

Message# 311_11-03-2024 – In the Beginning

Preached first on 11/03/2024 on www.molibertyradio.us

Good morning everyone. Thank you for tuning into the message this morning.

Alright - once again - in the conclusion of this series - try as hard as I can to get everyone to understand what the purpose of this series has been. Very simply, I have brought to the table as many Scriptures as I could find that deal with God's Created world and how it works. It was not my intention to explain eclipses from Scripture, or the tides, or the seasons. Those things are explained to some degree in the Book of Enoch - but - as I explained - I am not even certain that the Book of Enoch is to be included in what we call the Bible. Our Bible speaks of Enoch. Our Bible speaks of the Book of Enoch, the prophesies of Enoch - that should tend to make us to a closer look. Personally, I have not done so.

The Bible clearly states - several times - it is the sun that moves - God's world does not. This fact - a belief that I will live and die by - is the basis for rejecting the “scientists spinning ball earth theory”. The “scientists” who demand we believe in a “spinning ball earth” - are the ones who have stated - publicly, openly and have - no doubt had - tremendous influence in the colleges and universities - and who have produced an overwhelming amount of young people - who declare - with the “scientists” - “there is no God.” And the foundation point of belief - that has produced “there is no God” - is their belief in a “spinning ball world.”

I believe the Bible. I believe the Bible contains the Word of God and with study - and from the correct approach to the Scriptures - perspective - the Holy Spirit of God will lead us to the truth - even with man's attempts at subverting it, changing it, altering it, etc. The problem is - the “churchmen” have been as successful as the “scientists” in that they have completely hidden the correct perspective - the correct approach to the Bible which has hindered most people from the simple understanding that

the whole duty of man is to Fear God and Keep His Commandments.

We live in a world full of atheism. Friends, I submit to you this morning that atheism is not simply the belief that “there is no God.” Atheism is the belief that there is “no God's Law.” The following statement is going to be painful for most people to hear. I've been meditating on this for quite a while and to be frank with you, I've only mentioned to Teresa and maybe just by son-in-law and daughter, Chrissy, I don't even remember, but I

know I haven't talked about this publicly.

If a man believes in the state. If a man believes that it is okay for men to make "laws" - to make their own definitions of good and evil, right and wrong - it doesn't matter how many times he says the sound J-e-s-u-s in a day, it doesn't matter how many times he reads a Bible in a day, it doesn't matter whether he says the sound G-o-d or whether he says the sound of the tetragrammaton - an atheist is one who believes that men are allowed to make their own definitions of good and evil.

If and when a man truly believes in the God of the Bible - that man will only yield his life to the Laws, Statutes, Commandments, and Ordinances - as they are found in the Word of God. That will be the man who does all he can to rid himself of entanglements with the world. That will be the man who understands that the God of Creation demands His Will be done on earth - as it is in Heaven.

Are we so foolish to think that man's definitions of good and evil, man's "laws", man's CONstitutions, man's ordinances and statutes - then all the many ways man steals from other men in order to finance those activities - are we so foolish to believe that any of that is found in Heaven?

Yet, one of the simplest things that Jesus ever taught those who listened to Him was,

"Thy Will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven."

Christians are supposed to be the Light of the Word and if necessary, the salt of the earth. We are supposed to lead by belief and lead by example - that God's Will is supposed to be done on earth - as it is in Heaven.

Fear God and Keep His Commandments.

Simple, simple, simple.

Yet we find ourselves in a world today that despises the Will of God - friends - I say this world doesn't even know what the Will of God is. The Will of God has been twisted down into just "go to 'church' and obey man's "government." That's where we are today. And I submit to you this morning - if men and women - boys and girls believed the Bible - as it clearly states that the sun is moving and the world is not - that that would force them to reevaluate everything they think they know and would bring many

back to the Creator, the God of the Bible. The Creator, who said in His first handshake with a man - "You can have everything in this fantastic world that I Created - except one thing - of everything in this Garden that I created - you may have it all - but you may not make your own definitions of good and evil."

There is no reason whatsoever why most people do not know that is what God told Adam and Eve. But I say again, the reason most people do not know this, is because between the "science of the world" and the "science of the 'church'" - there has been enough doubt instilled in the minds of most people - that this doubt has caused them to never make it past Genesis chapters 1 and 2 - to get to chapter 3 - where God lays down the most simple thing that man is never to forget. And here we are today - with men's little g "governments" all over the world - doing everything they can to control every single step, even every single breath, that every single man, woman, boy and girl alive take in the course of their lives. From the "birth certificate to the death certificate" - and every single thing in between. All because

...the whole duty of man is to Fear God and Keep His Commandments...

has no meaning at all in the minds and lives of most people.

