Copernican fraud took over. Except for necessary discrepancies in scale, this still gives us a comprehensible grasp of the geocentric universe. And, if we wave aside all the horoscope baloney, we can appreciate just how vitally important and revealing the Zodiac can be in determining just what signs God did put in that fabulous belt of constantly moving bodies. Did HE put the Gospel story in there? Seiss and others make a very good case that HE did and that we can see it if we get rid of the Devil's counterfeit

bull, fish, lion, scorpion, etc. We would then be in a position to unlock the real signs God built into His starry creation

. . . and will doubtless be built into the New Heavens (and New Earth) HE has prepared for those who love HIM




FIGURE XXII. A 17th-century engraving shows that, from Earth, the sun, moon and planets appear to orbit in the plane of the zodiac.

Doubtless. And—having seen some of the depth and breadth of the Copernican Plot—who can doubt that there is absolute, irrefutable, and unchallengeable proof of a stationary Earth to be found in the intricate motions on the heavenly bodies inside the Zodiac?? After all, the *only thing* that needs

to be proven is which direction the moon is moving! Remembering that telescopes have mirrors that invert and reverse all images, can all the weight of modern technology not determine if the moon is going east or west?!!

It was going west for Brahe and for thousands of years before him it went westwardly. Fantastically accurate readings of the Zodiac from Stonehenge for hundreds and hundreds of years always rested on a westwardly moving moon which meant a non-moving Earth. Nobody has ever given any proof of any kind, except *mythematical*, that it's going eastward, have they, Bo Bo?

MYTHEMATICAL! I love it, Vern! And you can put it in the bank that there is no proof of an eastwardly moving moon. So, in addition to *the other numerous flaws* we've seen—eclipse shadows, weather maps, bombs down smokestacks, satellite re-positioning, etc.—there has got to be at least one *super* flaw in the counterfeit which is waiting to be discovered in the Zodiac. And, since there is nothing more easily studied in the heavens than the moon, I'd recommend concentrating on it and particularly on the direction it is going around the Earth.

Calling all honest astronomers; come in, come in . . .

Yes indeedy. Amateur or professional . . . Roll up you sleeves, spit on your hands, focus your telescopes on the moon in the Zodiac, and find that biggest flaw of all in the Copernican counterfeit, that SIGN GOD PUT THERE FOR THIS PURPOSE that we've been missing all these years; the proof that the moon moves westwardly over the Earth just as the whole world has seen it do since the Creation!


I feel like doing a football type cheer, Bo Bo. How's this:
Sis, Boom, Baw!

Look at the Zodiac
and find that Flaw!

Lord, help us . . .

PART VII

THE FALL OF BABYLON



Eschatology.

Huh?

Eschatology, Vern . . .

Never heard of him.

It's not a "him", Vern; it's what teaching about the End Times of this Earth is called.

I was just kidd'n. I'm looking it up here . . . Let's see: e-s-c??

E-s-c-h-a-

Got it. E-s-c-h-a-t-o-l-g-y. (es 'ka tol' o ji) "Comes from the Greek *eschatos*, which means the furthest or the last, plus *logy*," which I know means "knowledge of" or "study of" . . .

Right. Or "the science of" some would say . . .

PART VI

ZODIAC

- ¹ Walter Lang, Board & Friends Newsletter, Quoted in *Bulletin Of The Tychonian Society*, Spring, 1990, Minn., MN, No. 53, pp. 30-31.
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- ³ John D. Jess, "Do Planets Rule Our Lives?" (Book Fellowship International, North Syracuse, N. Y.), p. 5.
- ⁴ Laurie Brady, *Star*, 8-8-89, p. 36.
- ⁵ Jess, "Planets Rule?" p. 1.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁷ Robert A. Morley, *Horoscopes And The Christian*, (Bethany House Pub., Minn., MN, 1981), p. 8.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ¹¹ Lang, *Tychonian Bulletin*, Spring, 1990, p. 31.
- ¹² J. Allen Hynek, "Circle of Animals," *Science Digest*, January, 1983, p. 40.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ Morley, *Horoscopes & The Christian*, p. 36.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- ¹⁷ *Bible, Psalm 19:1; Genesis 1:14.*
- ¹⁸ Morley, *Horoscopes*, p. 19.
- ¹⁹ *Bible, Exodus 20:13.*
- ²⁰ *Ibid., Isaiah 66:22-24.*
- ²¹ Franklyn M. Branley, *The Moon: Earth's Natural Satellite*, (Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1960), p. 23.
- ²² *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- ²³ Walter van der Kamp, *De Labore Solis*, (14813 Harris Rd., Pitt Meadows, B.C. Canada, V3Y 1Z1, c. 1989), p. 19.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 102.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 101.
- ²⁶ Harald Nordenson, *Relativity, Time And Reality*, (George Allen Ltd., London, 1969), p. 102.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 198.
- ²⁸ Hans Reichenbach, *From Copernicus To Einstein*, (N. Y.: Dover Publications, 1980), p. 67.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 62.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

³² Ronald W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, (World Publishing Co., N.Y. & Cleveland, 1971), p. 87.

³³ *Ibid.*

PART VII

THE FALL OF BABYLON

- ¹ *The Holy Bible, KJV, I Peter 4:17, 18.*
- ² *Ibid., Genesis 11:7.*
- ³ *Ibid., I Thessalonians 5:4.*
- ⁴ *Ibid., Revelation 14:7.*
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ *Ibid., Revelation 18:4.*
- ⁷ *Ibid., II Thessalonians 2:3.*
- ⁸ *Ibid., II Thessalonians 2:4.*
- ⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰ *Ibid., Revelation 17:3.*
- ¹¹ *Ibid., Matthew 28:18.*