

## Message# 312\_11-10-2024 – In the Beginning

Preached first on 11/10/2024 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

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

Why Samuel Rowbotham? Why read extensively from a man's book, which really, the last chapter is hardly extensively, instead of reading from the Scriptures, alone? In this series, I have read a lot of Scripture. With the exception of just a few things, I've pretty much covered the things that the Bible speaks about in regards to God's Created world. Samuel Rowbotham, if you will, is a second witness. The man was from the 1800s, forgot more about natural phenomena than I'll ever know. He started studying and experimenting natural phenomena at a young age - and then spent the rest of life studying and experimenting. And - he did so from the perspective - that the Bible is correct - and anything and everyone that argues against, or does not agree with the Bible as the starting point, the foundation, the basis of any of their theories - is not to be relied upon for truth. Exactly what I've been saying for years.

So once again. Like I have been saying for years - not just since I started on Missouri Liberty Radio 6 and a half years ago - I've been preaching for more than 40 years now - a man's perceptive will determine what he believes about the Bible. And for his conclusions, then, for how he is supposed to live his life.

I was looking at an obituary of a “preacher” that I once knew - all the way back in the 1970s and 1980s - he had died recently. I did not know this particular fact about this “preacher” but I was not the least bit surprised when I read it. Before this man became a “preacher” he had been in the u.s. military. As such, he had sworn an oath to fight for the u.s. and for the u.s. CONstitution. There was no mention of him ever renouncing that oath. I also did not know, until I myself went to “Bible college” that lots of the men that I went to “Bible college” with - were having their college paid for because they had been in the military. To this day, I have never heard of or known of a single one of them renouncing their oaths and repenting of their “service” to the u.s. and the u.s. CONstitution.

I know, after seeing this for my entire life, people that have been in the military - with the exception of exactly one man that I know - surely there are more - but I know of exactly one man who has repented of swearing that oath and has repented of being in the u.s. military. One - just one. But what I have seen in my lifetime of more than 60 years - is that people that have been in the military - remain loyal to their “service” and

to their oath. Even though Jesus Christ said - as plain as day - "Swear not" - they never recognize what they have done as things that dishonor Christ and the God of the Bible.

"This CONstitution, and our laws, and our treaties, and our statutes, and our ordinances, and our public policies, and our way of life that we died for, shed our blood for, fought and died for - shall be the supreme law of the land."

That is nothing less than a man sticking his fist in the face of Christ, in the face of God and saying - exactly what the jews did in the first century - "We will not have this man to reign over us, and, whosoever... very quickly, turn to John chapter 19 this morning and read, beginning in verse 1. The trial and ultimate condemnation of Jesus Christ.

[1] Then Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged Him.

[2] And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on His head, and they put on Him a purple robe,

[3] And said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote Him with their hands.

[4] Pilate therefore went forth again, and saith unto them, Behold, I bring Him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in Him.

Huh, really Pilate? I'm amazed at how many people point to those words of Pilate without ever considering what Pilate had just allowed to happen to Jesus. A crown of thorns? They beat Him with their hands. They mocked Him with the purple robe and calling Him - mockingly - King of the Jews? Then, you bring Him out in front of the people and declare, "I find no fault in Him?" Huh. So you allow all of this to happen to an innocent man? You bring out a bloody and beaten man, mocked with a crown of thorns pressed into his head and a bloody purple robe to an angry mob - then you say, "I find no fault in Him." That's ridiculous. Pilate was as guilty as can be. Complicit with every bit of it. Pilate knew exactly what he was doing and it was all about protecting himself from Rome.

[5] Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man!

[6] When the chief priests therefore and officers saw Him, they cried out, saying, Crucify Him, crucify Him. Pilate saith unto them, Take ye Him, and crucify Him: for I find no fault in Him.

[7] The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because he made Himself the Son of God.

[8] When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid;

[9] And went again into the judgment hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art Thou? But Jesus gave him no answer.

This does go to somewhat of a description of Pilate being conflicted. Pilate's entire conversation with Jesus was about Jesus calling Himself King. Something that is most certainly lost in the conversation today. Pilate - in trying to make a decision between Jesus and Rome - the power of Jesus versus the power of Rome - wanted Jesus to tell him that if Pilate sided with Him - would Jesus then use His power against Rome?