Before we pick back up with Samuel Rowbotham's final chapter in Zetetic Astronomy: Earth not a Globe! let me say one other thing about this series. Most people in the world today have developed their belief system regarding the shape of the world, the way things work in the world, by forming their opinions from the foundation of a "spinning ball earth." That is the perspective with which they have approached their learning. They've never looked at the world from another perspective. For instance, that it is the sun that is moving and the world is not. As I've said many times now, the assumptions are made through the use of mathematics. Or I guess I should say, the conclusions are made - through the use of mathematics. A mathematician can make the numbers do just about anything he wants them to do. You start with a baseline in the equation - then go from there. I read to you last week from what we are told were the words of Copernicus. He said he started with assumptions. Assumptions are not facts. If your main assumption is found to be faulty - then everything derived in that equation will be faulty.

Copernican and Newtonian theories are based on an assumption - mainly - a "spinning ball earth." Calculations then, the math, is based on that assumption. "Flat-earththers" will also use math - but will base their "assumption" on a non-rotating, non-revolving,

generally flat plane - and will make their equations based on that foundation. On that assumption. And most people have never done that, so most people don't even have any idea that if you are going by the math - both sides can present compelling arguments.

In answering the question this week in regards to the eclipses, the tides, etc., I said - again - this series has been about presenting what the Bible says about Creation. If you want to know what assumptions are then made by people who start with that foundation - what the Bible says - then go to Samuel Rowbotham's book, Zetetic Astronomy: Earth not a Globe! -

<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/69892/69892-h/69892-h.htm>

and see his answers to all of those questions. The man is smarter than I'll ever be - probably forgot more than I'll ever know - his book answers all those questions - but - from the perspective based on what the Bible says about God's Creation. If you want videos, go to flatearhdave.com and look at his videos. He has a video answering every single objection that people who believe in a "spinning ball earth" can come up with. And, I want to make it perfectly clear - I do not believe in everything Rowbotham said and I don't agree with everything that Dave Weiss says. But if you want to see what people are saying - people who say the Bible is right and the likes of Neil DeGrasse-Tyson are wrong - then go and research what these guys are saying. Now for me, the Bible is enough. The Bible says the sun moves, the world doesn't. That satisfies me. I realize that others want more. Fine. There is a ton out there. And not just from Rowbotham and Weiss.

For every equation that the globe believers produce - there is a response from the "flat-earthners."

It's all based on math and you can make numbers do whatever you want them to do. Globe believers say, "This can only work on a globe." And whatever the "this" is - "flat-earthners" can show you the same thing and say, "This can only work on "flat-earth." This is why I have determined that I will yield myself to the Bible as the Authority. And I have presented now, for months, what the Bible says about God's world - and it is not a "spinning ball."

Last week, we left off with some quotes from Rowbotham that he attributed to Adam Clark and John Wesley, who were famous preachers from a couple hundred years ago.

And again, I don't agree with everything Adam Clark or John Wesley said. I want to read those again, then continue with Rowbotham, hopefully to the end. Quote:

All the expressions of scripture are consistent with the fact of the Sun's motion. They never declare anything to the contrary. Whenever they speak of the subject it is in the same manner. The direct evidence of our senses confirms it; and actual and special observations, as well as the most practical scientific experiments, declare the same thing. The progressive and concentric motion of the Sun over the Earth is in every sense demonstrable; yet the Newtonian astronomers insist upon it that the Sun does not really move, that it only appears to move, and that this appearance arises from the motion of the Earth; that when, as the scriptures affirm, the "Sun stood still in the midst of heaven," it was the Earth which stood still and not the Sun! that the scriptures therefore speak falsely, and the experiments of science, and the observations and applications of our senses are never to be relied upon. Whence comes this bold and arrogant denial of the value of our senses and judgement,[190] and the authority of scripture? The Earth or the Sun moves. Our senses tell us, and the scriptures declare that the Earth is fixed and that it is the Sun which moves above and around it; but a theory, which is absolutely false in its groundwork, and ridiculously illogical in its details, demands that the Earth is round and moves upon axes, and in several other and various directions; and that these motions are sufficient to account for certain phenomena without supposing that the Sun moves, therefore the Sun is a fixed body, and his motion is only apparent! Such reasoning is a disgrace to philosophy, and fearfully dangerous to the religious interests of humanity!

Christian ministers and commentators find it a most unwelcome task when called upon to reconcile the plain and simple philosophy of the scriptures with the monstrous teachings of theoretical astronomy. Dr. Adam Clark, in a letter to the Rev. Thomas Roberts, of Bath,[43] speaking of the progress of his commentary, and of his endeavours to reconcile the statements of scripture with the modern astronomy, says: "Joshua's Sun and Moon standing still, have kept me going for nearly three weeks! That one chapter has afforded me more vexation than anything I have ever met with; and even now I am but[191] about half satisfied with my own solution of all the difficulties, though I am confident that I have removed mountains that were never touched before; shall I say that I am heartily weary of my work, so weary that I have a thousand times wished I had never written one page of it, and am repeatedly purposing to give it up."

[43]Life of Adam Clark, 8vo Edition.

The Rev. John Wesley, in his journal, writes as follows:—“The more I consider them the more I doubt of all systems of astronomy. I doubt whether we can with certainty know either the distance or magnitude of any star in the firmament; else why do astronomers so immensely differ, even with regard to the distance of the Sun from the Earth? Some affirming it to be only three and others ninety millions of miles.”[44]

[44]Extracts from works of Rev. J. Wesley, 3rd Edition, 1829. Published by Mason, London, p. 392, vol. 2.

