

**THE  
CREATOR  
OF THE  
HEAVENS**

**By**

**Steven E. Behrmann**

# **THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS**

©Steven E. Behrmann

2013

Milo Edition

## Dedication

This book is dedicated to my beautiful and intelligent daughter, Stephanie, who often watches stars and satellites with me, and assists me in various and helpful ways with my astronomy books, seminars and lectures. Many evenings, beginning in her early childhood, and continuing on through her youth, we have lain on our backs out under the starry host and observed with delight the heavenly glories above us.

It is great to have a daughter who shares my interest in the astronomy. Herein is found yet another of the broad purposes found in the creation of the heavens. The common study of them can draw family members and friends together. This blessing has been especially experienced in my life because of my delightful daughter. Stephanie is truly a shining star in my life!

# Table of Contents

<b>Preface .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>What the Bible Says About the Origin of the Heavens and the Earth.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>When Were the Heavens Created?.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Do the Astrophysics of Creation Really Matter? ....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Question Everything.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b><i>Terra Firma</i> .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon, Awesome as the Host .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>The Surprising Structure of Our Local Universe .</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>The Big Bang and Other “Special Creations” .....</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>Hubble’s Rubble .....</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Is There Life on Other Planets?.....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Where is the Center of the Universe? .....</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>The Properties of Light and Color .....</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>The Sabbath and the Heavens.....</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>The Great Wonders of the Heavens .....</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>Appendix A .....</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>242</b>
<b>Appendix C .....</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>Appendix D .....</b>	<b>259</b>
<b>Appendix E.....</b>	<b>264</b>



# Preface

This book is the fourth book in a five-part<sup>1</sup> series dedicated to the study of the heavens. The previous three books (*The Torah of the Heavens*, *Clock of the Heavens*, and *Signs of the Heavens*) were aimed at studying the heavens from a theological or biblical viewpoint. The approach has been philosophical, historical, and religious---but not “scientific.”

However, for some time the author has felt the need to hazard some comments about the science of astronomy in general. The need arises in his heart to collaborate in the effort of “taking back astronomy” for those of a faith/creationist persuasion.

The scientific study of astronomy in our present world seems in no way to be related to biblical religion. For the most part modern culture assumes that the heavens above came about as a result of a cosmic accident. The possibility of a god-related first cause is commonly excluded from the thinking of almost every other modern science as well.

So at the outset, I will define my premise and unashamedly reveal

---

<sup>1</sup> The fifth book, “The Planisphere of the Heavens,” is not so much a book as it is a “planisphere.” A planisphere is a map of the sky. The book is a simple handbook or guide to the sacred names and meanings of the most important stars and constellations viewable in the northern hemisphere.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

my bias. I from the beginning believe in a scheme fundamentally counter to the naturalistic and uniformitarian models of science prevalent today. I believe that the heavens can find no other *raison d'être* than the handiwork of a grand designer. I believe that the most reasonable explanation for what we see is that indeed “God did it,” no matter how odious and distasteful secular scientists find the claim.

So at the very portal of this document let the author offer a direct word to the reader. If the reader does not already believe in at least the possibility that there is a Creator God, then the reading of the following pages will likely be in your view a waste a time. I will not be able to convince you otherwise, nor will I attempt to. You may lay the book down and never take it up again, no matter who gave it to you to read. It is not for you. In a way, I don't want you to read it.

But if you are willing to examine a few pieces of what I believe is powerful evidence that the heavens have a personal creator, then you are invited to read on. It may be that you may find an arrow, a signal, or a sign that might inform your quest for knowledge.

Of one thing I am sure, and will hasten to confess: “I am neither an expert, nor a scientist.” I am what they call a humble “layman in the field.” True, as a gospel minister I am not accustomed to considering myself a “layman.” But when it comes to astronomical science; that I am. Please, friends, I make no great claims on my own account. I know just enough to know that I don't know very much, and maybe just enough---to be dangerous!

Once when I visited with my wife and her coworkers at the hospital where she works they were engaged in some rather scientific medical shoptalk. Finally one of the medical personnel noticed that I looked a little lost, and commented, “Oh, I forgot we have a layman in here.” I discovered (again) what it feels like to be a layman. And truly when considering the enormous field of astronomy I most certainly feel like a novice, at least most of the time.

## *Preface*

Then why is the following document written? Because, I suspect, there are other laypeople in this world that might welcome some biblical explanations of the heavenly sciences that perhaps they can understand. They need someone at their level, maybe even a little below it, to explore it with them! The best teachers are not the “experts” anyway. The best teachers are the struggling learners themselves who search for satisfaction about such things in their own minds---wise *students*---who are simply careful and unwilling to quickly and blindly accept the trite platitudes and opinions of others.

It is my settled conviction that far more evidence is available for a *creator in the heavens* than is commonly and candidly confessed by even Christian astronomers. Further, I am particularly concerned about the real and resident existence of “pseudo-science,” commonly taught falsehoods and teachings about the starry worlds. Regrettably these dangerous humanistic interpretations are even propagated by Christian astronomers. The fruit of this fallacious tree, when tasted and eaten by the naive adoption of many of these assumed facts, has the tendency to discount the creatorship of Christ and to explain the grandeur of the heavens as accidental and happenstance. Modern science has seductively and effectually stolen away God’s property from him. My appeal is that more voices should be heard in an effort to give back God His creation.

I certainly don’t expect the welcome consideration or immediate adoption of many of the suggestions and teachings explored in this book. It isn’t that I don’t believe in them, or because I have my own doubts about them, at least at this time in my journey. It is not that at all. It is because there are some radical and unorthodox conclusions suggested in this book, and I find people as a rule tend to discard anything that doesn’t suit their liking, regardless of the evidence---or they tend to reject anything that doesn’t fit what they have already pre-determined in their own mind. All the author asks is a “fair shake” when it comes to some of these things. He can already hear the whining, the moaning,

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

and the groaning from the so-called “informed” about some of the conclusions already. But give the author a break, o.k.? Take an open look, learn or parley if you can---walk away if you can’t.

Finally, I, the author, reserve the right to learn on my own, and to change my mind about certain things as the evidence presents itself or as the picture becomes clearer. That is how the honest scientist should work, anyway. Therefore, there are likely things in this layman’s effort that might endure vast revisions in the end. The science of astronomy is among the broadest of all the sciences. The enormity of the heaven’s themselves leaves the observer very small in his own eyes, and so it probably should be.

However, after studying the heavens for some time and writing this book, one grand premise I doubt will soon, if ever be, surrendered by this author. That is that the heavens do indeed represent the work of a master creator and designer. They speak most loudly in this regard, in fact, the evidence is almost deafening. The heavens “declare” (“shout”) the glory of God. It is my desire that the reader find it so in this humble document, and most of all through the voice of the magnificent heavens themselves.

Come! “Lift up your eyes on high,” with me, if you will. If you care----if you dare----read on!

# 1

## **What the Bible Says About the Origin of the Heavens and the Earth**

What does the Bible teach regarding the creation of the heavens and our earth? It teaches unequivocally that the one and only God is the Creator of everything we see and know. The very first verse of the Bible says:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." *Genesis* 1:1, NIV.

While scientists and theologians interpret the Bible according to their various opinions today, there can be no confusion concerning the position the Bible writers had when it comes to

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

the subject of universal creation. So however men may understand their origin today, the Bible is absolutely consistent in teaching that God is and always has been the prime mover of all things animate and inanimate.

The reason this chapter is written is to demonstrate that the Bible has a lot more to say about the creation of the universe than is typically gathered from the first couple of chapters. Few people, even few Christians, realize the extent to which the Bible goes to establish the case for the theistic creation of the heavens and everything else.

Multiplied hundreds of texts testify to the belief that the Supreme God was directly involved in bringing all the worlds into being. Some Bible commentators say that more is said in the Bible about astronomy than about any other particular earthly science.

While men may be free to believe whatever they wish about the origins of the universe, it is totally inconsistent to try to extrapolate from the Bible, as some attempt to do, anything but theistic creation of the earth and its surroundings over a short period of time. Right or wrong, this is what the Bible writers believed and taught. "Special creation" is the Bible position. This deduction, this fact, is an easy---"no brainer."

Writes the Psalmist in Psalm 19:1: *"The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of His hands."* NIV

Paul, the apostle, in Romans 1:20 (NIV) attributes the creation to the living God, claiming that God's creatorship is so obvious that it is inexcusable for men to see it in any other way: *"For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—His eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse."*

God, we are repeatedly told in the Bible, spoke the worlds into existence. *"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, their starry host by the breath of his mouth.... For He spoke, and it*

## ***What the Bible Says***

*came to be; He commanded, and it stood firm."* Psalm 33:6, 9, NIV

Among the very central words in the eternal law of God, the Ten Commandments the claim is made that God created the world in six literal days. *"For in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but He rested the seventh-day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy."* Exodus 20:11, NIV.

Through whom did God create all things? Colossians 1:16 reports:

*"For by Him [the Son] all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by Him and for Him."* John 1:3, adds *"Through Him all things were made; without Him nothing was made that has been made."* NIV

The "Him," of course, is the Lord, Christ Jesus. Christ himself is presented as the "Alpha and Omega," "The Beginning of (first cause of) the Creation of God" (Rev. 1, 3).

For Christians, at least, to adopt the conclusions of "so called" modern science in removing the Son of God from the direct creative act, effectively denies the entire Christian faith, and reduces the standing of Christ to virtually nothing. Only a creative god could have the necessary power to reverse the effect of sin---deterioration and death. The Bible teaches that God through Christ brought the heavenly realms into existence. This creative ability is the signature of Christ's divinity and underlies his salvific effectiveness as well. *No creator equals no savior.*

God's original object in making the heaven and the earth was to make a place for his purposes to exist and to provide a place for his creatures to live within and to enjoy. Isaiah 45:18, NIV: *"For this is what the Lord says—He who created the heavens, He is God; He who fashioned and made the earth, He founded it; He*

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

*did not create it to be empty, but formed it to be inhabited—He says: 'I am the Lord, and there is no other.'*

God next placed man in a position to have dominion over this created earth. Says Genesis 1:26, TLB. *"Then God said, 'Let us make a man—someone like ourselves, to be the master of all life upon the earth and in the skies and in the seas.' "*

The heavens above were created for many direct and practical purposes, not the least of which was to provide an awesome canopy over men on earth to inspire them to consider the wonder and the greatness of heaven's God.

Psalm 8:3-6, TLB, reads: *"When I look up into the night skies and see the work of Your fingers—the moon and the stars You have made—I cannot understand how You can bother with mere puny man, to pay any attention to him! And yet You have made him only a little lower than the angels, and placed a crown of glory and honor upon his head. You have put him in charge of everything You made; everything is put under his authority."*

A case could easily be made that probably every Bible writer clearly believed that God was the ultimate and sole creator of the heavenly universe and the earth of which we are a part. How Christians can claim to be Christians and propagate any other view is truly preposterous. It would be better for such to simply not denigrate the name of "Christian" by claiming to be one. Such pretenders believe in God, yet at the same time they don't believe God--- or what He says. Every Bible writer including Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, David, Daniel, Solomon, Ezekiel, Samuel, Peter, Paul, Matthew, John, and a host of others uniformly believed that God was the genuine and sole creator of the universe. Are we to assume they were all wrong then, and now modern men, still with but tiny intellect, are finally right about all the issues of genesis?

Certainly the Bible, if you accept its authority, is correct after all about the subject of origins.