[10] Then saith Pilate unto Him, Speakest Thou not unto me? knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and have power to release Thee?

[11] Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against Me, except it were given thee from above: therefore He that delivered Me unto thee hath the greater sin.

[12] And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release Him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this Man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh Himself a king speaketh against Caesar.

To say that people in the world today do not refer to men's little g "governments" as "Caesar" - as in their most famous quote of all - "Render unto Caesar" when demanding that people submit to and obey men's little g "governments" would be to say one of the most foolish things that a man could say today. 99.9999% of people in the world today - equate their "government" symbolically as "Caesar."

Today, if a man, woman boy or girl chooses to live their life as if Jesus Christ is King - that individual will be declared as an enemy of "Caesar" - and pretty much the entire world would be in agreement with that conclusion. Yet here we see the trial of Jesus Christ - with the final condemnation was,

"Whosoever maketh Himself a king speaketh against Caesar."

And the same would say, "Whosoever saith that Jesus is King, is not the friend of Caesar." One of the most cringeworthy statements, in my opinion, and I hear all the time, hardly a day doesn't go by where I do not hear the phrase "the powers that be" in reference to men's little g "governments." And, of course, the horribly taught message of the "churchmen" as they feebly, deceptively convince the masses that Romans 13 refers to "Caesar" as "the powers that be" - then magically transferring an understanding of the purely Biblical phrase - "the powers that be" - to anything then

that would refer to itself as “government.” I dare say that it is the height of blasphemy to refer to anything other than the Government of King Jesus as “the powers that be.” The “powers that be” is a purely Biblical, sacred phrase that refers to the exclusive Kingship of Jesus Christ over God's Creation and for anyone to state otherwise proves that he is a lying deceiver.

Yet, the “pulpits of the churches” are filled with men and probably women who have been in the “armies of Caesars” all around the world. Men and women who have never renounced their oath to the Caesars - and from that perspective, from that paradigm - trick and deceive naive people into believing they teach the truth of God's Word. What I'm saying is that anyone who claims to preach the Word of God from that perspective - doesn't have a chance of teaching, of rightly dividing the Word of truth.

I do not agree with everything Samuel Rowbotham said. But I give him far more credibility as to his study and his experiments because of his publicly stated, publicly avowed belief that the Word of God, the teachings of the Bible, the teachings of Christ are the basis, the foundation, for his research and his conclusions as they relate to natural phenomena.

While on the other hand, those that stand for modern astronomy today - and modern astronomy as Rowbotham called it all the way back in the 1800s - the great majority of them - the ones who wield the most influence in the world today - open state that their “study of the 'universe'” causes them to conclude, “there is no God.”

And listen now, if citing their own words - “there is no God” - then attacking their teachings because of that - is a “straw man” - then so be it. It was God Who said,

“The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God. They are not to be trusted. Their lying lips are corrupt and they do abominable things.”

As I have said many times now - for every natural phenomena a man wants to discuss - whether it be eclipses or tides or seasons, or what have you - the globe believers say, “This can only be seen on a globe.” Then, for the exact same phenomena, the “flat-earthers” say, “This can only be seen on a flat, non-rotating, stationary world.” For everything you want to talk about - there are two completely opposite points of view. Two completely opposite conclusions. When that's the case, I'm yielding to the Authority of Scripture every single time.

No, the Bible doesn't use the phrase "flat earth." Neither does it say "spinning ball." But there's more language, there's more descriptions found in the Word of God that oppose modern astronomy than there are those that agree with modern astronomy. There's not one single verse in the whole Bible that points to a "spinning ball earth." Not one. Samuel Rowbotham uses Scripture after Scripture to try to prove his points. And yes, I see how he - in my opinion - maybe due to his zealousness which I certainly am not going to criticize - but he does use some Scripture that I say is a stretch. And that's okay. Take all that away, and there's still a lot of Scripture that would lead us to a non-rotating, non-revolving, non-spherical world.

From Wikipedia, using the title "Spherical Earth." And again, this is history now, so only God knows whether this is even true or not. But here goes.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spherical\\_Earth#:~:text=The%20earliest%20documented%20mention%20of,and%20calculated%20the%20Earth's%20circumference.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spherical_Earth#:~:text=The%20earliest%20documented%20mention%20of,and%20calculated%20the%20Earth's%20circumference.)