In vol. 3, page 203, the following entry occurs:—“January 1st, 1765.—This week I wrote an answer to a warm letter published in the London Magazine, the author whereof is much displeased that I presume to doubt of the ‘modern astronomy.’ I cannot help it. Nay, the more I consider the more my doubts increase; so that at present I doubt whether any man on earth knows either the distance or magnitude, I will not say of a fixed Star, but Saturn or Jupiter—yea of the Sun or Moon.”

[192]

*In vol. 13, page 359, he says:—“And so the whole hypothesis of innumerable Suns and worlds moving round them vanishes into air.” And again at page 430 of same volume, the following words occur:—“The planets revolutions we are acquainted with, but who is able to this day, regularly to demonstrate either their magnitude or their distance? Unless he will prove, as is the usual way, the magnitude from the distance, and the distance from the magnitude. * * * Dr. Rogers has evidently demonstrated that no conjunction of the centrifugal and centripetal forces can possibly account for this, or even cause any body to move in an ellipsis.” There are several other incidental remarks to be found in his writings which shew that the Rev. John Wesley was well acquainted with the then modern astronomy; and that he saw clearly both its self-contradictory and its anti-scriptural character.*

It is a very popular idea among modern astronomers that the stellar universe is an endless congeries of systems, of Suns and attendant worlds peopled with sentient beings analogous in the purpose and destiny of their existence to the inhabitants of this earth. This doctrine of a plurality of worlds, although it conveys the most magnificent ideas of the universe, is purely fanciful, and may be compared to the “dreams of the alchemists” who laboured with unheard[193] of enthusiasm to discover the “philosopher’s stone,” the elixir vitæ, and the “universal solvent.” However grand the first two projects might have been in their realisation, it is known that they were never

developed in a practical sense, and the latter idea of a solvent which would dissolve everything was suddenly and unexpectedly destroyed by the few remarks of a simple but critical observer, who demanded to know what service a substance would be to them which would dissolve all things? What could they keep it in? for it would dissolve every vessel wherein they sought to preserve it! This idea of a plurality of worlds is but a natural and reasonable conclusion drawn from the doctrine of the Earth's rotundity. But this doctrine being false its off shoot is equally so. The supposition that the heavenly bodies are Suns and inhabited worlds is demonstrably impossible in nature, and has no foundation whatever in Scripture. "In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth." One Earth only is created; and the fact is more especially described in Genesis, ch. i., v. 10. Where, instead of the word "Earth" meaning both land and water as together forming a globe, as it does in the Newtonian astronomy, only the dry land was called earth," and "the gathering together of the waters called He seas."

Friends, I need to tell you again how that, as Teresa and I were discussing this last week, I was so moved by that last statement. The land and the water - the Newtonian globe - in my opinion - it is a denial of the God of the Bible to call the land and the water together - Earth. When referring to their globe - they always call it "earth." This is not what the Bible says - and it's not just a technicality. It is not just an innocent misuse of words. It is a denial of what the God of Creation told His writer to record so that we would be able to understand His Creation. If we don't have this one simple thing down - our foundation is off. The assumption which forms the basis of the equation will be off. This is so vitally important that we understand this. I've said this many times in this series - and to read Rowbotham make the same statement - was moving for me. I will tell you - I never read this statement of Rowbotham's until just a couple weeks ago. And to read the confirming statement is very moving for me. Back to Rowbotham.

The Sun, Moon, and[194] Stars are described as lights only and not worlds. A great number of passages might be quoted which prove that no other material world is ever in the slightest manner referred to by the sacred writers. The creation of the world; the origin of evil, and the fall of man; the plan of redemption by the death of Christ; the day of judgement, and the final consummation of all things are invariably associated with this Earth alone. The expression in Hebrews, ch. i., v. 2, "by whom also he made the worlds," and in Heb., ch. ii., v. 3, "through faith we understand that the worlds were framed," are known to be a comparatively recent rendering from the original Greek documents. The word which has been translated worlds is fully as capable of being rendered in the singular number as the plural; and previous to the introduction of the Copernican Astronomy was always translated "the world." The Roman Catholic and the

French Protestant Bibles still contain the singular number; and in a copy of an English Protestant Bible printed in the year 1608, the following translation is given:—“Through faith we understand that the world was ordained.” So that either the plural expression “worlds” was used in later translations to accord with the astronomical notions then recently introduced, or it was meant to include the Earth and the spiritual world, as referred to in:—

[195]

Hebrews ii., 5—“For unto angels hath he not put into subjection the world to come.”

Ephesians i., 21—“Far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.”

Luke xviii., 29, 30—“There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God’s sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.”

Matthew xii., 32—“Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world neither in the world to come.”