## ***What the Bible Says***

Following are but a sample of the Word's continuing testimony:

*"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth... God saw all that he had made, and it was very good." (Genesis 1:1, 31)*

*"You made the heavens, even the highest heavens, and all their starry host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them. You give life to everything, and the multitudes of heaven worship you." (Nehemiah 9:6)*

*"He spreads out the northern skies over empty space; he suspends the earth over nothing. He wraps up the waters in his clouds, yet the clouds do not burst under their weight. He covers the face of the full moon, spreading his clouds over it. The pillars of the heavens quake, aghast at his rebuke. By his power he churned up the sea.... By his breath the skies become fair.... And these are but the outer fringe of his works; how faint the whisper we hear of him! How then can we understand the thunder of his power?" (Job 26:7-9, 11-14)*

*"How many are your works, O Lord! In wisdom you made them all; the earth is full of your creatures. There is the sea, vast and spacious, teeming with creatures beyond number—living things both large and small. (Psalm 104:24-25)*

*"Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made." (John 1:3)*

*Christ "is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him." (Colossians 1:15-16)*

*"In these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, and through whom he made the*

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

*universe." (Hebrews 1:2)(cf. also Hebrews 11:1ff.)*

God *owns* the creation because, of course, he formed it and built it himself:

*"To the LORD your God belong the heavens, even the highest heavens, the earth and everything in it." (Deuteronomy 10:14)*

*"Yours, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the majesty and the splendor, for everything in heaven and earth is yours." (1 Chronicles 29:11)*

*God says: "Everything under heaven belongs to me." (Job 41:11)*

God also keeps and maintains His universal creation:

*"He is before all things, and in him all things hold together." (Colossians 1:17)*

*"The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word." (Hebrews 1:3)*

*"Praise the Lord from the heavens, praise him in the heights above. Praise him, all his angels, praise him, all his heavenly hosts. Praise him, sun and moon, praise him, all you shining stars. Praise him, you highest heavens and you waters above the skies. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded and they were created. He set them in place for ever and ever; he gave a decree that will never pass away." (Psalm 148:1-6)*

That the Judeo-Christian God is indeed the "Creator of the Heavens" is the subject of this small book. How and what this means will be explored in an elementary fashion, perhaps. But the actual fact should be known, celebrated, and appear obvious to the child of faith.

## *What the Bible Says*

The heavens are indeed God's handiwork. It seems to this author to be the only logical conclusion. As a continuing sequel to the other "star" books in this sequence we have already surveyed such an abundance of evidence demonstrating God's supervision of the starry worlds. There is too much order, too much providence, too much evidence to arrive at any other conclusion. Intelligent Design, (used in the creative sense) abounds everywhere. God, or at least *something exactly like Him*, is most certainly the *Creator of the Heavens*.

As presented from the start, this book will not be the work of a scientific expert in astronomy or any such field of science. The purpose of this book is to exonerate and celebrate the creatorship of God through a believer's eyes. Thus it is a book of what I call "Sacred Astronomy," or "Biblical Astronomy." We will largely leave the discussion of astrophysics, black holes, supernovas and quasars to the secular wizards. While they are pounding out formulas of quantum physics and accidental designs, we will directly seek God's glory and power, which is, and always will be infinitely beyond what even the most brilliant scientists can ever know or conjure up. While astrophysicists may be way beyond some of us in their "calculated" knowledge of the universe, they still remain pathetic midgets, even relative idiots, next to the Almighty God who made all things.

Science (in its truest form) does have its place. But I believe the grandest things to be learned from the heavens are not sterile, scientific facts anyway. My opinion is that "sacred astronomy" is the "real" science of the heavens. The heavens were made to glorify God and to declare his worth (Psalm 19:1). Popular astronomy does not tend to declare and acknowledge God's greatness, even though it should. Scientists are comparatively lost in their understanding of the heavens largely because they are mistakenly blind as to their purpose. So while they search for life and meaning behind every celestial rock, the entire testimony is there all the time staring them in the face. But "there are none so blind as those who *will not see!*" They cannot see the forest for

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

the trees, or more accurately, they can't see the sky for the stars!

But scientific questions must be part of our concern as we move forward because there is so much discussion and preoccupation these days with them. Again, this author does not claim to be able to explain or answer all of the issues raised by science. But I do think that it should be a learning exercise for him as well as the reader to explore a few of the issues that pervade our recent culture. The popularity and the prominence of some of these issues do have the lateral effect of sometimes undermining a believer's faith in God. Therefore we will seek to address them in a way that exonerates the biblical claims.

While our bias is clear, so is that of the others. And to tell you the truth, I would a trillion times more rather have the creationist's bias! At least they have something foundational and sure to build from. If one is going to have a bias, they might as well have the "best" one! I strongly recommend the position of the creator-believing Christian. I'm satisfied that in time, everyone, great and small, will see that it is the plainest truth of all that the heavens are the work of God, and that such a conclusion is as obvious as the moon and stars in the sky and as clear as the morning sun.

# 2

## When Were the Heavens Created?

The question naturally arises as to “when” the heavens, or the starry heavens, were created. We propose, biblically speaking, that we already know “who” created them. God did. But “when” were they brought into existence? Were they all created all at once at some time in the indefinite past, or are they in a continuing process of creation as we speak, or did they begin their existence about six thousand years ago at the creation of our own planet earth?

The Bible informs us in Genesis 1:1 that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The “heavens” in this first verse seems to be referring mostly to the atmosphere of this earth. But in verse 17 of the creation account, it says parenthetically of God, “*He made the stars also.*” (KJV)

It does not seem to directly say in these passages “when” God made the stars. It simply says that God is responsible for their

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

existence, even as he is responsible for the creation of the earth and its existence. Psalm 33:6, 9 is similar in its expression:

*“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth, he spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.” (KJV)*

Again it credits God with the creation of the heavens, brought immediately into existence by his command, but it does not specifically say “when” this happened. The inference has always been that this was at the same time when the earth was originally created. But is the Genesis text necessarily saying this?



APOD July 8, 2008

**In the Heart of the Virgo Cluster**

**Credit & Copyright:** [Günter Kerschhuber](#) ([Gahberg Observatory](#))

## ***When Were the Heavens Created?***

**NASA Explanation:** The [Virgo Cluster of Galaxies](#) is the closest cluster of galaxies to our [Milky Way Galaxy](#). The [Virgo Cluster](#) is so close that it spans more than 5 [degrees](#) on the sky - about 10 times the angle made by a [full Moon](#). With its heart lying about 70 million light years distant, the [Virgo Cluster](#) is the nearest [cluster of galaxies](#), contains over 2,000 galaxies, and has a noticeable gravitational pull on the galaxies of the [Local Group of Galaxies](#) surrounding our [Milky Way Galaxy](#). The [cluster](#) contains not only galaxies filled with stars but also [gas](#) so hot it glows in [X-rays](#). Motions of galaxies in and around clusters indicate that they contain more [dark matter](#) than any visible matter we can see. [Pictured above](#), the heart of the [Virgo Cluster](#) includes bright [Messier](#) galaxies such as [Markarian's Eyes](#) on the upper left, [M86](#) just to the upper right of center, [M84](#) on the far right, as well as spiral galaxy [NGC 4388](#) at the bottom right.

Present cosmological thinking teaches that the universe began about 13.7 billion years ago. This is arrived at because space-time relationships demand such a figure to fit into our current scientific paradigms, such as the Einsteinium theories of relativity and other similar models. For instance, if the universe is expanding at or near the current speed of light, then based on its apparent size, 13.7 billion might be a reasonable estimate. But such figures are based on gigantic assumptions, similar in size to the universe itself, which are everywhere made, and which we will briefly address in time. I suggest some of these enormous assumptions may not be factual at all, perhaps not even close to the truth, contrary to what many scientists would like us to believe.

### **Genesis 1: 1, 2.**

The foundation and groundwork of all biblical creationism is in Genesis 1:1,2.

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep, And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” (KJV)

Richard Davidson, Ph.D., a reputable Old Testament scholar and writer, argues that because of stylistic, literal, linguistic, theological, and other grounds that these introductory verses are

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

essentially to be separated purposefully from the rest of the initial chapters. In other words, they essentially stand by themselves.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Davidson concludes that these first verses of Genesis describe a creation of matter before the first day of creation week, a condition often noted and debated and found in the Genesis text: “without form”(tohu), and void (bohu).”

Of this view, Dr. Mart de Groot, Astronomer from the Armagh Observatory of Northern Ireland says:

This is the traditional view of the majority of Christian and Jewish interpreters, also called the ‘initial unformed-unfilled’ view. I accept this view as the one that has greatest promise of understanding the Bible’s account of the origin of the Universe.<sup>3</sup>

Of course, the issues for creationists here are whether God:

1) Created this earth and the universe at the time of Genesis 1, totally out of nothing (creation: *ex nihilo*)

---

<sup>2</sup> Richard M. Davidson, In the Beginning: How to Interpret Genesis 1, in: Christianity and Science, *Amicus*, 2002, pp. 73ff.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Mart de Groot, “The Bible and Astronomy,” 2nd Symposium on the Bible and Adventist Scholarship; (Astronomer, former Director of Armagh Observatory, Northern Ireland. /fae.adventist.org/essays/31Bcc\_159-181.htm

“In this view, the first two verses of Genesis 1 are to be separated from the rest of the chapter because they describe what happened at an earlier, ‘in-the-beginning’, epoch or era. I consider this an essential element in our understanding of the origin of all things, and an indispensable ingredient for the harmonisation between the scientific and biblical views....The account of the origin of the world as we know it on our planet is then given in Genesis 1:3-31, the account of the Creation Week.”

## *When Were the Heavens Created?*

or

2) He created the universe including an unformed and unfilled earth before Genesis 1, and then came and “finished” the creation of this earth during the six days of creation week,

or

3) He has always been creating, for thousands, even millions of years, according to some evolutionary process represented by the days of creation.

It is probably accurate to say that the Bible teaching does not demand that all things were created when this earth was formed. What the Bible does insist upon is that God is responsible for the creation of all things. (John 1:1-3) “All things were made by him, and without him, was not anything made that was made.” God’s existence and power precedes and pre-empts all things. In him all things consist (Col. 1:15,16). “In him we live, and move, and have our being.”

Therefore, it makes sense that since it is God’s continuing purpose to create, that he has indeed done so, with regularity, for perhaps even eons of time. This world does not have to be the first thing that God has created, in order to be biblically consistent. So God very well may have produced pre-existing matter, long before this earth took its form. There was likely some kind of a universe out there.

However, we are considering when the heaven or heavens that pertain to this earth were created. I am not sure one can be “biblically” consistent in this endeavor, and claim that the sun, moon, and perhaps the local stars were finally formed in our solar system at a time removed from the original creation week.

It is true that in the statement: “*He made the stars also*” (vs. 16b);

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

the words “he made” are *supplied* (thus italicized). Therefore certain advocates of creation argue that this phrase is parenthetically added to inform the reader that God is also responsible for the creation of the stars, but reason that the text gives latitude for God to have created them at a different time.

A common argument that is used to certify this distinction is the argument that the “firmament” that God creates on the second day is not the third heaven, or the universal heavens containing the starry host. James Burr, astro-scientist from Colorado, vociferously advocates the view that the *firmament of heaven* spoken of in Genesis is basically speaking of the atmosphere of air and clouds separated from the oceans below on Day 2 of creation week. This view preserves the conclusions of science that the stars are at such a great distance from us. As a result the starlight and time problem<sup>4</sup> is therefore accommodated and placated to a degree.

Perhaps the most commonly accepted view today among believers in creation is that the sun and moon and perhaps the planets were placed in their current positions and functions during creation week, but that the stars were created long before and their light is only now reaching us. Others believe that God simply created the stars at “maturity” just like he did Adam and Eve, and that the light that reaches us was put in place by divine fiat about 6-10 thousand years ago.

This writer is not sure these apparent solutions are adequate biblically. While many Bible passages may not be starkly clear as to when each author believed the stars and the luminaries of heaven were created, it is not responsible to build an entire model of creationary science out of this ambiguity.

It seems in most cases that the Bible writers themselves were

---

<sup>4</sup> If the stars are at such distance from us as believed, then they could not have been created on creation week about 6,000 years ago, because their light cannot have reached us yet.