*The earliest documented mention of the concept [the spherical earth] dates from around the 5th century BC, when it appears in the writings of Greek philosophers.[3][4] In the 3rd century BC, Hellenistic astronomy established the roughly spherical shape of Earth as a physical fact and calculated the Earth's circumference. This knowledge was gradually adopted throughout the Old World during Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.[5][6][7][8] A practical demonstration of Earth's sphericity was achieved by Ferdinand Magellan and Juan Sebastián Elcano's circumnavigation (1519–1522).[9]*

*The concept of a spherical Earth displaced earlier beliefs in a flat Earth:*

Earlier beliefs by who? Well, again, if you believe history, prior to the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. - and funny thing about that is that other "historians" say that it (the spherical earth theory) didn't come onto the scene until the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. Ok. So who then believed in this supposed "flat-earth theory" - better stated non-rotating, non-revolving, stationary plane? Well, that would put Abraham in that time period prior to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. The Bible puts Abraham roughly 42 generations before Christ. Calling a generation 40 years - that puts Abraham at roughly 1680 years before Christ. According to the historians - who else would have been in the time frame of history prior to the belief in the "spherical earth"? Well, David was approximately 28 generations before Christ - that puts him squarely in that ignorant age of "flat earth." Job certainly. Isaiah certainly. Jeremiah certainly. Joshua absolutely.

According to most - and that certainly doesn't make it right - Malachi was the last prophet to write in the last 39 books of our Bibles. Some believe that he was around 500 B.C. Malachi being on the fringe of an era - that would put every other Bible character in that “ignorant age” where people did not believe in a “spinning ball earth”.

Ok. So call me an idiot. Call me a simpleton. That's okay - I'll give everything I have in life to be able to stand with the likes of Abraham, Joshua and David. Call these last comments exegesis if you want to - I don't care. I believe that God inspired Job to record that the waters are encompassed with a border and His earth is turned like clay to a seal. God caused Joshua to record that the sun stood still, the moon stood still. If those things caused the people of the age before the Greeks to believe in a non-rotating, non-revolving, stationary plane - then that's where I'll take my stand. The Wikipedia article continues.

*In early Mesopotamian mythology, the world was portrayed as a disk floating in the ocean with a hemispherical sky-dome above,[10] and this forms the premise for early world maps like those of Anaximander and Hecataeus of Miletus. Other speculations on the shape of Earth include a seven-layered ziggurat or cosmic mountain, alluded to in the Avesta and ancient Persian writings (see seven climes). [Which I don't care about.]*

*The realization that the figure of the Earth is more accurately described as an ellipsoid dates to the 17th century, as described by Isaac Newton in Principia. In the early 19th century, the flattening of the earth ellipsoid was determined to be of the order of 1/300 (Delambre, Everest). The modern value as determined by the US DoD World Geodetic System since the 1960s is close to 1/298.25.[11]*

What does “history” say people believed before the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.? It says they did not believe in a “spinning ball”. And who did they say began the “spherical earth” theory? The Greeks. And again, who did Paul warn Christians against? He warned against the “wisdom of the Greeks.” And specifically, according to Mr. Thayer, who forgot more about the history of the Greeks than I'll ever know - specifically said the “wisdom of the Greeks” referenced Euclidean geometry.

<https://www.blueletterbible.org/lexicon/g4747/kjv/tr/0-1/>

**4. the elements, rudiments, primary and fundamental principles (cf. our 'alphabet' or 'a b c') of any art, science, or discipline; e. g. of mathematics, as in the title of Euclid's well-known work, The Elements.**

For goodness sake, brethren, Paul warned about the elements of the world - and Euclid's well-known work - which everyone in the first century would have known about, was titled, The Elements. I don't think it takes too much to understand this.

The elements of the world is not exclusive to Euclid's geometry, it can mean more than that, but that is one of the main things that Mr. Thayer put in his commentary.