Alright. Let me stop here for just a second. I've already told you that I do not agree with everything that Rowbotham said. And this is a good example of that. In Hebrews chapter 1, when the word “worlds” is used in the plural - yes - that word was translated sometimes singular and sometimes plural. It comes from the Greek aeon. We know what this means. It's easy. The word means age. As smart as Rowbotham was, I would have thought he knew that, but apparently he didn't. The Scriptures speak of multiple ages - and the KJV translators used the words worlds and world. My personal opinion is that they were not correct to do so. Had the correct word - age - been used - there would have been a lot less confusion in the world today. The Bible does not speak of the cosmos being destroyed or coming to an end. In fact, it states otherwise. But the age - the Old Covenant age did indeed end - that “world” passed away - and a New Heavens and a New Earth - a new age - a new world - was instituted. That new world - that new age - began when the temple was destroyed - that which was the center of the Israelite Judahite world was destroyed. I wish Rowbotham would have known that. But, as I would hope all of us would do, I would hope that we would continue learning - building on whatever truths are passed to us from one generation to another.

Hopefully, we would look at our fathers - learn from their truths and build on them. Learn from their failings - and never repeat them. That's what all of us should be doing. Back to Rowbotham.

The Scriptures teach that in the day of the Lord "the Heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat,"

Yes. That's talking about the Old Covenant age.

and the "stars of Heaven fall unto the Earth even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs when shaken of a mighty wind." The Newtonian system of astronomy declares that the stars and planets are mighty worlds—nearly all of them much larger than this Earth. The fixed stars are considered to be suns, equal to if not greater than our own sun, which is said to be above 800,000 miles in diameter. All this is proveably false, but to those who have been led to believe it, the difficult question arises,—“How can[196] thousands of stars fall upon the Earth, which is many times less than any one of them?” How can the Earth with a supposed diameter of 8000 miles receive the numerous suns of the firmament many of which are said to be a million miles in diameter?

Stop again. We know that the stars falling to the earth is symbolic language. But, as I've said many times in this series, God would not use language in the natural world to describe the spiritual world - that would be impossible. That doesn't make any sense. If the physical stars were to fall from the sky and land on the earth - they would have to be much smaller than this world. If we believe the Word of God - we have no choice but to believe that the stars are very small - in comparison to God's Created world. Can't we see that those who want all of us to believe “there is no God” - have created the lie that the stars are so huge, so much bigger than the sun and the moon - there's no way that the Words of Jesus could be true? Back to Rowbotham.

These stars are assumed to have positions so far from the Earth that the distance is almost inexpressible; figures indeed may be arranged on paper but in reading them no practical idea is conveyed to the mind. Many of them are said to be so distant that should they fall with the velocity of light or above one hundred and sixty thousand miles in a second, or six hundred millions of miles per hour, they would require nearly two millions of years to reach the Earth! Sir William Herschel in a paper on “The power of telescopes to penetrate into space,” published in the Philosophical Transactions for the year 1800, affirms, that with his powerful instruments he discovered brilliant luminaries so far from the Earth that the light from them “could not have been less than one

million nine hundred thousand years in its progress.” Again the difficulty presents itself —“If the stars of Heaven begin to fall to-day, and with the greatest imaginable velocity, millions of years must elapse before they reach the Earth!” But the Scriptures declare that these changes[197] shall occur suddenly—shall come, indeed, “as a thief in the night.”

The same theory, with its false and inconceivable distances and magnitudes, operates to destroy all the ordinary, common sense, and scripturally authorised chronology. Christian and Jewish commentators [I wish he wouldn't have put that in there, but he did], unless astronomically educated, hold and teach that the Earth, as well as the Sun, Moon, and Stars, were created about 4,000 years before the birth of Christ, or less than 6,000 years before the present time. But if many of these luminaries are so distant that their light would require above a million of years to reach us; and if, as we are taught, bodies are visible to us because of the light which they reflect or radiate, then their light has reached us, because we have been able to see them, and therefore they must have been shining, and must have been created at least one million nine hundred thousand years ago! The chronology of the bible indicates that a period of six thousand years has not yet elapsed since “the Heavens and the Earth were finished, and all the Host of them.”

Stop again. I understand exactly what he's saying. I get it. And, I believe that. But it is also possible that when God Created - 6,000 years ago - He could have just as easily placed those stars trillions of miles away. But, I do not believe that's what the Bible teaches and I do not believe that is what God wants us to believe. There's too many other things that we've seen that would lead us to that conclusion. Back to Rowbotham.

In the modern astronomy, Continents, Oceans, Seas, and Islands, are considered as together forming one vast Globe of 25,000 miles in circumference. This has been shown to be fallacious, and it is clearly contrary to the plain, literal teaching of the scriptures. In the first chapter[198] of Genesis, we find the following language: “and God said let the waters under the heaven be gathered unto one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth, and the gathering together of the waters called He Seas.” Here the Earth and Seas—Earth and the great body of waters, are described as two distinct and independent regions, and not as together forming one Globe which astronomers call “the Earth.” This description is confirmed by several other passages of scripture.

2 Peter, iii., 5—“For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the Word of God the Heavens were of old, and the Earth standing out of the waters and in the waters.”