## *When Were the Heavens Created?*

under the impression that God created, at least what we see in the local heavens, during creation week. This is implied or claimed on the basis of Hebrew parallelism. In almost every case when the creation of the sun, moon, AND stars are mentioned, it is in poetic or literary parallel with the original creation of this earth. Some of these texts follow that demonstrate this parallelism:

### Creation of heavens with earth:

- Genesis 1,2: Stars mentioned together with the firmament of the heavens, cf. Gen. 1:16
- Psalm 33:6-9: He made all the host of the heavens by speaking with his voice, then vs. 7: “He gathered the waters of the sea together as a heap,” (reference to the creation of the earth), etc., then, “He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.” (KJV)
- Job 38:4-7: “Where were you when the foundations of the earth were laid?... when the morning stars sang together,” etc.
- Psalm 8: Equates the sun, moon, and stars with the creation of man who is given dominion over the earth and inferentially ALL the creation.
- Nehemiah 9:6: “Thou, even Thou art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and the things therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshipeth thee.” (KJV) (Cf. also Psalm 148:3,4 and context)

Says Gen. 2:1, words deliberately and distinctively written as a summary of the entire creation: “Thus the HEAVENS and the Earth were finished, and ALL THE HOST, of them.

It is plain that the heavens are referred to in a PLURAL form, meaning the firmament below and the firmament above. Included are the “hosts” of both earth and heaven. The word

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

“hosts” likely includes much more than mere birds, for birds “fly” in the heavens, but don’t really “inhabit” them. In addition, the word “host” is biblically applicable to the stars of heaven in a “host” of places! (Dan. 8:10: “the host of the stars,” etc.)

It also needs to be observed that on the fourth day the sun, moon, and presumably the **stars** are placed IN THE FIRMAMENT:

- “And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven” (vs. 14)
- “And let them be lights in the firmament of heaven” (vs. 15)
- “And God set them in the firmament of the heaven” (vs. 17)

The pattern of repeating a concept THREE times in a row is a literary device often given in the *Pentateuch* for emphasis. Thus it is said of the Sabbath that God rested, blessed, and sanctified it (2:1-3) to emphasize its importance and distinction. The fourth commandment (Ex. 20:8-11) uses the same three-fold emphasis in “rest, blessed, and hallowed.” Three times it is told us in the Genesis narrative that the sun, moon, and stars (by context) were placed WITHIN the firmament.

Therefore it is a hard case to reason that the Genesis writer is providing a scientific loophole for stars being in a separate firmament to the one created on the second and fourth days of creation. At the very least the elements of our solar system were formed, or reformed at creation. Even the visible stars of our local galaxy should have been sending light on Day 1 (if created long enough before this earth was), yet it says that in the beginning absolute darkness was upon the face of the *abussos*.

Therefore it seems to this writer that the consistent biblical datum would be that the entire local host of heaven----sun, moon, and stars are represented as being created during creation week. It seems also that the consistent way to translate these ideas is that usually when the word “heaven” is used in singular form, the

## *When Were the Heavens Created?*

*context* or the *number* of the word governs whether it is referring to the atmosphere only, or to the heaven of the stars, or even the heaven of God's throne.

On the second day the “dividing” of the firmament is well-documented---so a singular form is used (1:8); yet the result is plural. But largely through the rest of Scripture when the plural form is used, “heavens” (*shamayim*), then both upper and lower heaven are denominated, which could include the starry worlds. Thus it is in Gen. 2:1, and Gen. 2:4: “These are generations (pl.) of the heavens (pl.) and the earth.”

I believe that the best “biblical” evidence is that the sun, moon, and our local system of stars were created on the fourth day of creation. Such a position is unacceptable to many Christian scientists who wish to bridge biblical concepts with the evolutionary foundations of these things. So the popular Christian view of pre-existence of matter becomes the prevailing view for at least two reasons:

1. Because of the starlight and time problem, and...
2. Because so many scientists teach otherwise, and hammer the concepts of great time and distance into their heads that the timid creation scientist begins to believe that these unproven secular theories must be true. They finally cannot accept the Bible view because they are ironically indoctrinated into a view propagated by the very people who pathetically lack the ultimate proofs foundational to *their* own conclusions.

What may actually be at stake for Christians is the continual erosion or loss of biblical faith due to “so called” science. This circumstance may actually be an issue on the authority of Scripture, a concept that has definitely taken an enormous hit in the last few centuries.

Let us remember that the starlight and time problem only

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

becomes a problem if we buy without reservation the prevailing theories of modern science. But what if modern science really is incorrect about some of the things commonly taught today as unquestioned fact?

For example, writes Dr. Stewart Custer:

“Some advocates of the theory of evolution had thought that during the long ages of the moon’s existence a surface layer of meteoritic dust would have accumulated to such a thickness that an astronaut stepping onto the moon would be in danger of disappearing out of sight. The dust turned out to be a fraction of an inch deep.”<sup>5</sup>

It may be inaccurate as well as dangerous to quickly accept the world’s view on how the moon was formed and when. The data is not yet complete. It may not be wise to make scientific determinations on the basis of *theory* about anything that cannot first be convincingly proven beyond doubt or be tested. Yet many Christians do this very thing repeatedly!

In the same way the Christian should not be made to feel apologetic about waiting out the jury on these astronomical matters. It is not necessary to conclude that all astronomical science is now determined, and that the creationist must fold up his tent and go home. I believe it far, far from this.

But how could so many be wrong? Well, often the majority IS wrong. For centuries people believed blood-letting was good medicine. With better evidence the practice was abandoned. What we must remember is that most of the evidence in the astronomical field is largely out of our reach, even now. No one

---

<sup>5</sup> Stewart Custer, *The Stars Speak*, p. 105. There were pockets of deeper dust, but none deep enough to correlate with the evolutionary time periods. There is no rain or wind on the moon to cause the dust to disappear. (Since the moon landings scientists deny that they made this claim, or that this circumstance can be used to prove anything about the moon’s age. However, some of us have lived on both sides of this time period and were witnesses to many such well publicized, so-called “factual” claims, that turned out to be *bogus* in the end.) The reader may make his own judgment.

## *When Were the Heavens Created?*

has *manually* measured the actual linear distance to any body outside our earth except the moon. No commenting scientist has even been out there. No one has seen the heavenly realms close up, or tested their actual substance. And certainly no one alive today was there when they were formed! Therefore it is wise to be reasonably skeptical about the heady, foregone conclusions of mad scientists and frizzy-haired physicists.

Why do so many so easily accept these highly publicized notions as fact? Worthy comment is made by Dr. Jason Lisle, a physicist and astronomer at the University of Colorado:

“One answer is circular reasoning: many scientists believe the world is old because most other scientists think the world is old. Although a given scientist may be well aware of evidence that is not consistent with long ages, it is very tempting to dismiss such evidence because, “How could all those other scientists really be wrong?” How many of those other scientists believe in long ages simply because they also think that other scientists do? A majority opinion can become self-sustaining through circular reasoning: people believe because other people believe. It is surprising that many people do not realize the inconsistency here.....”

“Many times, the circular reasoning can be cross-disciplinary. A geologist may feel assured that the earth is billions of years old since most other astronomers believe that that the solar system is billions of years old. However, an astronomer may feel confident that the solar system is billions of years old since the majority of geologists accept this for the age of the earth. Of course, the majority opinion can be wrong. In fact, many scientific discoveries have gone against the majority. Nonetheless, the psychological pressure to agree with the majority is a very powerful and well-documented phenomenon.”<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Jason Lisle, p. 41, *Taking Back Astronomy* (Ph. D. in Astrophysics, University of Colorado).

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

While we aren't given detailed information about how the worlds of our universe were placed into being, and particularly at what time they were introduced upon the scene, I believe that the safest conclusions would be near to those outlined in the book of *Genesis* and elsewhere in the Creator's own great book.

It seems that the Bible teaches on the basis of context and expression that our *local universe*, at least, came about during the chronology of creation week. The sun, moon, and stars were given to serve our earth, to serve as lights, signs, seasons, and energy sources. Their purposes are tied to the creation itself.

Most of all they were created to give glory to the living, creator God. May all heaven and earth, some day at least, give the Creator of the universe the credit He deserves by acknowledging it as the product of His own divine hand.

# 3

## Do the Astrophysics of Creation Really Matter?

What we have in our world today are two drastically different perspectives on what makes up our universe and how it came to be. Preponderantly there is the popular secular view that typically includes “big bang cosmology” and other similar structures of origin.

Then, there is the minority opinion represented by a few Christian scientists and believers. The Christian, or biblical view is rarely even acknowledged in public literature. While probably more people in the western world believe in a creationist scenario than is commonly represented in the media and in other expressions of scientific dialogue, the prevailing view remains that the heavens came about by accidental design. This view is not only favored by secular science, but is endorsed and promoted by some of the world’s leading Christian thinkers. The prevailing philosophy is

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

that most of what popular science gives us is probably more fact than theory and really represents things as they truly are. Christian proponents of these unproven theories actually repeat or use the raw conclusions of secular science as evidence of God's greatness or even of his creative power.

Therefore a question emerges: Does it really matter what view a Christian takes of these things as long as the Christian's faith in God is intact?

I would like to submit that it makes an incredible difference what view one takes of these things. While it may seem immaterial to a Christian's faith whether a star is one light year away versus several light years away, the automatic adoption of certain scientific conclusions will ultimately lead the believer into a trap. "You can't have your cake, and eat it too." Therefore I would propose that it makes more than just a fundamental difference which view one adopts. The disparity between the two views is categorically enormous----universal, in fact.

### **Fatalism**

One reason I believe it makes a difference how one views such a theory as the "Big Bang," for instance, is the dismal perspective that theory gives to the future and fate of man and the cosmos he lives in. Part and portion of "Big Bang" cosmology is what we could refer to as *fatalism*.

Germane to the entire mechanics of the Big Bang scenario is the aspect of *heat death*. The popular models are based on the premise that because energy is constantly being expended or exchanged into another state, that the universe is in a slow meltdown. All the stars are at varying stages of death. Now, of course, little of this will happen in our lifetime or in just about any number of lifetimes (!) but the model teaches the inevitable oblivion of everything we see and know in the universe today. Everything is slowly cooling and in time our sun will burn out

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

leaving us all desolate in the end.

Christian enthusiasts of *Big Bang cosmology* sometimes don't realize that they are endorsing a model that sees no positive outcome for our universe, and *fails to recognize the present divine superintendence of our universe*. The Bible teaches that not only did God create the heavens, but that he SUSTAINS them by his power.<sup>7</sup> It is almost a complete denial of God and his power to acclaim a theory that requires that God be separated from his efforts toward salvation and also from the faithful maintenance of his own well-oiled machine. Creationism is naturally related to the concept of sustained life, but evolutionary paradigms seem to be pre-occupied with ultimate death. The two views are contra, to the extreme.

Therefore, the outlook for the current models of the universe are bleak and tragic at best, and all end in oblivion. No hope is offered to life in this cosmos, it all comes to nothingness and blackness in the end. Man through some possible ingenuity must save himself.

Thankfully, this is not the Christian message! What a monumental and superior difference! Instead the Bible teaches that God is in his holy temple, reigning with absolute power and glory over his well-sustained realm. He seeks the salvation and blessedness of every creature and object he has created. He does not want humans to think that the best hope they have is oblivion! Instead he offers to personally dwell with them, and promises to provide them with all the riches in heavenly places in Christ! Only where sin reigns will there be entropy and death.

There is a precious pearl for Christians that can be gleaned out of the rubbish of total fatalism, however. Ironically, man with his foolish designs intends to exclude God from his equation. But it only results in arguing for God in the end. The product of all of man's theorizing and scheming results in demonstrating more

---

<sup>7</sup> Colossians 1:16,17

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

powerfully than ever the need for a Savior and Redeemer. It distinctly isolates the fact that the universe is in desperate need of a Savior to rescue it!

But it is totally inconsistent for the Christian to hold any other background belief than that of a personal Savior/Creator for our world and universe. It thematically counters the Christian's calling and purpose to believe otherwise and presents a false picture of God, his active plans, abilities, and purposes.

### The Astronomical/Evolutionary Paradigm

Few stop to fully realize the direct relationship between astronomical science and the evolutionary theoreticism that has overtaken our world. When a Christian thinks of "evolution" his mind typically turns to Darwin or Huxley, or to natural selection--dinosaurs, finches, the geological column, and so forth. Consequently the focus "naturally" turns to the mutative and evolutionary influences on the natural world over time. But remember, not even evolution can begin at this juncture. Something must still be first introduced in the universe for all evolutionary processes to act upon.