Now, I'll be the first one to say that what people believed in the 1800s about the Bible - should be questioned. Just like the beliefs of every generation. There was a lot of futurism popping up in the 1800s. We know that futurism is wrong, it is not Biblical. And I go so far as to say it's a denial of Christ. So we throw out what we know is wrong - and if we find truth - we build on it.

With that said, here's the rest of Rowbotham's final chapter, Cui Bono, "who has the most to gain?"

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

When we finished last weekend, we ended with two bullet points that Rowbotham made and I think they are excellent. They lead into his next statement, so, I want to read those two points again, then, we'll go right on in to his final statements.

*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.*

Let me stop here for just a minute. In this series, I have presented several things, I think you could say the main things that astronomers have said - they have said - their words - not mine - that they say "what they see in the universe, tells them there is no God." The main thing is that they say it is the sun that is sitting still, and the "earth" as they call it - is the one moving. The Bible says the sun is the one moving. And not just in Joshua chapter 10. In the 230+ other passages of Scripture where the Bible talks about the sun, it uses language that means motion. In almost every passage in our Bibles that references the sun, it uses language that tells us to believe that the sun is moving.

Psalm 19:1-6:

[1] The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.

This is a sidenote, but one of the detractors to this series sent me an email several months ago and I took as mocking the firmament. Sad, so sad. And I think I recall him saying something like "your firmament." It's not my firmament. It's God's firmament. It's Bible and I'd say it's Bible 101. You don't believe in the firmament? That is deeply concerning, to say the least.

[2] Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge.

[3] There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.

[4] Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,

[5] Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.

[6] His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.

So this is all symbolic language? It's all figurative? Of course it is. But if the language is not based in natural phenomena then why did God use the language He did? "Well, it's because He was talking to these people according to their understanding of the day." Well, friends, their understanding of the day came from Him. He told them what to write. These words are not their own. The Bible is not what some men wrote based on their own understanding. "Jesus wasn't getting them" like He seems to be today. All of the language here that is referencing the sun uses movement to describe it. If this isn't



true, God could have just as easily told them to write something else.

Their line is gone out through all the earth.

Why not “their arc is gone out through all the earth?”

Their words to the end of the world.

Where is the end on a ball? A ball doesn't have an end. And notice the different uses of the words earth and world here. The earth is measured with a straight, level line. The ends of the world - that's the water and the land. The world is the water and the land. The earth is not the “globe.” It is Biblically incorrect to refer to the water and the land together as the “earth.”

The irreligious men - and using the word religion in the most Biblically correct way possible - are the ones who have assailed the Scriptures. That's the way it was in Rowbotham's 1800s - that's the way it is today - and it's the way it's always been.

The fact that it is the sun that is moving and not the world - should bring people like Neil DeGrasse-Tyson and those of his ilk, it should bring them down. Rowbotham continues:

*They can no longer be wielded as weapons against religion.*

And again, using the word religion in the most Biblical sense.

*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.*

And again, I understand what he's saying. I get it. But I am so deeply committed and steadfastly confident in the Word of God - I do not need practical evidence in order to believe the Scriptures. I told you about a little video that took with an iPhone of a star that is supposed to be - I think something like 1.5 lightyears away - I don't remember exactly what they said - but it is supposedly trillions of miles away - and I took video of it from my iPhone. Practical evidence - what I see with my own eyes tells me that star is small and near. I'm not looking at something that has already burned out millions of years ago but it's light is just now reaching the sky. My senses don't tell me I'm spinning at more than 1,000 miles an hour and rotating again more than 66.6 thousand miles an hour around the sun. In order to believe that, I have to accept the wisdom of the Greeks - and that - I'm not going to do. Rowbotham continued.

*On the other hand the Atheist who is met by the Christian upon purely scientific grounds, and who is not belaboured with enunciations of what his antagonist believes, will be led to listen and to pay more regard and respect to the reasons advanced than he could possibly concede to the purely religious argument, or to an argument founded upon faith alone.*

This is another one of the very few things that I would like to have discussed with Rowbotham. The Scriptures tell us