Psalms cxxxvi., (136) 6—“O give thanks to the Lord of Lords, that by wisdom made the heavens, and that stretchest out the earth above the waters.”

Psalms xxiv., 1, 2—“The earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein: for he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.”

Hermes (New Testament Apocrypha)—“Who with the word of his strength fixed the heaven; and founded the earth upon the waters.”

Job xxvi., 7—“He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the Earth upon nothing.”

[199]

Some think that the latter part of this verse, “hangeth the Earth upon nothing,” favours the idea that the Earth is a globe revolving in space without visible support; but Dr. Adam Clark, although himself a Newtonian philosopher, says, in his commentary upon this passage in Job, the literal translation is, “on the hollow or empty waste,” and he quotes a Chaldee version of the passage which runs as follows: “He layeth the Earth upon the waters nothing sustaining it.”

It is not that He “hangeth the Earth upon nothing,” but “hangeth or layeth it upon the waters” which were empty or waste, and where before there was nothing. This is in strict accordance with the other expressions, that “the Earth was founded upon the waters,” &c., and also with the expression in Genesis, “that the face of the deep was covered only with darkness.”

If the Earth were a globe, it is evident that everywhere the water of its surface, the seas, lakes, oceans, and rivers, must be sustained the land, the Earth must be under the water; but if the land and the waters are distinct, and the Earth is “founded upon the seas,” then everywhere the sea must sustain the land as it does a ship or any other floating mass, and there is water below the earth. In this particular as in all the others, the scriptures are beautifully sequential and consistent:—

[200]

Exodus xx, 4—“Thou shalt not make unto thee any likeness of anything in heaven above or in the Earth beneath, or in the waters under the Earth.”

Genesis xlv, 25—“The Almighty shall bless thee with the blessings of heaven above, and blessings of the deep that lieth under.”

Deut. xxxiii, 13—“Blessed be his land, for the precious things of heaven; for the dew; and for the deep which couched beneath.”

Deut. iv, 18—“Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, and make no similitude of anything on the Earth, or the likeness of anything that is in the waters beneath the Earth.”

The same idea prevailed among the ancients generally. In Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Jupiter, in an assembly of the gods, is made to say, “I swear by the infernal waves which glide under the Earth.”

If the earth is a distinct structure standing in and upon the waters of the “great deep,” it follows that, unless it can be shown that something else sustains the waters, that the depth is fathomless. As there is no evidence whatever of anything existing underneath the “great deep,” and as in many parts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans no bottom has been found by the most scientific and efficient means which human ingenuity could invent, we are forced to the[201] conclusion that the depth is boundless. This conclusion is again confirmed by the scriptures.

Jeremiah xxxi, 37—“Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar, the Lord of Hosts is His name. If these ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the Lord: if heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the Earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel.”

From the above it will be seen that God’s promises to his people could no more be broken than could the height of heaven, or the depths of the Earth’s foundations be searched out. The fathomless deep beneath—upon which the Earth is founded, and the

infinitude of heaven above, are here given as emblems of the boundlessness of God's power, and of the certainty that all his ordinances will be fulfilled. When God's power can be limited, heaven above will no longer be infinite; and the mighty waters, the foundations of the earth may be fathomed. But the scriptures plainly teach us that the power and wisdom of God, the heights of Heaven, and the depths of the waters under the Earth are[202] alike unfathomable; and no true philosophy ever avers, nor ever did nor ever can aver, a single fact to the contrary.

In all the religions of the Earth the words "up" and "above" are associated with a region of peace and happiness. Heaven is always spoken of as above the Earth. The scriptures invariable convey the same idea:—

Deut. xxvi., 15—“Look down from Thy holy habitation, from Heaven, and bless Thy people Israel.”

We saw these verses early on in the series.

Exodus xix., 20—“And the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai.”

Psalms cii., 19—“For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary: from Heaven did the Lord behold the Earth.”

Isaiah lxiii., 15—“Look down from Heaven, and behold from the habitation of Thy holiness and of Thy glory.”

Psalms ciii., 11—“For as the Heaven is high above the Earth.”

2 Kings ii., 11—“And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven.”

Mark xvi., 10—“So then after the Lord had spoken unto them he was received up into Heaven.”

Luke xxiv., 51—“And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven.”

[203]

If the Earth is a globe revolving at the rate of above a thousand miles an hour all this

language of scripture is necessarily fallacious. The terms “up” and “down,” and “above” and “below,” are words without meaning, at best are merely relative—indicative of no absolute or certain direction. That which is “up” at noon-day, is directly “down” at midnight. Heaven can only be spoken of as “above,” and the scriptures can only be read correctly for a single moment out of the twenty-four hours; for before the sentence “Heaven is high above the Earth” could be uttered, the speaker would be descending from the meridian where Heaven was above him, and his eye although unmoved would be fixed upon a point millions of miles away from his first position. Hence in all the ceremonials of religion, where the hands and eyes are raised upwards to Heaven, nay when Christ himself “lifted up his eyes to Heaven and said, Father, the hour is come,” his gaze would be sweeping along the firmament at rapidly varying angles, and with such incomprehensible velocity that a fixed point of observation, and a definite position, as indicating the seat or throne of “Him that sitteth in the Heavens” would be an impossibility.