The foundation for even evolutionary thinking is not in biology, geology, or history. **It is in astronomy.** According to the typical evolutionary scenarios, matter, life, and existence first came about as a result of a big bang somewhere in the universe; or they emerged out of a singularity or a black hole. *In other words all the conventionalities of our present earth must have first had their start in the astronomical realm of things.*

Consequently, it is fundamentally paramount to realize that essentially all modern theory emanates from the realm of astrophysics. Without a *Big Bang* or the like, there would be no world here, or planet there, for evolution to continue upon. It is therefore in the field of astrophysics first that all evolutionary theory finds permission to enter upon its inquiry of origins.

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

Therefore I think it is essential for Christians to process in some way the relationship between astronomy and the current paradigm of origins. They need to realize that it is necessary to bring an astronomical model to the whole debate. In a way Christians must realize that *philosophically*, Hubble and Hawking necessarily come before Huxley and Darwin.

### **The Copernican Revolution**

Regardless of what view one takes of the “revolutions of the heavenly spheres,” it would be incorrect to assume that what is considered the more recent enlightenment on how cosmology works has not had an almost devastating impact on creationism or, at least, the biblical view upon it.

*It would not go a particle too far to claim that in modern times the Copernican Revolution (sun-centered cosmology) has had more impact on biblical belief and biblical faith than any other one thing.* The Enlightenment, the Renaissance, the Age of Reason, *Humanism*, the arrival of *Modernism* and *Post-modernism*, have all made enormous contributions to the attitude of skepticism and criticism of biblical faith. But no one area of modern science has had a greater and longer impact than the Copernican Revolution. It was astronomy, and astronomy first, that dealt the first and greatest blow to traditional creationist faith.

For millennia Israelites and Christians believed in a Creator God. Even the Roman world, believed in the Ptolemaic system (earth centered cosmology) often equated (though not always fairly) with the biblical view. But with the work and claims of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, and others, this all changed.

The church of the time fiercely and sometimes unkindly debated the switching paradigm. In other words, men of faith “noticed” what Copernican cosmology said and dearly realized what its

## **THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS**

adoption meant for the proponents of biblical faith.

What came about in most minds, at least eventually, was that the Bible was obviously wrong about astronomy. The sun does not “come up,” but instead the world turns. Our earth is not the center of our local universe, it is just a small insignificant planet of the sun.

The defenders of Biblical authority in the interest of maintaining their faith often made ridiculous claims about what the Bible actually teaches and really made the matter worse because what they claimed the Bible taught was obviously contrary to what astronomical scientists seemed to be clearly demonstrating. The debate became extremely heated----scientists were accused of heresy and sometimes were persecuted; and to be contrary, church men and priests stubbornly refused to look through the telescope.

The net effect has been that in the end the Bible’s position has been effectively demoted to that of a mythical religious book that cannot be trusted for any scientific endeavor at all. Therefore, since it can’t be trusted for truthful information about our cosmos, some naturally reason that it isn’t all that effective for faith and salvation either. In fact, it probably isn’t even right about the existence of a Savior God at all. If the Bible proclaimed God isn’t even obviously right about his own claimed creatorship, how can His other claims have any import?

Therefore, I believe that it is profoundly important to realize the effect modern astronomical science has had upon all of science today. I think it is also paramount for those who lean toward a creationist view to consider all of this when formulating and processing their own scientific inquiry.

### **Secular Bias**


It has become the foregone conclusion among secular scientists

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

and modernists that if the Bible says it, it must not be true. The Bible is catalogued in the mythical sections of the library. There is a very real anti-biblical sentiment, openly promoted through a designed ignorance of biblical teaching and practice. In the media religion is scorned and ridiculed, and biblical apologists are treated like ignoramuses who are still products of antiquated or “Dark Age” thinking.

What isn't scientific about this position is that true science should be willing to look at evidence of any kind.

Refusing to admit into the equation a God-related first cause, or even teleological expression in nature, is deliberately turning one's back to powerful evidence. To claim as does the scientific community that “intelligent design” is not a valid component of scientific inquiry is deliberate and stubborn foolishness. It is an open and declared bias; an invalid and foolish excuse. The Bible teaches that it is the fool that “says in his heart there is no God.” True, indeed.



But we must let secular humanists be as they may be. Yet a great mistake is committed repeatedly by Christians in accepting unreservedly the conclusions of godless men.<sup>8</sup> It is not only

---

### <sup>8</sup> **Albert Einstein (1879-1955)**

Einstein is probably the best known and most highly revered scientist of the twentieth century, and is associated with major revolutions in our thinking about time, gravity, and the conversion of matter to energy ( $E=mc^2$ ). Although [never coming to belief in a personal God](#), he recognized the impossibility of a non-created universe. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says of him: "Firmly denying atheism, Einstein expressed a belief in "Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the harmony of what exists." This actually motivated his interest in science, as he once remarked to a young physicist: "I want to know how God created this world, I am not interested in this or that phenomenon, in the spectrum of this or that element. I want to know His thoughts, the rest are details." Einstein's famous epithet on the "uncertainty principle" was "God does not play dice" - and to him this was a real statement about a God in whom he believed. A famous saying of his was "Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind."

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

dangerous spiritually, but generally misleading otherwise.

Says the great keynote Psalm: “Blessed is the man that walks not in the counsel of the ungodly.”<sup>9</sup> Why, we wonder, do Christian scientists not even consider for a moment whether to readily accept the common conclusions of the same men who are boldly and willingly blind about the most obvious things already? “If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.”<sup>10</sup> Perilously, and in all seriousness, I believe that this is what is happening in the world today.

Christian scientists sing the praises of Albert Einstein<sup>11</sup>, Edwin

---

<sup>9</sup> Psalm 1: “Nor stands in the road of sinners, nor sits in the seat of the skeptic.” The Psalm teaches that thought should be grounded in the Word of God. Such students will stand like a healthy tree. But the godless philosophies will end up like chaff, blown away by the wind. The approach of the ungodly is like building on sand. It is unreliable.

- **Psalm 1, the “orphan’s psalm,” is providentially placed at the very gate of the wisdom literature section of the Bible to prepare the godly to be particularly wary and wise in forming a cultural philosophy.**

<sup>10</sup> Matthew 15:14

<sup>11</sup>*Albert Einstein: God, Religion & Theology*

*Explaining Einstein's understanding of God as the Universe / Reality*

A knowledge of the existence of something we cannot penetrate, of the manifestations of the profoundest reason and the most radiant beauty - it is this knowledge and this emotion that constitute the truly religious attitude; in this sense, and in this alone, I am a deeply religious man. (**Albert Einstein**)

I do not believe in a personal God and I have never denied this but have expressed it clearly. If something is in me which can be called religious then it is the unbounded admiration for the structure of the world so far as our science can reveal it. (**Albert Einstein**, 1954)

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

Hubble, Stephen Hawking, George Ellis, and many others, men who are or were decidedly against God or did not believe in God. Many of these men are or were boldly agnostic and disrespectful toward God. What is so convincing, I wonder, about nebulous theories from wild-haired men with cigars sticking out of their mouths?<sup>12</sup>

### **Uniformitarianism**

Another philosophical position driving modern thought is *uniformitarianism*. This is the belief, often applied to geology or biological science, that holds that the way things are now is consistent with the way they have always been. In other words, weather, erosion, geological and biological processes have always been similar to what we see now, and what we see now is the product of millions of years of these same structures and processes.

The box this places the Christian within in these matters is that it leaves no room for a personal God to insert a change into the developmental history of this earth or universe. There could be no universal flood if that is not the type of thing we see happening today. There cannot have been highly developed civilizations before this because progress only goes in one direction according to our modern viewpoint. Decay rates, stellar occurrences, natural habits all follow an inflexible pattern from which the cosmos never varies.

---

I believe in Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the orderly harmony of what exists, not in a God who concerns himself with the fates and actions of human beings. (**Albert Einstein**)

<http://www.spaceandmotion.com/albert-einstein-god-religion-theology.htm>

<sup>12</sup> It is said of Edwin Hubble that he was never seen without a cigar in his mouth. His anti-religious stance was equally prominent. And we all know about the famous pictures of Einstein.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Now while there are consistent natural laws, and “God,” no doubt, usually follows them, it is not safe to conclude there have been no changes, interruptions, or insertions in the past. Absolute *uniformitarianism* seeks to wall God out of the equation, and I suggest that Christians should not fraternize with the extreme stricture this view places on salvation history and the way in which God, as a result of his own divine will, plays and interplays with the affairs of this earth and the whole cosmos.

### Naturalism

Finally we must mention the over-riding bias of naturalism that pervades all secular science. This is the idea found in evolutionary cycles particularly that all things that come to be, become so exclusively by natural processes. In other words, they just happened, and a creator God could never be part of the picture.

While humanity is free to think whatever they wish about naturalism, it is quite inexcusable for Christians to take the same view, for in so doing they are denying God of his creative ability-- the requisite thing that makes him God. If God is not able to create, he is then unable to save, because the saving that is necessary requires a power that can restore what would *naturally* die otherwise.

Naturalism depends entirely on time and chance. George Wald, a well-known voice for evolutionary philosophy, once wrote:

**“Time is in fact the hero of the plot. . . . Given so much time, the ‘impossible’ becomes possible, the possible probable, and the probable virtually certain. One has only to wait; time itself performs the miracles.”<sup>13</sup>**

---

<sup>13</sup> George Wald (late professor of biology, Harvard University, “The Origin of Life,” *Scientific American* (August, 1954): p. 48. Quoted in Lisle, *Taking Back Astronomy*, p. 42.

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

Notice in this one time Harvard professor's statement "*who*" or in this case, "*what*" the hero of the plot is; then reason for a moment *who* the hero of the *plot should be*---- in fact---- is! Notice, as well, the grossly illicit slide from "impossible" to "certain" in one short, illogical sentence! How a man with such reasoning could have been tolerated even at Harvard, much less be an honored professor is equal to the mystery of the ages. Truly, this is marvel beyond expression! It is creation, *ex nihilo*, credits to evolution; and even more, of course, it lacks even a source!

Of course, the real "hero" of the creation story for the creationist, is God; and the worker of "miracles," is Christ. Divinity in the naturalist's scenario is blatantly replaced by the mere "impersonalities" of *time* and *chance*.

In wholly supporting the concept of naturalism, the Christian scientist has in effect given up the ship to the enemy. Therefore, I believe it is inconsistent as a Christian to seek explanations about the heavens from a view totally restricted to naturalism, or from those who are proponents of such. The Word of God, and true science, I believe, has within them the obvious marks left by a first cause, creator God. The Christian will "naturally" reject, or should, *in an exclusive sense*, reject secular naturalism from his scheme.

## **Safe Thinking**

While I purport that there is abundant evidence for biblical creationism of the heavens, creationists are failing miserably by spending too much time chasing "relativity" and "big bang" notions imagined into being by the secularists. Instead, creationists could be effectively hammering solid nails into the coffins of *secular humanism*, *naturalism*, and *uniformitarianism*. The data is really on the creationist's side. Secular scientists rely almost totally on *theory*, *chance*, mysterious quantum physics, and *over-exponential* mathematics. None have ever been out in

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

the universe to confirm anything they teach about them. They have no reliable guide in their quest. Ironically, *they arrogantly pose as tour guides of places to which they have never been!* They are imposters of the worst sort.

I do not wholly accept the general advice of many of my teachers and science instructors, all themselves believers and proponents of creationism, who instruct us to be hesitant in defending creationism with any surety, and counsel that we take the position of apologists. The common caution given is that the evidence out there is really divided, and it remains to the Christian or the non-Christian to make his decision according to his own faith or a *priori* bias.

While Christians are not armed with the scientific answers for everything, it is evidentially irresponsible to say that whichever way one goes is merely a “toss-up” based on pre-supposition. My contention is that the evidence clearly and resoundingly tilts in the creationist’s favor, hands down.