For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged

sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

I've seen firsthand the power of the Word of God change grown men's lives. Cause grown men and women to completely commit to a lifestyle that is totally opposite of that which the world has declared to be normal. I've seen grown men brought to their knees yielding their lives to the Kingship of Jesus Christ - on nothing other than - the preaching of the Word of God. I'm not going to apologize to the atheist for his denial of the Word of God - nor do I find it acceptable to excuse the atheist because I can't convince him that his understanding of an eclipse is not based on the perspective of a flat, non-spinning, non-rotating earth. As I keep saying - over and over - for each natural phenomena you want to discuss - the globe believer has his belief and states, "This can only happen on a globe." For the same exact natural phenomena, the flat-earthier says, "This can only happen on a 'flat earth'." It's theory. It's all theory. No one has ever seen the "globe." No one has ever taken a photo of the "flat-earth." And if it could be done - surely in the age in which we live - where scientists claim to be able to see so far - they can "see the past" - they should be able to turn their cameras around and zoom in on Australia and show people walking upside down. They should be able to zoom in on America and see people walking sideways.

By faith we understand that God made the world.

I'm not criticizing Rowbotham - just seeing things a little bit differently. He continues:

*If it can be shown to the atheistical philosopher that his astronomical and geological theories are fallacious, and that all the expressions in the scriptures which have reference to natural phenomena are literally true, he will of necessity be led to admit that, apart from all other considerations, if the philosophy of the scriptures is demonstrably correct, then possibly[218] their spiritual and moral teachings may also be true;*

Let me stop again. Rowbotham is operating on the assumption that the atheist is somehow an honest man. That's not what God said. The Scriptures say that the fool is left to his folly. The man that says there is no God is altogether corrupt. The atheist, no matter how sincere Rowbotham was in reaching - may be beyond reach. I would never ever tell someone not to try. Never would I do that. But at some point, we need to understand the principle of casting our pearls before swine. I would much rather spend what time I have left in trying to reach people that already believe, that claim to

believe, that publicly declare that they believe the Bible to be the inspired Word of God. We have a foundation, a firm foundation to work off of.

*and if so, they may and indeed must have had a divine origin; and if so they are truly the “word of God,” and after all, religion is a grand reality; and the theories which speculative adventurous philosophers have advanced are nothing better than treacherous quicksands into which many of the deepest thinkers have been engulfed and lost. By this process many highly intelligent minds have been led to desert the ranks of Atheism and to rejoin the army of Christian soldiers and devotees.*

[If he saw that in his life, thank God.]

*Many have rejoiced almost beyond expression that the subject of the Earth’s true form and position in the universe had ever been brought under their notice; and doubtless great numbers will yet be induced to return to that allegiance which plain demonstrable truth demands and deserves. To induce numbers of earnest thinking human beings to leave the rebellious cause of Atheism and false philosophy; to return to a full recognition of the beauty and truthfulness of the scriptures, and to a participation in the joy and satisfaction which religion can alone supply, is a grand and cheering result, and one which furnishes the noblest possible answer to the ever ready “Cui Bono.”*

*In addition to the numerous quotations which have been given from sacred scriptures, and[219] proved to be true and consistent, it may be useful briefly to refer to the following difficulties which have been raised by the scientific objectors to scriptural authority:—“As the earth is a globe, and as all its vast collections of water—its oceans, lakes, &c., are sustained by the earthy crust beneath them, and as beneath this ‘crust of the earth’ everything is in a red-hot molten condition to what place could the excess of waters retire which are said in the scriptures to have overwhelmed the whole world? It could not sink into the centre of the earth, for the fire is there so intense that the whole would be rapidly volatilised, and driven away as vapour. It could not evaporate, for when the atmosphere is charged with watery vapour beyond a certain degree it begins to condense and throw back the water in the form of rain; so that the waters of the flood could not sink from the earth’s surface, nor remain in the atmosphere; therefore if the earth had ever been deluged at all, it would have remained so to this day. But as it is not universally flooded so it never could have been, and the account given in the scriptures is false.” All this specious reasoning is founded upon the assumption that the earth is a globe: this doctrine, however, being false, all the difficulties quickly vanish. The earth being “founded on the seas” would be as readily cleared of its*

*superfluous[220] water as would the deck of a ship on emerging from a storm. Or as a rock in the ocean would be cleared after the raging waves which for a time overwhelmed it had subsided.*

*“Thou coveredst the Earth with the deep as with a garment; the waters stood above the mountains. At thy rebuke they fled; and at the voice of thy thunder they hasted away ... down by the valleys unto the place which thou hast founded for them.”[48]*

[48]Psalm civ.