*Again: the religious world have always believed and meditated upon the word “Heaven” as representing an infinite region of joy and safety, of[204] rest and happiness unspeakable; as “the place of God’s residence, the dwelling place of angels and the blessed; the true palace of God, entirely separated from the impurities and imperfections, the alterations and changes of the lower world; where He reigns in eternal peace. * * It is the sacred mansion of light, and joy, and glory.[45]” But if there is a plurality of worlds, millions upon millions, nay, an “infinity of worlds,” if the universe is filled with innumerable systems of burning suns, and rapidly revolving planets, intermingled with rushing comets and whirling satellites, all dashing and sweeping through space in directions, and with velocities surpassing all human comprehension, and terrible even to contemplate, where is the place of rest and safety? Where is the true and unchangeable “palace of God?” In what direction is Heaven to be found? Where is the liberated human soul to find its home—its refuge from change and motion, from uncertainty and danger? Is it to wander for ever in a labyrinth of rolling worlds? To struggle for ever in a never ending maze of revolving suns and systems? To be never at rest, but for ever seeking to avoid some vortex of attraction—some whirlpool of gravitation? The belief in the existence of Heaven, as a region of peace and harmony[205] “extending (above the Earth) through all extent,” and beyond the influence of natural laws and restless elements, is jeopardised, if not destroyed, by a false and usurping astronomy, which has no better foundation than human conceit and presumption. If this ill-founded, unsupported philosophy is admitted by the religious mind, it can no longer say that—*

*“Far above the sun, and stars, and skies,
In realms of endless light and love,
My Father’s mansion lies.”*

[45]Cruden’s Concordance, article “Heaven.”

The modern theoretical astronomy affirms that the Moon is a solid opaque, non-luminous body; that it is, in fact, nothing less than a material world. It has even been mapped out into continents, islands, seas, lakes, volcanoes, &c., &c. The nature of its atmosphere and character of its productions and possible inhabitants have been discussed with as much freedom as though our philosophers were quite as familiar with it as they are with the different objects and localities upon Earth. The light, too, with which the Moon so beautifully illuminates the firmament is declared to be only borrowed—to be only the light of the Sun intercepted and reflected upon the Earth. These doctrines are not only opposed by a formidable array of well-ascertained facts (as given in previous sections), [go back and look at his previous sections] but they are totally denied by the scriptures. The Sun and[206] Moon and Stars are never referred to as worlds, but simply as lights to rule alternately in the firmament.

*Genesis i., 14, 16—“And God said let there be lights in the firmament of the Heaven to divide the day from the night. * * * And God made two great lights—the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.”*

Psalms cxxxvi., [136] 7, 9—“O give thanks to Him that made great lights: the Sun to rule by day, the Moon and Stars to rule by night.”

Jeremiah, xxxi., 35—“The Sun is given for a light by day, and the ordinances of the Moon and of the Stars for a light by night.”

Ezekiel, xxxii., 7, 8—“I will cover the Sun with a cloud; and the Moon shall not give her light.” “All the bright lights of Heaven will I make dark over thee.”

Psalms cxlviii., 3—“Praise him Sun and Moon, praise him all ye Stars of light.”

Isaiah xiii., 10—“The Sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the Moon shall not cause her light to shine.”

Matthew xxiv., 29—“Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the Sun be

darkened, and the Moon shall not give her light.”

*Isaiah ix., 19, 20—“The Sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall[207] the Moon give light unto thee. * * Thy Sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy Moon withdraw itself.”*

Psalms cxxxvi., 7 to 9—“To him that made great lights, the Sun to rule by day, the Moon and Stars to rule by night.”

Job xxv., 5—“Behold even to the Moon, and it shineth not.”

Ecclesiastes xii., 2—“While the Sun, or the light, or the Moon, or the Stars be not darkened.”

Isaiah xxx., 26—“The light of the Moon shall be as the light of the Sun; and the light of the Sun shall be sevenfold.”

Deuteronomy xxxiii., 14—“And for the precious fruits brought forth by the Sun, and for the precious things put forth by the Moon.”

In the very first of the passages above quoted the doctrine is enunciated that various distinct and independent lights were created. But that two great lights were specially called into existence for the purpose of ruling the day and the night. The Sun and the Moon are declared to be these great and alternately ruling lights. Nothing is here said, nor is it in any other part of scripture said, that the Sun is a great light, and that the Moon shines only by reflection. The Sun is called the “greater light to rule the day,” and the Moon the “lesser light to rule the night.” Although of these two “great lights” one is[208] less than the other, each is declared to shine with its own light. Hence in Deuteronomy, c. 33, v. 14, it is affirmed that certain fruits are specially brought forth by the influence of the Sun’s light, and that certain other productions are “put forth by the Moon.” That the light of the sun is influential in encouraging the growth of certain natural products; and that the light of the Moon has a distinct influence in promoting the increase of certain other natural substances, is a matter well known to those who are familiar with horticultural and agricultural phenomena; and it is abundantly proved by chemical evidence that the two lights are distinct in character and in action upon various elements. This distinction is beautifully preserved throughout the sacred scriptures. In no single instance are the two lights confounded. On the contrary, in the New Testament, Paul affirms with authority, that “there is one glory of the Sun, and

another glory of the Moon, and another glory of the Stars.”