The problem, then, may not be with the lack of evidence, but with the timid and tentative philosophy of the Christian himself. While Christians must be careful how they represent their faith science before their non-Christian friends, they must never take the role of an “apologist.” Many Christians are operating on much more than simple *a priori* assumptions.

Writes Jason Lisle, Ph.D. in Astrophysics from the University of Colorado:

When it comes to creation-based models of the universe, I am convinced that we have only scratched the surface....I am also convinced that much of the astronomical evidence for biblical creation is *already known*, but has been misinterpreted because of a secular bias.<sup>14</sup>

---

14 *Taking Back Astronomy*, p. 115 (Master Books, Green Forest, AR, 2007, [www.masterbooks.net](http://www.masterbooks.net)).

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

There are probably thousands of irrefutable<sup>15</sup> arguments for the young age of our earth and local system available. Many of these are known but receive no notice, partly because dishonest science spurns them, and partly because Christian proponents are hiding in their closets while evidence and affirmation wait on their doorsteps offering them a check from the lottery.

Writes a famous scientist of yesteryear:

“The picture of the world, as drawn in existing physical theories, shows arrangement of the individual elements for which the odds are a *google* [one with one hundred zeros after it] to one *against* an origin by chance.”<sup>16</sup>

Let us think about this for a moment. On which side might be found the preponderance of the evidence? Popular theories, even by their own proponent’s admissions hold that the chances of “big bang evolution” being successful is not unlike this *google* figure referred to above.

Here is the amazing thing: Modern science *has built their whole edifice on that one in a google chance*, a lonely opportunity that is for all practical purposes totally negligible. In my opinion, there is not even one chance. So is this good science, a Christian scientist should ask? Is it not total and absolute foolishness? It appears to be at the very best an infinitely *stupid* gamble! There is no nice way to say it.

---

<sup>15</sup> **Arguments for recent creationism:**

1. Gradual recession of the moon.
2. Magnetic field of the earth
3. Comets
4. Lack of “antimatter.”
5. Horizon problem, etc.

<sup>16</sup> A.S. Eddington, *Nature*, pp. 127, 447-453 quoted in *The Stars Speak*, p. 157.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Science, one would think would gravitate toward where the preponderance of the evidence is to be found. In other words, a successful theory has the best chance when attaching itself to the largest pool of evidence. But the scientist ignores obvious design, miraculously preserved historical knowledge, providential function and findings, and still chooses to stake his entire claim on the one unlikely, even impossible, fluke. Such a thinking process is pure insanity, a wonder of marvelous proportions! As Paul the apostle says, the “creation-ignoror” is left “without excuse.”<sup>17</sup> None. Period. Not even one excuse---not one in a *google*!

Would the same scientist who seeks to reason the absurd way he does, board an airplane, if he were told by an experienced airplane mechanic or pilot that the plane he was planning to fly on had a *google* to one chance of surviving its next flight? One would think he would not. Yet philosophically the godless scientist *willingly* boards the same doomed plane anyway, insistent on the coveted prize of chance and oblivion! As the Psalm says: “He will not stand in the judgment....for the way of the ungodly shall perish (go to oblivion).”<sup>18</sup>

It is much safer, fellow Christian, to take our information from those who at least profess a belief in God. There have been many such men: Sir Isaac Newton<sup>19</sup>, Sir Fred Hoyle, Sir William

---

<sup>17</sup> Romans 1:20

<sup>18</sup> (Psalm 1:5,6)

<sup>19</sup> **Ibid. Isaac Newton (1642-1727)**

In optics, mechanics, and mathematics, Newton was a figure of undisputed genius and innovation. In all his science (including chemistry) he saw mathematics and numbers as central. What is less well known is that he was devoutly religious and saw numbers as involved in understanding God's plan for history from the Bible. He did a considerable work on biblical numerology, and, though aspects of his beliefs were not orthodox, he thought theology was very important. In his system of physics, God is essential to the nature and absoluteness of space. In *Principia* he stated, "The most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion on an intelligent and powerful Being."

## *Do the Astrophysics of Creation Matter?*

Herschel, and others. But even these cannot ultimately be trusted. Just because one is known to be a Christian doesn't assume that person is a "Spirit-guided" one.<sup>20</sup>

Now it isn't that Christians, because they are Christians, are always right about things; for this is not particularly so. And it isn't that godless men and women are never right about certain things or that creationists can't learn a great deal from their research. Even a broken clock is right twice a day. But their (secularists) self-imposed will against God effectively blocks heaven's communications to them, and the Devil's inventions quickly take their place. The Holy Spirit is withdrawn from them, they let go of their anchor, and are left to beat about upon the rocks of infidelity.

Says the faithful Word of God:

The working of Satan will come: "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie....(and) who believed not the truth."<sup>21</sup> (KJV)

The fatal error in the end, one will notice is really not that some believed a falsehood. It is because they refused to believe the truth or hold a "love of the truth" when it was offered to them.

There is really an enormous difference. It is good to ask questions and be constructively critical of the evidence. But the goal should be to find and confess the truth. One should search to see if these biblical or spiritual things are so, and not insist on trying to arbitrarily circumvent or disallow them. Contrarily, modern men are trying every possible way to avoid accepting the

---

<sup>20</sup> Apparently Copernicus was a Christian as were many of the early astronomers. But the claim and title of "Christian" does not guarantee the safety of the doctrine they teach. God's Word is the ultimate standard.

<sup>21</sup> I Thessalonians 2:9-12

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

truth, to dismiss God deliberately, and ignore the powerful evidences right in front of them.<sup>22</sup>

This dangerous attitude of being bent on dishonestly trying to disprove the Bible and the testimony of creation should never be adopted or approved by the Christian scientist. The true and sacred astronomer will plainly recognize the testimony of the stars in the heavens, and seek to see in them the glory of the living God. This condition of things is what the author, for one, is trying to accomplish through these astronomy books.

Therefore, all conclusions drawn from secular humanists, must, and I repeat must, be tested against biblical standards and reliable science before accepting any of them. It is the only safe way. The astrophysics of creation **do** matter. They matter indeed!

---

<sup>22</sup> “Creation is not anti-science;

It is good science.” Don B. DeYoung, *Astronomy and Creation*, Creation Research Society Books; Ashland, Ohio, p. 9.

# 4

## Question Everything

The Greek playwright, Euripides (c.480-406 BC), once wrote:

*“Question everything. Learn something. Answer nothing.”*

For no subject is such an attitude more appropriate than for the subject of astronomy. In my mind astronomical science simply *begs* for questions and inquiry.

Because no normal human being has ever physically visited even a fraction of what we see in the universe beyond our own world, one cannot be *absolutely* certain what is out there. Further, none of us were around when it came to be. Our eyes, space probes, and telescopes tell us some things about our universe. But even these tools and the data they provide are subject to interpretation.

Knowledge about our universe increases or changes year by year. Certain things thought to be established beyond question years ago are often amended or even rejected today. Determinations about such distant or complex mysteries such as those in the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

heavens, when submitted to honest and through investigation, often turn out to be totally different from what was originally thought.

From our earliest days we modern earthlings have received instruction about the laws of physics and have been taught certain general facts relative to the celestial system beyond us. We have adopted these common facts as true. Some of these determinations seem to be beyond question today. Yet I believe we should begin by questioning even these basic foundations. If a building does not rest on a solid foundation, it will eventually crumble. Any safe position, therefore, should be able to withstand scrutiny.

Some of these typical established facts regarding our earth and the local universe around it might be listed as follows:

- The sun is about 93 million miles away from earth.
- The earth rotates on its axis, completing one full turn each earth day.
- The earth is also hurtling through space going many thousands of miles per hour (ca. 67,000 M.P.H.) and spinning as it does, at a rate of speed of about 1,040 miles per hour, at the equator.
- The earth is tilted on its axis 23 plus degrees, causing our seasons.
- The closest star, *Alpha Centauri*, is about 4.3 light years away. Our surrounding universe is all very distant from us.
- The stars are really “suns”
- These suns are arranged in rotating “island universes” called “galaxies.” Our earth and sun are part of a galactic system known as the “Milky Way Galaxy.”
- Einstein (and others like him) understood physics at a level way beyond most of us. The movements of the heavens are now understood by geniuses and scientists.
- Such astronomers as Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo

## *Question Everything*

finally proved that the earth revolves around the sun.

- The sun is comparatively massive, when compared to this earth. (Thus: A golf ball compared to a 18 ft. globe, or a “BB” to a basketball.) The same is relatively true of the dimensions of the stars and our surrounding universe.
- The planets circumvent the sun in a particular order and in ever widening orbits.
- The moon travels around us in about one month.
- Etc.

These general premises are now widely accepted by most moderns, and probably by even 99.9 per cent of Christians. I learned them in my early educational grades and have adopted them as part of my total cosmological view. Indeed, these basic facts have been handed down to us by centuries of scientific inquiry, and for what we think are good reasons, in most cases they seem to be plausible explanations of what we observe about us.

---

But remember, our *mantra* at the moment, at least, is to *question everything*.

Where do we begin? In a broad universe it is hard to know. But perhaps we can begin with the heavenly configurations that are closest to our own earth. The sun and the moon, for instance.

Since we already know a fair bit about the moon, given it is our closest neighbor and men have even been able to visit it (though some even question that!), let’s discuss the sun first, its size, properties, and primarily, the relative distance to it from earth.

This seething mass of heat and light generates the energy to warm our planet and to provide us with light during the day. It helps our food and plants to grow, and marks the passage of our days. This giant orb resides about 93 million miles away from us, right?

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Or, to question, does it?

How do we know the sun is about 93 million<sup>23</sup> miles away?

We basically deduce that the sun is about 93 million miles away by a system of mathematical triangulation. A similar method is used for finding the distance to the stars. Let us give attention to this first. This popular scientific method is called stellar parallax. The mathematical formulas of parallax allow one to predict somewhat accurately the distance an object is from us, based on another distance or standard that we already know, or relative to one that we already have previously established.

To simplify how it works, let us give a basic example. Suppose I'm looking at a star, from earth, when the earth is at a certain place in its orbit around the sun. Let's say, for example, that we are viewing at the time of the spring equinox. At this time I note the position and geometric angle of that particular star's location in the heavens from my vantage point.

Now, exactly six months later, let's say, I am looking at this same star at the time of the fall equinox, and I am at the same relative position to it, except I now believe I'm on the other side of the sun (Roughly 186 million miles from the first point). At this point I observe the position of that very same star and note that there is an angular difference in the star's position as compared to the original reference point. This I record as well.

Because I believe the sun to be a certain distance from me I can deduce a relative measurement taken from the radius of the earth's orbit around the sun (93 million miles). Using the geometric formulas that apply to right angles and other angles I can estimate the distance to that star from each end of the reference line. The mathematical equations are quite reliable, and

---

<sup>23</sup> We will usually use miles as a distance unit simply because most people are familiar with the length of a mile. Astronomers, of course, typically use astronomical units, light years, parsecs, and other such exponential figures.

## *Question Everything*

if adequate tools are used in fixing the location of a particular object one can be reasonably accurate in determining the distance to that object.

But.....these determinations rest upon a few *grand* assumptions. And I mean grand! That is to begin with, that the earth indeed orbits the sun in the way we have come to believe, and second, that indeed the sun is about 93 million miles away from us. But if either (or both) of these premises are *not true*, the calculations could be in error, by perhaps even hundreds of light years in distance. So in a way this scientific method might be circular, because it is based on an *assumed* distance, and on an *assumed* model as well of how our solar system is constructed and how our outer galaxy is thought to work.

The distance to the sun is calculated basically with the same principles. Assuming that Kepler's laws of motion are correct and based on certain premises, the distance to the sun is calculated. Commonly the distance is calculated by a rather complicated method that utilizes triangulation, reckoning from the orbits of planets that are at certain "known," "thought," or popularly "established" distances from us, such as Venus.<sup>24</sup>

But to return to our original question, is the sun really this relative distance from earth?