*“Thou didst cleave the Earth with rivers; and the overflowing of the waters passed by; and the deep uttered his voice and lifted up his hands on high.”[49]*

[49]Hab. iii. 9-10.

*The surface of the Earth standing above the level of the surrounding seas, the waters of the flood would simply and naturally run down by the valleys and rivers into the “great deep,”—into which “the waters returned from off the earth continually ... until the tenth month, and on the first day of the month were the tops of the mountains seen.”[50]*

[50]Gen. viii. 2-5.

*Again; as the Earth is a Globe and in continual motion, how could Jesus on being “taken up into an exceedingly high mountain see all the kingdoms of the world, in a moment of time?” Or, when “He cometh [and I'll just for clarity sake go ahead and change that to say -] When He came with clouds and every eye [saw] him,” how could it be possible, [221] seeing that at least twenty-four hours would elapse before every part of the Earth would be turned to the same point? But it has been demonstrated that the Earth is a Plane and motionless, and that from a great eminence every part of its surface could be seen at once; and, at once—at the same moment, could every eye behold Him, when “coming in a cloud with power and great glory.”*

And that concludes the final chapter to Samuel Rowbotham's work, Zetetic Astronomy: Earth not a Globe!

I wish that people would understand why I did this series - In the beginning. I am still talking to some people who - even though I have tried to say it every single week - have still missed why I have done what I have done and said what I said.

Modern astronomy - and by that I mean from Copernicus in the 1400 and 1500s - Newton in the 1600s and the 1700s - and even Eratosthenes and Euclid in 300 B.C. if you want to believe history - modern astronomy has led people to conclude - "there is no God." In my lifetime, I've seen such a monumental change in the world. In the 1960s, sure, there was atheism - but mostly we heard it describe "communist Russia" or "communist China". In the 1960s, I don't think I ever even knew about homos or queers. Of course they were there - but they were "in the closet." Fear of being found out. Fear of losing their job. Even Hollywood's queers were "in the closet" for fear of losing their job.

Of course there was "crime" in the 60s. There were murders, there were rapes, there was stealing. But it was either hidden way better than today - or something has happened to make things indescribably worse today than they were back then.

As I look back on my own life, I see how things have gotten worse and worse and worse and - it doesn't seem to be doing anything other - than getting worse. And, it's not just been a gradual thing - lately it has been an exponential thing that we are seeing.

Listen to this, again, from a Wikipedia source.

*A 2007 [17, almost 18 years ago] [Barna group](#) poll found that about 20 million people say they are atheist, have no religious faith, or are agnostic, with 5 million of that number claiming to be atheists. The study also found that "[t]hey tend to be more educated, more affluent and more likely to be male and unmarried than those with active faith" and that "only 6 percent of people over 60 have no faith in God, and one in four adults ages 18 to 22 describe themselves as having no faith." [27]*

More educated. Yes. Indoctrination from the colleges and universities where "science" has convinced them, "there is no God."

If someone can cast doubt on the Genesis account of Creation....we know Genesis is not correct. The "universe" was created 13.7 billion years ago by a "big bang". The sun is 93,000,000 miles away - and is actually quite small compared to all the other "suns" that are out there. The Bible does not say that God created millions and millions of suns. The Bible says God created the sun and the moon and the stars. When we read each verse of Scripture related to each of these, the sun, the moon and the stars, modern astronomy opposes - or as Rowbotham said - modern astronomy assails the Scriptures. The moon is also a light. That's what God said. That's what the Bible says.

But that is not what modern astronomy says. And modern astronomy says the moon is merely a reflector - "we've proven it so, we've been there" [haha] - and if that is true - the Bible is false. If the Bible is false - there is no God. That is what the world, led by their "scientists" have concluded.