The same fact of the difference in the two lights, and their independence of each other is maintained in the scriptures to the last. “The Sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the Moon became as blood.” If the Moon is only a reflector, the moment the Sun becomes black her surface will be blackened also, and not remain[209] as blood, while the Sun is dark and black as sackcloth of hair!

Again: the modern system of astronomy teaches that this earth cannot possibly receive light from the Stars, because of their supposed great distance from it: that the fixed Stars are only burning spheres, or Sun’s to their own systems of planets and satellites: and that their light terminates, or no longer produces an active luminosity at the distance of nearly two thousand millions of miles. Here again the scriptures affirm the contrary doctrine.

Genesis i., 16-17—“He made the Stars also; and God set them in the firmament to give light upon the earth.”

Isaiah xiii., 10—“For the Stars of Heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light.”

Ezekiel xxxii., 7—“I will cover the Heaven, and make the Stars thereof dark.”

Joel ii., 10—“The Sun and the Moon shall be dark, and the Stars shall withdraw their shining.”

Psalms cxlviii., 3—“Praise him Sun and Moon: promise him all ye Stars of Light.”

Jeremiah xxxi., 35—“Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the Sun for a light by day; and the ordinances of the Moon and of the Stars for a light by night.”

[210]

Daniel xii., 3—“They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the Stars for ever and ever.”

These quotations place it beyond doubt that the Stars were made expressly to shine in the firmament, and “to give light upon the Earth.” In addition to this language of

scripture, we have the evidence of our own eyes that the Stars give abundant light. "What beautiful star-light!" is a common expression: and we all remember the difference between a dark and starless night, and one when the firmament is as it were studded with brilliant luminaries. Travellers inform us that in many parts of the world, where the sky is clear and free from clouds and vapours for weeks together, the Stars appear both larger and brighter than they do in England; and that their light is sufficiently intense to enable them to read and write, and to travel with safety through the most dangerous places.

If it be true that the Stars and the Planets are not simply lights, as the scriptures affirm them to be, but magnificent worlds, for the most part much larger than this earth, then it is a very proper question to ask—"are they inhabited?" If the answer be in the affirmative, it is equally proper to inquire "have the first parents in each world been tempted?" If so, "have they[211] fallen?" if so, "Have they required redemption?" And "have they been redeemed?" "Has each world had a separate Redeemer? or has Christ been the Redeemer for every world in the universe?" And if so, "did His suffering and crucifixion on this Earth suffice for the redemption of the fallen inhabitants of all other worlds? Or had He to suffer and die in each world successively? Did the fall of Adam in this world involve in his guilt the inhabitants of all other worlds? Or was the baneful influence of Satan confined to the first parents of this Earth? If so, why so? and if not, why not? But, and if, and why, and again—but it is useless thus to ponder! The Christian philosopher must be confounded! If his religion be to him a living reality, he will turn with loathing or spurn with indignation and disgust, as he would a poisonous reptile, a system of astronomy which creates in his mind so much confusion and uncertainty! But as the system which necessitates such doubts and difficulties has been shown to be purely theoretical; and to have not the slightest foundation in fact, the religious mind has really no cause for apprehension. Not a shadow of doubt remains that this World is the only one created; that the sacred Scriptures contain, in addition to religious and moral doctrines, a true and consistent philosophy; that they were written for[212] the good of mankind, at the direct instigation of God himself; and that all their teachings and promises are truthful, consistent, and reliable. Whoever holds the contrary conclusion is the victim of an arrogant false astronomy, of an equally false and presumptuous geology, or a suicidal method of reasoning—a logic which never demands a proof of its premises, and which therefore leads to conclusions which are contrary to nature, to human experience, and to the direct teaching of God's word, and therefore contrary to the deepest and most lasting interests of humanity. "God has spoken to man in two voices, the voice of inspiration [the Bible] and the voice of nature. By man's ignorance they have been made to disagree; but the time will come, and

cannot be far distant, when these two languages will strictly accord; when the science of nature will no longer contradict the science of scripture.”[46]

[46]Professor Hunt.