It is actually very difficult for a questioning observer, or "layman" in the field of astronomy, to get reliable or understandable answers from astronomical scientists on these issues. Why? One reason is because the "answer" will typically come from someone who is already indoctrinated into a certain school of thought or who has adopted as fact certain assumptions

---

<sup>24</sup> The distance to Venus has been measured by supposedly bouncing signals off the planet from earth. (I am suspect that this can be done reliably). By reckoning its phases and thereby its angle to the sun the remaining distance measurements are estimated geometrically. But the whole system of measurement *a priori* ASSUMES the validity of the popular astronomical theories of motion.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

borrowed from others, or who has adopted as fact many things which have never been ultimately proven. These assumed facts are simply then repeated as proof. This circular concept or phenomenon we must revisit numerous times in this short book.

### *Science Fiction*

Being a natural skeptic of some modern sciences, I am beginning to suspect more and more, that a portion of what we have been told about astronomy in the past may not be entirely true. Corollary to this I would suggest that the bottom line, therefore, is that a Christian probably should not ultimately trust anyone outside our faith (and even many within) to provide us with comprehensively reliable conclusions on these matters.

The scientists could often be right, in what they say, of course. But it is the opinion of this author that some of the assumed facts and models need to be first questioned from a Christian standpoint, and not just blindly accepted. *I believe that Christians should be skeptical of modern science equal to the level that modern science has reciprocally become skeptical of biblical philosophy.* This reservation itself posits an integral concept that should be considered more seriously by all Christians. I believe this concept cannot be overstated---and that it is universally enormous in scope and weight!

Again, I do not wish to disparage the work of astronomers and scientists and say that it cannot be used to advantage in our quest for truth and that their work shouldn't be respected at all---but I am saying that it is simply a tenet of wisdom to *question everything*. The principle reason for this is that the purposes of modern science to begin with are sometimes counter to the aim and purpose of the Christian. The Christian's purpose is to encounter sacred truth, to obey and glorify God. The typical modern scientist's declared purpose is not this at all. It is to explain everything empirically and in a humanistic sort of way. Therefore the modern scientist will often skew or ignore certain

## *Question Everything*

aspects of even scientific endeavor to make the data fit his own limited, humanistic paradigm or model. He is "narrow" and "religious" too, only he just won't admit it! He simply belongs to a different belief system.

The typical scientist or astronomer himself may not have a particular agenda in his mind to take God out of the picture, and there may not be an anti-God conspiracy behind every secular endeavor, but I feel the results of naturalistic reasoning will simply often turn out to be unreliable. There are many reasons to suspect this. But chiefly, I have come to believe from a biblical viewpoint that ultimate truth cannot be consistently perceived by a secular scientist if he consistently leaves God out of the picture. He will be sent a strong delusion, so that he will believe and propagate a lie. It is the fool, biblically speaking, that "says in his heart there is no God." We should not want to readily accept the conclusions of a "fool." Without God, then, there is no true or complete science. So finally, we as Christians ought to at least question and examine carefully what we are told.

One particular author has offered a term for this disconnect between true science and popularly biased science. Science without the necessary integrity is referred to as "scientistic" rather than "scientific."<sup>25</sup> True science cannot be classed with everything that claims to be "scientific" these days. Therefore a Christian must be careful in how he or she processes and filters the data received from scientific inquiry.

Even God does not recommend blind belief, even toward himself. He invites us to come and reason together with him (Isaiah 1:18). He asks us to test and to prove everything. God is not afraid of man's questions or skepticism. A "real" creator will never be stumped by a hard question. I think God wants us to be dialectic thinkers and to ask questions, even hard questions. In a sense I believe God actually invites questions! And truly without

---

<sup>25</sup> Wolfgang Smith, *Cosmos and Transcendence*. Publisher: Sophia Perennis, (April 16, 2008).

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

questions, there can be no answers.

So, like Euripides, I say again, *question everything!* Even this book!----mmmm----especially this book!

### Evolutionary Bias

Another reason why it is “scientific” to question the conclusions of modern science is due to what I call the *evolutionary quantity quirk*. Evolution itself seems to have a very aggressive, even as it were, carcinogenic, gene in its gene pool. While there are several annoying practices of current scientific endeavor, the most common one seems to be the *ad nauseam* over-inflation of the data. Everything is a million this and a billion that! Even a billion this and a trillion that----and way beyond! Remember, the same humanistic thinking that has concocted the millions of years of evolutionary progress, from worms, to apes, to man---has likewise concocted the 13.7 billion year old universe, the Big Bang “notion,” and all the other probably oversized time, volume, and distance paradigms we are mercilessly subjected to.

These wild guesses and manufactured mathematical notions are monotonously presented as fact. The scientific throttle seems to be stuck. Yet some of us already believe we “know,” for other and better reasons, that these typical predispositions and notions are generally inaccurate, unbiblical, and really in most cases nothing short of ridiculous. Why then, I would challenge the Christian reader, should one *readily* adopt the over-blown *cosmological* version of the same thing? Why? Why? Yet Christian thinkers repeatedly do just this; gullibly buying the whole exaggerated (*star*) *fish story*, “hook, line, and sinker.”

Spiritually speaking, I suspect the ultimate objective or intent driving this “evolutionary tendency,” is not so much “ape-ish,” as it is “imp-ish.” Reasoning from a “demonic” perspective, it becomes advantageous to use the scientific process to discount and/or illegitimate the creatorship of Christ. Long ages become

## ***Question Everything***

necessary for chance to effect outcome. The worlds are pictured as lonely, forgotten, and neglected for billions of years. This circumstance effectively discounts or ignores the loving God that indeed created the heavens and that sustains them moment by moment. The universe, as great as it is, is greatly exaggerated as to certain facts, in an effort to “outdo” (“out create”) what a god could supposedly ever “do.” God is thus “atrophied” and “depersonalized,” and finally ignored.

Even this attempt is futile, of course. God is still greater than it all. In fact, he probably will always turn out to be even bigger than *we* thought. For this writer suggests that God still remains, the ever loving, sustaining, “Creator of the Heavens,” and in the same way the Creator of us all.

## **The Love Affair with the Sun**

Another concept we will visit in a brief fashion in this chapter, and will not doubt allude to in the following chapters, is another philosophical and cosmological concept seeming to pervade all of astronomical and cosmological science. This is the exaltation of, or the preferred centrality of the sun in our local planetary system, and “suns” as well in other galactic systems. Suns miraculously and repeatedly show up everywhere!

I don’t believe this infatuation and tendency is merely accidental, or as most would assume, purely scientific. It is far, far from new. It is actually something that comes to us from very ancient times. For spiritual reasons, I believe there is a bias that tends toward exalting the sun, which thereby devalues the importance placed upon this specially created earth where the Son of God became incarnate and died to bring salvation.

I would hasten to suggest that this philosophical stance (that of the exaltation of the sun, etc.) is not something dreamt up only by extremists who see a sinister plot behind everything (though there are some of these types around). Rather it is something that can

## **THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS**

be clearly established from Sumerian, Babylonian, and Egyptian history, and can also be documented from open religious history starting in ancient times right down to the present moment. It is part and parcel of a great controversy that has raged around our planet for thousands of years, and that rages to date, in the opinion of some informed believers, at even supernatural levels.

It requires no footnote to teach that “sun worship” can be easily established as the foundation of every false religious system since time immemorial. That it continues to this day should be identified and recognized, even if it sometimes bears the title: “Science.”

### **The Distance to the Sun**

So, with these considerations simmering in the background let us return again to our original question of how far the sun might be away from us, and how large it really might be.

In an effort to determine an answer to this question for myself, I decided to devise my own experiments. Laugh if you will, but somehow, I cannot easily trust the conclusions of the same “mad scientist” that tells me that everything thing from our beautifully designed bodies to the grand universe simply came about as the result of a cosmic accident millions, even billions of years ago. I’m sorry. I can’t! As some have most appropriately quipped, “I don’t have enough faith to believe in evolution!”

If you ask any typical teacher or astronomer how far the sun is from the earth he will simply tell you “about 93 million miles.” Few teachers or professors know “exactly” why it is considered to be at that distance. None of them have really “physically” measured it. They just “know” it is that far, in the same way that we have always believed it is that far from us.

Usually some form of mathematical triangulation is given as the answer. While parallax works, it is typically based on other

## ***Question Everything***

assumptions that may not be facts. We will look at a few of these assumed facts in some of the following chapters. Anyway, for now, I suggest we need to begin creating *our own model* based on more verifiable facts, or with tools *we* can use. I'm opening up myself to scoffing and criticism, I know, in attempting to do this. I will be called a Christian extremist, an ignoramus, and a hobbyist. I will be recommended as a special honorary member of the "flat earth society," and the like!

But this response is nothing unusual or surprising; some creationists are getting quite used to such scorn and accusation anyway. Yet remember, each person is given a couple of eyes and a brain. They have permission to use them. I simply know that my own mind, right or wrong, needs to be ultimately satisfied through the three great pillars of the Bible, Science, *and* Reason. So again, it is good to question.

A great writer once said that men and women should be "thinkers, and not mere reflectors of other men's thoughts."<sup>26</sup> This grand and classic statement might best be aimed at astronomers, for astronomical terms are used in the very wording of the statement. There can be nothing wrong with questioning everything, even within the context of faith. Indeed, faith should be based on reason. Truth, if it is truth, will never be afraid of scrutiny and investigation. Therefore it is the lay person's right and privilege to question the work of astronomers and modern scientists. It is, I would even submit----their unquestioned *duty* to do so.

## **A Questioner's Experiment**

Here is the experiment I have attempted as regards the proximity of the sun<sup>27</sup>. While this type of thing may have been attempted before, the results have certainly not been commonly accepted.

---

<sup>26</sup> E.G. White, *Education*, p. 17. (1903)

<sup>27</sup> The description of the experiment is *greatly* simplified in the following text to aid the reader.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Because of certain exaggerative predispositions in mainline science, such a possibility has been ruled out. But here goes:

What I have done utilizing several reliable astronomy computer programs is virtually position myself at two opposite points of the earth (or a globe the size of the earth). One point is the “zero” position. This would be out in the Atlantic Ocean near Africa where the equator and the prime meridian intersect. The second position is the exact opposite of this, on the antemeridian in the Pacific Ocean beyond Hawaii. I have set up the computer for the equinox on March 20, 21, when the ecliptic (path of the sun) intersects the equator most directly, and when the days and nights are nearly equal. The object in question, the sun, is centered between these two extremes.

A very important adjustment must first be accounted for on the basis that astronomy programs note the position of objects next to the horizon using a direct 24 hour continuous time model. This, however, is erroneous *when considering the horizon* as a measuring tool, for geometrically a complete solar day is less than 24 hours. This significantly skews the position of the sun relative to the horizon and must be adjusted for when calculating this way. Please refer to Appendix A, for a more detailed explanation of this phenomenon. It is of paramount importance to this whole endeavor that this factor is reckoned into the equation.

So to continue, at sundown at the first position (“0” sea level, only an eyeball above the surface) we can note the horizontal altitude or angular position of the sun right when it is setting, relative to the horizon line at sea level. The center of the sun is finally reckoned to be below the horizon about 15 arc minutes, and near 270 degrees, so I am looking directly west.

Now, *at the exact same moment* (time zones and day changes present a challenge, so we use universal time) I note the relative position of the sun, at sunrise, just as it should be touching the horizontal reference lines from an exact opposite side of the globe

## *Question Everything*

(180 degrees, and facing directly east at zero altitude). I also factor to **not take** the adjustment for horizon refraction<sup>28</sup>. We want to mark simply where the sun actually is. This second measurement takes the same position as the corresponding side measured before, and when properly assessed proves our measurement is in balance.<sup>29</sup>

Since we do know that the diameter of the earth is close to 8,000 miles (ca. 3980, almost a 4,000 mile radius); this provides an estimable baseline to work from. Imagine now, a line to the center of the sun (or better yet, from the sun's center to each side of the globe) to each of these points on the globe. These lines can potentially give us an extremely slight, yet calculable angle to the same three points. At this juncture we don't need to consider the "size" of the sun because we are only triangulating to its apparent center or relative position.

To explain further in a different way, imagine two lines emerging from the two base points 8,000 miles apart. These lines are slowly converging, but ever so slightly because the angle is so small (one quarter of a degree relative to the perfect astronomical horizon). Nevertheless, one can reliably use solid trigonometric mathematics to see how far these converging lines must go to meet.