"The stars are light-years away." We can't even fathom what they are talking about when they talk about light-years. The closest star they say, is 2.4 lightyears away. That's almost 13 trillion miles. If we traveled at one mile per second - no one has ever or will ever do that - but at one mile per second - it would take 403,000 years - traveling at one mile per second - to get to that star. I'm not even sure if that math is correct. It's so beyond our wildest imagination - but I believe it's meant to be that way. We don't think in ways like that. We're just dumb people who need to yield to the wisdom and intelligence of the scientists who are so smart. Well, friends, I've listened to DeGrasse-Tyson, I've listened to Carl Sagan and others like them and I think they are the ones that are the fools. They are the ones who believe in Santa Claus and the easter bunny and fairytales. They aren't smart. They aren't wise. They are the exact ones that the Bible talks about when it says,

[20] For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

[21] Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

[22] Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

One of the statements that Rowbotham made that really struck me was when he said:

*The Earth a Globe, and it is necessarily demanded that it has a diurnal and an annual and various other motions; for a globular world without motion would be useless—day and night, winter and summer, the half year's light and darkness at the "North Pole," and other phenomena could not be explained by the supposition of rotundity without the assumption also of rapid and constant motion. Hence it is assumed that the Earth and Moon, and all the Planets[180] and their Satellites move in relation to each other, and that the whole move together in different planes round the Sun. The Sun and its "system" of revolving bodies are now assumed to have a general and all-inclusive motion, in common with an endless series of other Suns and systems, around some other and "central Sun" which has been assumed to be the true axis and centre of the*

*Universe! These assumed general motions with the particular and peculiar motions which are assigned to the various bodies in detail, together constitute a system so confused and complicated that it is almost impossible and always difficult of 12 comprehension by the most active and devoted minds.*

I see this. The system of astronomy they have created is so complex and so complicated - most people that look closely at it will just give up and accept it - because they find it too challenging not to. "Those scientists are just so smart. So intelligent." And people would think they would be too embarrassed or be made to feel stupid to go against what these supposed "brilliant" minds have come up with.

I am not going to let someone who says "there is no God" hijack my understanding of God's Creation. Especially when what they teach is not what the Bible teaches.

And ultimately, in my opinion, it all boils down to this.

If the Bible cannot be trusted, then the Bible is not the Word of God. If the Bible is not the Word of God, if the Bible cannot be trusted, then, "there is no God." But friends, that's not the worst of it. Simply saying there is no God or even saying there is a God - that is not what matters most. What matters most is exactly what Carl Sagan said that it all boiled down to - and that is -

"It's just us."

If there is no God, there is no nation of God. If there is no God, there is no Law of God. Men are then free to make their own laws, to make their own "governments", to make their own code of morality. And so what happens is this - no man, then, has a choice. No man can live according to his own conscience. A man must accept the "government" that happens to be in existence in the place of his birth. Then, he either lives as a slave in hopefully a benevolent or somewhat benevolent "government" or - he will live his life as one who feels like he is constantly hunted, as a rebellious slave who left the plantation.

The way of God is this: "Choose you this day whom you will serve. You have two choices. You can serve the God of the Bible and live by His Laws. Or, you can choose the little g "gods" of your fathers." And, as one of the greatest examples we have in our Bibles - if we believe the Bible to be the Word of God - if we believe that the Bible contains the instructions for how we are to live - Joshua said: "As for me and my house,



we will serve the Lord.”

As long as men believe there is no God, as long as men believe that it is perfectly fine for one man or a group of men to make their own laws, to make their own morality, to make their own way of living and then force other men - at gunpoint, if necessary - to live according to their ways - “As for me and my house...” is only available to those who live the life of an “outlaw.” An “outlaw” of course, as defined by those who believe they have the power to force other people to obey them and not God.

I have believed this for a long, long time. And I believe it now more than ever. Genesis chapter 3 - just three chapters into the plan of God for His Creation - God said: “Man is not allowed to make his own 'laws.' Man is not allowed to make his own definitions of good and evil, right and wrong. And, in the day a man believes he can - that is the day he dies.”

I believe in the Government of God. I believe in the Laws of God. I believe in the Nation of God - the Commonwealth of Israel. And my belief in those things has been strengthened by my study for this series - In the beginning.

It is my intention to begin a new series next week. I intend to begin answering questions - as I understand things - as I believe them to be true - “What is it all about?” What are we supposed to do? How are we supposed to believe and live? What does the future have in store for us? Those are all obviously, where the rubber meets the road and I intend on trying to answer those questions beginning next week.