Cui Bono.—“Of all terrors to the generous soul, that Cui bono is the one to be the most zealously avoided. Whether it be proposed to find the magnetic point, or a passage impossible to be utilised if discovered, or a race of men of no good to any human institution extant, and of no good to themselves; or to seek the Unicorn in Madagascar, and when we had found him not[213] to be able to make use of him; or the great central plateau of Australia, where no one could live for centuries to come; or the great African lake, which, for all the good it would do us English folk might as well be in the Moon; or the source of the Nile, the triumphant discovery of which would neither lower the rents nor take off the taxes anywhere—whatever it is, the Cui bono is always a weak and cowardly argument: essentially short-sighted too, seeing that, according to the law of the past, by which we may always safely predicate the future, so much falls into the hands of the seeker, for which he was not looking, and of which he never even knew the existence. The area of the possible is very wide still, and very insignificant and minute, the angle we have staked out and marked impossible. What do we know of the powers which nature has yet in reserve, of the secrets she has still untold, the wealth still concealed? Every day sees new discoveries in the sciences we can investigate at home. What, then, may not lie waiting for the explorers abroad? Weak and short-sighted commercially, the cui bono is worse than both, morally. When we remember the powerful manhood, the patience, unselfishness, courage, devotion, and nobleness of aim which must accompany a perilous enterprise, and which form so great an example, and so heart-stirring[214] to the young and to the wavering, it is no return to barbaric indifference to life to say, better indeed a few deaths for even a commercially useless enterprise—better a few hearths made desolate, and a few wives and mothers left to bear their stately sorrow to the end of time, that the future may rejoice and be strong: better a thousand failures, and a thousand useless undertakings, than the loss of national manhood or the weakening of the national fibre. Quixotism is a folly when the energy which might have achieved conquests over misery and wrong, if rightfully applied, is wasted in fighting windmills; but to forego any great enterprise for fear of the dangers attending, or to check a grand endeavour by the cui bono of ignorance and moral scepticism, is worse than a folly—it is baseness, and a cowardice.[47]”

[47]Daily News of April 5, 1865.

The above quotation is an excellent general answer to all those who may, in reference to the subject of this work, or to anything which is not of immediate worldly interest, obtrude the cui bono? But as a special reply it may be claimed for the subject of these pages—

First,—It is more edifying, more satisfactory, and in every sense far better that we should know the true and detect the false. Thereby the mind becomes fixed, established upon an eternal[215] foundation, and no longer subject to those waverings and changes, those oscillations and fluctuations which are ever the result of falsehood. To know the truth and to embody it in our lives and purposes our progress must be safe and rapid, and almost unlimited in extent. None can say to what it may lead or where it may culminate. Who shall dare to set bounds to the capabilities of the mind, or to fix a limit to human progress? Whatever may be the destiny of the human race truth alone will help and secure its realisation.

Second,—Having detected the fundamental falsehoods of modern astronomy, and discovered that the Earth is a plane, and motionless, and the only material world in existence, we are able to demonstrate the actual character of the Universe. In doing this we are enabled to prove that all the so-called arguments with which so many scientific but irreligious men have assailed the scriptures, are absolutely false; have no foundation except in their own astronomical and geological theories, which being demonstrably fallacious, they fall to the ground as valueless. They can no longer be wielded as weapons against religion. If used at all it can only be that their weakness and utter worthlessness will be exposed. Atheism and every other form of Infidelity are thus rendered helpless. Their sting is cut away,[216] and their poison dissipated. The irreligious philosopher can no longer obtrude his theories as things proved wherewith to test the teachings of scripture. He must now himself be tested. He must be forced to demonstrate his premises, a thing which he has never yet attempted; and if he fails in this respect his impious vanity, self-conceit and utter disregard of justice, will become so clearly apparent that his presence in the ranks of science will no longer be tolerated. All theory must be put aside, and the questions at issue must be decided by independent and practical evidence. This has been done. The process—the modus operandi, and the conclusions derived therefrom have been given in the early sections of this work. They are entirely consonant with the teachings of scripture. The scriptures are therefore literally true, and must henceforth either alone or in conjunction with practical science be used as a standard by which to test the truth or falsehood of every system which does or may hereafter exist. Philosophy is no longer to be employed as a test of scriptural truth, but the scriptures may and ought to be the test of all philosophy. Not

that they are to be used as a test of philosophy simply because they are thought or believed to be the word of God, but because their literal teachings in regard to science and natural phenomena, are demonstrably[217] correct. It is quite as faulty and unjust for the religious devotee to urge the scriptures against the theories of the philosopher simply because he believes them to be true, as it is for the philosopher to urge his theories against the scriptures only because he disbelieves the one and believes the other. The whole matter must be taken out of the region of belief and disbelief. The Christian will be strengthened and his mind more completely satisfied by having it in his power to demonstrate that the scriptures are philosophically true, than he could possibly be by the simple belief in their validity, unsupported by practical evidence.

Stop. I'm out of time. But I want you to know that I receive this myself as a correction and even as a rebuke. He is saying that the chapters in his book that deal with nature, the eclipses, the tides, etc., we who believe the Bible as the Word of God - should be able to give an answer to these questions - and not merely state that we believe only because the Bible says so. I have not read Rowbotham's entire book. I will. I'm going to go back and read all of his answers to questions regarding natural phenomena - from the perspective that the Bible is true - and I will give answers as to why the Bible is true.

Well, that's not going to happen today. I'm out of time. I've only got two pages left in Rowbotham's conclusion. The plan will be to finish those, next week.