For example, suppose you are standing on a straight suburban street and you can see a car parked on the center line some distance ahead of you. Suppose you wish to know how far the car is away from you, but you are not allowed to approach the car and manually measure the intervening distance. Using a similar method you can estimate the auto's distance from yourself to it if you know the distance across the street where you are standing, and *if* you likewise determine the angle from each curb to (let's

---

<sup>28</sup> Another thorny issue, addressed briefly in Appendix B.

<sup>29</sup> Again, it is essential to read the Appendix if this issue is questioned for the computer will lie to the observer if the discrepancy is not accounted for properly.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

say the ball on the trailer hitch) the car. If the street is 35 feet across and the angles are discernible, you can use trigonometry to quite accurately assess the relative distance to the car.

My brothers and I did something similar to this once for interest at home when I was in my teens. The neighbors (the Schnibbes) who lived about a half mile away on the flat or plateau on which we lived had a modest, yet abrupt hill by their house. My brothers and I once had a “discussion” about how high the hill actually was from the plain. Therefore, since we knew from driving the car how far it was to the neighbors hill from our house, we used my father’s transit that he used for construction projects to determine the angle to the top of the hill from our house. Using the angle of say ten degrees (I can’t remember for sure now what it actually was, of course) with the necessary tangent equivalents, together with the known intervening distance to the hill, we were able to determine that the hill was somewhere between four and five hundred feet higher than the plain. (Topographic maps later confirmed our calculations). Surveyors, geologists, and cartographers use these same tools all the time, with much more exactness.

Now I realize that I don’t have the necessary tools to be *totally* accurate with such astronomical calculations. It is difficult to be totally accurate with such extreme angles as these, and there are other variables. There will be a certain margin of error, of course. But this margin of error is probably not in the millions of miles, but rather in the thousands of miles category. So the results, if validly conceived (please cf. *Appendix A*, B, C and D), should be able to confirm to us whether the sun is relatively *about* 93 million miles away or not. Are you interested in the results of this simple experiment?

Here are the results we are left with. They are, given no major mistake in reading them, most stunning and surprising. The distance to the sun according to this geometric calculation comes

## *Question Everything*

close to 950,000<sup>31</sup> miles---not even close to the 93 million miles we are systematically told. According to this simple test, the distance we are used to believing would be almost a hundred times more than it really is! Is this possible?

This result, let us remember quickly, should be no stunning surprise after all, given the “evolutionary quirk” we have alluded to in this chapter, where hyper-inflation seems to be locked in to everything the “scientists” tell us. Thus, the sun, at a conservative estimate of 1.0 million miles, more or less, from us would be radically disparate from the accepted 93 million. Therefore the sun, according to this scenario, would be relatively quite close to us. In fact, to the natural eye it really appears to be so.

Even Copernicus, living hundreds, and Ptolemy, thousands of years before us, estimated that the sun was about 3,000,000<sup>32</sup> miles away from us. How they determined this I don’t know fully, but they may have been actually closer in their estimations than all the gyrations of modern science. They probably measured off the phase of the moon. A similar experiment is outlined in *Appendix A* that parallels and validates the idea that the general distance to the sun can be calculated with such methods quite reliably.

What would be most significant about this possibility of the sun being closer to us than we have been told is that it would call into question nearly all of the mathematical and theoretical wizardry typically carried on by astronomers! While space is indeed vast,

---

<sup>31</sup> The distance was calculated in February, and therefore may be almost the closest to us. In other months it is probably more, because the distance is known to vary.

<sup>32</sup> The ancient Greeks said that the sun was only about 3,000,000 miles (4,828.032 km) from the earth. This was the number given by Ptolemy and the great Arab astronomer al-Battani. Even Copernicus in his book *On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres* gives the number at *about* 3,000,000 miles.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

and volume likely is infinite in any direction, such correcting information would radically change how we look at our local universe, and it would greatly alter the many assumptions about the various light year estimations and distances astronomers are commonly working with. If the primary benchmark is erroneous, how much more the distances calculated from it are! Science may be using a rubber ruler. I believe this possibility, if anybody is willing to consider it out there, has enormous implications! Universal implications in fact!

It is also probably true as well that if our calculations are in any way valid, that objects farthest away in our universe are thus *exponentially* miscalculated and erroneously assessed because of the “expansion” principle. If the distance to the sun is used as the standard for measuring the distance to the stars, and the sun is not at all the distance we are told, then the common calculations of astronomy are in error by exponential proportions! Perhaps some of the starry heavens themselves may be much closer to us than we have been taught. This whole possibility changes the face of the universe dramatically, at least for me. Therefore, as a result, I am frankly beginning to have some serious reservations about even the general claims of astronomers on many of these distance issues.

Such reckonings as the one above would also change the relative size of the sun dramatically, and put it in a much more reasonable framework. If we determine a revised distance to the sun, then its apparent size and diameter would be much different than typically postulated.

Present scenarios give us a *monstrous* sun<sup>33</sup> when compared to this earth, and for which it was made a servant at creation. The sun is said to be 400 times larger than our moon<sup>34</sup>, and many,

---

<sup>33</sup> Remember also what we have said about the obsessive blessing modern science awards the sun and other "suns" as well.

<sup>34</sup> “The sun is about 400 times more distant than the moon. It is also 400 times larger”----Lisle, p. 16 “The sun is 100 times the diameter of the earth.

### *Question Everything*

many, times larger than the earth. Now, with some calculated revisions, this disproportionate sun can be reduced to a reasonable size for the system it is housed in.

More reliable calculations can thus be applied to this matter as well. We know that a law exists that states that as objects of the same size move away from us they appear smaller based on the proportion of distance they have moved. A baseball one foot from our face will have an apparent size that fills much of our view. Move it two feet away and it will be about half the size it was before. Move it another foot and it will be cut *roughly* in half again. Therefore we can estimate the actual size of the sun if we know what distance it is from us and use the correct formula.



---

If it were hollow, it could hold 1 million earths". Lisle, p. 17.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

We will let trained mathematicians actually determine this more accurately, but roughly speaking we know that the sun and the moon have about the same “apparent” diameter to us visually on earth. The providential reason for this we may later discuss. But we also know that the moon is about 240,000<sup>35</sup> miles away, and that it is about  $\frac{1}{4}$  the size of this earth. Therefore, if the sun is even 1,000,000 miles away we could estimate it is only about 4 times larger than the moon. This would make the sun roughly match the size of this earth!<sup>36</sup> (According to diameter)

The above picture is interesting for at least two reasons. NASA provides the photo taken from a spacecraft about six million miles away from earth (photo, no doubt, cropped and enlarged, and who knows about the suggested distance). The moon in the picture is reported as closer to the camera than the earth.

What is of interest is that the amount of illuminated surface for the moon seems detectably less (or presented in a way different) than that of the earth. It is obvious by viewing the earth itself that one can deduce almost exactly what direction the sun’s light is coming from. Yet the moon not only seems to catch the sun’s light from a slightly different angle, but since it is closer to the camera it cannot even show a well-defined edge, for sunlight is unable to fill the foreground craters. It seems to be that if the sun is 93 million miles away there would be virtually NO detectable differences like this. Even though the moon is about 230,000 miles from the earth, this is but a slight jog when compared to the proscribed distance to the sun. Experiments should show that the sun at the given traditional distance could not produce this

---

<sup>35</sup> On the average, because the actual distance varies. Astronauts have placed at least four mirrors on the surface of the moon. By using laser beams that reflect back to earth the distance to the moon can be calculated within a meter, some claims say even within a millimeter! (225,000 to 252,000 miles)

<sup>36</sup> The moon has a diameter of ca. 2160 miles. The rough mathematics I use makes the diameter of the sun perhaps even as small as 8-10 thousand miles. It would not even be equal to twice the diameter of the earth--- *if* it is about 2 million miles away!

## *Question Everything*

anomaly.<sup>37</sup>

Now, remember, at this point I'm not claiming yet that any of these estimations are positively accurate, or "scientifically" that close. Please don't quote me on the distances! They will lock me up tomorrow! I still need to finish raising my children! But until I am corrected, I am going with my basic *relative* information as opposed to what I have been *told* about the sun's distance from us. This is my own "law of relativity!" It is grounded on something measurable and real, and not some slippery, nebulous theory that maybe no one really understands.

Some may charge that one's astronomy program is not accurate enough, or that such calculations just have to be in error. However, if they were, the astronomy program would not work at all, and it would be way out of sync with actual astronomical movements and would make no sense to us when we use them to look at the sky. The fact is that the programs map the movements of the celestial system quite well. Otherwise they would not work for us under normal circumstances (NASA and moon shots, etc.). They are simply working models of what is observable around us every day and night. Possibly, in some ways as time goes on, popular science may (if it hasn't already in some respects) get caught in its own web of lunacy and deceit on this issue.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> For instance if a person aimed a powerful light from a distance toward a basketball and a baseball; themselves separated by a relative distance of only two feet, and photographed them at this same proportionate angle and distance it is doubtful you could tell any phase difference on how the light strikes them. The equivalent scenario would make the light source about 800 feet away (93,000,000); yet the two spheres are actually only separated by a couple of feet. The angular difference at the greatest extreme would be in the fractions of seconds almost impossible to detect (ca. .146 of one degree)

<sup>38</sup> There are other considerations as well. Why is it that the Arctic regions experience radically different temperature ranges than those at the equator and the difference is explained as owing to the varied distance from the sun? How "in the world" would there be such disparate differences within a few thousand miles of each other when the entire earth is at such an incredible distance from the sun as 93 million miles?

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

What are we claiming here? Are we claiming that we have proved the distance to the sun? No, I humbly submit, we probably have much more learning to do about this whole issue. Unlike the bold certainty championed by modern science about such things, we simply are entertaining possible evidence that the sun and perhaps many other things may be much closer than we thought. Maybe we have missed something and it is farther than we think. We just can't be sure just yet.

But most of all, we are questioning. This is the main concern. We are questioning so that we can arrive at safer conclusions, conclusions that can have important implications for our faith as well. We are seeking conclusions that appear to concur with the claims of the Bible, and that exonerate the Creator the Bible teaches us about. We need to base our faith on real evidence, and for now I suggest we go with God's already created evidence, and not the wholesale *assumptions* and *theories* of the *godless*. This position is "astronomically" safer, I would suggest---and "light years" easier to believe!

What we are ultimately suggesting is that one should *question everything* when building a model of astronomical science. I am also sounding a warning that all kinds of "facts" are commonly circulating about us, most of which only have in the end the philosophical purpose of de-glorifying the Creator of the Heavens. Sadly, even Christians often buy or readily promote these flawed ideas. Not even one creation astronomer that I know of has even considered openly the data we have explored in this chapter. Even they typically parrot the raw conclusions of the secular scientists. But I would suggest this is not a safe way to do business in the corrupt, humanistic, and godless world we live in.

It behooves every modern Christian, therefore, to seek his answers in the light of the biblical models, and through *reliable* science. Yes, ask questions. Do it! But ask the questions of the *Creator* and not of the *pseudo-creators*. Test the spirits,<sup>39</sup> to see

---

<sup>39</sup> I John 4:1

## ***Question Everything***

whether they are of God. Indeed, *Question everything!*

# 5

## *Terra Firma*

Now that we have looked briefly at our closest neighbors, the sun and the moon, and their probable reference points relative to planet earth, let's take a look at the earth itself. Let's give consideration to some commonly understood facts about the very ground upon which we stand.

The first and great question we must ask is if the earth itself is moving. Is it hurtling through space, and is it rotating or spinning on its axis as it does?

Of course this is the question that has absorbed the interest of astronomers for centuries, even millennia. Since the Copernican Revolution about five centuries ago, the view has become somewhat settled that the earth makes a yearly journey around the sun, the sun being the center of our celestial system. Our days are brought about because the earth is believed to rotate on its axis,

## *Terra Firma*

providing us with day and night. This view is called *heliocentrism*, for the Greek word for sun is *helios*, and, of course, we all understand what *centrism* means.

For centuries, if not in some ways for the entire prior history of our world, men had believed that the earth was the center (some even thought the center of the universe) of our local system. This is often referred to as the Ptolemaic system because it was so explained and studied by Ptolemy in Roman times. Today this view is known as *geocentrism*, or as some prefer for reasons we may later explain, *geocentricity*, “geo” being a Latin form for “earth.” In this model the sun, moon, and planets are seen to revolve chiefly around the earth.

One of the least known facts in our present world is that despite what is taught and understood by science and humanity everywhere, the widely accepted Copernican model has never really been finally and ultimately proven. Rather, the heliocentric model has become preferred and accepted, yet neither model has ever been “proven” beyond doubt.

In most minds it has been proven, of course, but even the most eminent scientists generally will agree that ultimate proof still is wanting, even in the space age. In all, this is an amazing circumstance.

Taking the now traditional heliocentric model,<sup>40</sup> we are forced to conclude that the earth is indeed moving, and that it is moving in two different ways. First the earth is traveling or revolving around the sun at a rate of about 67,000 M.P.H. in order to complete its circuit about the sun in a year (Hang on to your hat!).

---

<sup>40</sup> "Basic heliocentric planetary data: "The mean distance of Earth from the Sun is about 149,600,000 km (92,960,000 miles). The planet orbits the Sun at a speed of 29.8 km (18.5 miles) per second, making one complete revolution in 365.256 days. As it revolves around the Sun, Earth spins on its axis and rotates completely once every 23 hours 56 minutes 4 seconds." (*New Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 4, p. 320).

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Secondly, the earth is spinning, or to use a more accepted astronomical term, rotating, at a relative speed of about 1,040 M.P.H. at the equator to complete a full rotation in 23 hours and 56 minutes.

The Bible view, contrarily, seems to be one closer to *geocentrism*. Bible phrases seem to speak of an earth that is circumvented by the sun, moon, and stars. Yet we could assume that the Bible writers are speaking through their “old world” eyes. So is the Bible really geocentric?

Furthermore, we might ask, should we immediately conclude that the Bible represents crude and ignorant views of science---- consequently it should not be trusted in making scientific conclusions---- or should we ever expect the Bible to be centrally reliable for scientific endeavor?

Before we address these questions, let us first start with a few sample Bible verses that may speak to the subject of a moving or non-moving earth:

*"He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing"(Job 26:7).*

*"The LORD reigneth, he is clothed with majesty; the LORD is clothed with strength, wherewith he hath girded himself: the world also is stablished (stabilized), that it CANNOT BE MOVED" (Psalm 93:1).*

*"Fear before him, all the earth: the world also shall be stable, that it be not moved" (I Chronicles 16:30). (KJV)*

Now we must first establish some basic Biblical interpretational rules before we would jump to sweeping conclusions based on what the Bible says. When it comes to science and its relation to the Bible, it is important to recognize there are different possible ways the biblical statements should be read and understood:

## *Terra Firma*

First there are biblical statements that are not even meant to be scientific statements in themselves and perhaps we should not take them as such:

### 1. Eyewitness Reports

An example of this type of statement is the controversial report in Joshua 10 that the “sun stood still.” The Reformers and the Copernicans fought over this verse and others like it, because according to Copernican theory it was not the sun that stood still, but rather the earth.

Even if you believe, along with the reformers, or the Roman Catholic leaders of that day, that the sun indeed stood still, it may be expecting too much to offer this verse as biblical “proof” that the sun revolves around the earth. The writer of the book of Joshua was confronted with an astronomical enigma, for sure; but here in this passage he is probably simply reporting as a news reporter would report----what he observed, or saw. We do the same thing when we say the sun “rose,” or the sun “set.” No one is confused or befuddled about such expressions, even though it is incorrect nomenclature for those convinced in modern Copernican theory.

### 2. Literary metaphor or hyperbole

Another circumstance that arises thousands of times in Scripture is the use of literary terms that are used for literary reasons only, but in a technical sense they are not entirely true in the sense of a strict empirical reality----or when speaking scientifically.

For instance, many similes and metaphors are used. One example is in Psalm 91:4, where it says God’s people will be protected “under God’s wings.” Does this mean that God is really a “chicken” and has “wings?” This is the last thing the Psalm is trying to teach. It is trying to teach that in the time of trouble God will protect the righteous much as a mother hen covers and protects her chicks. Thus the teaching is absolutely true, God will

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

truly do this. But the similes and metaphors used are not strictly factual in themselves. Consequently, these metaphors are not leading us to believe *every possible thing* the metaphor *could* stand for.

In the book of Job God asks Job if he knows where the snow comes from. God tells Job he has “treasure houses” of snow which he empties out when it snows. Does this intend to mean that there is a large room up in the sky where God opens a trap door and dumps snow out in winter? Of course, not! Probably Job didn't even believe that! But it is saying that God has a system, and that it works at the fiat of his divine will.

Sometimes other exaggerations or anthropomorphisms are used as well, to make certain points. In Psalm 2 God is said to *laugh* at the scheming of earthly kings and powers, and in the same sense he could be said to *laugh* at certain modern astronomers, because he knows so much more than they do. Yet it is not probably true that God is “really” laughing. Nothing man typically thinks or does takes God by surprise, nor does it probably humor him that man is so scheming and selfish, and malignantly evil, as well. Instead God probably actually “weeps,” for he certainly has good reason to. But the ultimate point in Psalm 2 is that God is given the characteristics of a proud man, or whatever, so we can understand from a human perspective how things must look from His viewpoint.

Therefore, when astronomical statements are made in the Bible it is important to sometimes observe in what context the statements are made. Are they only poetic? Are they partly or totally metaphorical? Or are they simply, even, general eyewitness reports quoted from observers that the Bible writers chose to add to their document for non-scientific reasons?

### 3. Empirical Statements

Finally, I believe there can be statements in the Bible that are made on a “scientific” basis, or at least are made for the very

## *Terra Firma*

purpose of explaining physical phenomena, or whatever. These statements are not made only to entertain or theologize. They are made to teach a certain inspired, empirical, fact. They are made to explain something to us about the cosmos or the world in which we live. They are “intentional” statements of plain and sober reality.

In a large measure I believe the statements in Genesis 1 are like this. They are there FOR THE PURPOSE of telling us where the earth, sun, moon, and stars came from. They are not exclusively poetic or metaphorical in nature. Nor are they technologically detailed. They are meant to be plain statements of fact. In fact, they are so direct and simple that modern scientists will not accept them as true. When these same scientists make outrageous statements about the age of the earth and universe, for which there is not a particle of proof, everyone accepts it as truth---for a scientist says it is so. Yet when God, who truly is the *Creator of the Heavens*, makes a simple and direct scientific claim, the scientists assess the statement, or the claim--- as crude, barbaric, and even mythological. Here is a wonder indeed!

The Bible simply says in Genesis, in general, rational, sterile “scientific” form, if you please, that “in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” Following this it says: “*He made the stars also.*” These stark, simple, non-detailed statements are still infinitely more informative than “some nebulous explosion out of black hole!” Perhaps, as expressed in Sir Fred Hoyle’s caustic assessment of the prevailing theory---a “Big Bang,” it’s the creationist’s turn to laugh. It is a theory, no, a cosmology, named after a joke.

It seems that the such statements as Psalm 93:1 that say that the earth is “established so that it cannot be moved” have at least some, limited, scientific value, ancient worldviews excepted, for there are many, many such statements that appear in the Bible in a consistent fashion.

In the book of *Job*, God asks Job where he was when He (God)

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

laid the “foundations of the earth.” Now the earth doesn’t have a foundation exactly like a building, but God himself is speaking in temporal, physical terms, and seems to be saying that the earth, or *at least the ground*, has been “rooted” in a specific spot.

Several times the term, “foundation of the world” shows up in the Bible, not only indicating the *time* relative to the world’s beginning in *time*, but also when alluding to the establishment of the earth’s basement crust or whatever---a place designed and intended to be a permanent fixture for surface life.

In the book of *Revelation*, The New Jerusalem (in the new earth) is given twelve foundations, to denote its permanent nature, for buildings with foundations are known to last the longest. God also says elsewhere that he set up the earth’s pillars. Pillars are also a symbol in the Bible of permanence. They are the only things that remain in many an ancient city today. In this case it is a metaphor for the structure of the earth, perhaps its land, mountains and crust. But these statements, made directly by God himself, seem to claim *some kind* of foundational permanence to the earth and its place in the universe. It is not the random result of an explosion.

Therefore the Bible is quite consistent in teaching a somewhat stationary earth, or at least, firm ground---*terra firma*, under our feet.

Really there is little evidence that our earth is indeed flying through space, *at least as fast a men typically say it is*.

Experiments have been carried out trying to prove that the earth is indeed moving or rotating. Some originally reasoned that dropping objects from towers and marking where they landed might prove that the earth is moving beneath our feet. The results, though, when this has been done have always been quite inconclusive, or at least very difficult to authenticate.

It is probably true that whether the earth is moving or not cannot

## *Terra Firma*

be reliably detected by what we feel, or generally observed in this way. It is only when there is an abrupt change at the place upon which we stand that we can detect such movement. When we go on a jet-liner we are able to walk back and forth easily in the cabin as if we were on the ground, even though we are going 600 M.P.H. in one direction. Of course, when we take off, we can feel the “G” forces, but this is an abrupt change underneath us. A similar thing happens during an earthquake.

But it still seems that if the earth is continually moving beneath our feet at nearly 68,000 miles an hour, because it is both spinning and coasting through space, we would have some obvious signs of it. But if I jump up in the air, I don’t land several hundred feet away (or, actually it would be 18 miles away @ 18 miles per second!), even though I should at this rate. Even at 36,000 ft. it takes the same amount of time to fly in an airplane from coast to coast, either way. For example, if the president of the United States takes off in his helicopter and hovers over the White House for several hours and then lands, he will not land in San Francisco, but safely back at the White House. Therefore, if the world is indeed turning, the entire atmosphere somewhere above us is turning also, at the same commensurate rate.

A simple look at the earth from space presents us with what looks like a placid, totally stationary earth. The earth looks serene, almost peaceful. The clouds and atmosphere swirl in all directions, not particularly banded east to west. Therefore, if the earth is spinning and hurtling through space, the point of contact between say the earth and these other celestial bodies is somewhere outside the earth’s atmosphere, perhaps somewhere between us and these heavenly objects. But it is not close or detectible here on this earth. Yet the best determination is that the earth, while it may be rotating as scientists believe, for all practical purposes, may not be moving much otherwise, at least as fast as claimed.

There may be good evidence that the earth may be turning, when considering such things as the Foucault Pendulum, and the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Corioles Effect. Today these experiments are usually considered to be proof of the rotation of the earth itself.

### The Foucault Pendulum

Despite the great claims of those who followed Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler in teaching that the earth circled the sun (thus it had to rotate daily), no definite proof yet existed hundreds of years later to demonstrate this was indeed the case. Finally in 1851 a Frenchman by the name of Leon Foucault (1819-1868) invented a contrivance which he used in an experiment in Paris.

The following is a quote from a 36-year veteran of the space program with a Ph.D. in astronomy from the University of Michigan on the subject of a rotating earth:

Proof of earth's turning, or rotation, didn't come until 1851, more than two millennia after Heraclides, [an ancient astronomer, suggested it.] The proof came from a big French swinger: a heavy metal ball suspended from the ceiling above the floor of the Pantheon (a church) in Paris on a 200-foot wire. The ball is called a Foucault pendulum, after the French physicist who came up with the plan. If you kept an eye on the pendulum as it swung back and forth all day, you could see that the direction taken by the swinging ball across the floor gradually changed, as though the floor was turning underneath it."<sup>41</sup>

Impressive as this experiment was, it still turns out that it isn't final proof of much of anything. Some reports even tell us the experiment was "rigged." However it is unlikely that all the pendulums in all the science and industry centers throughout the world are all rigged today. More likely it is, that the swinging pendulum which changes direction to match the movement of the earth can be explained in other ways. What makes some sense for me is what I would call "gravitational lag." This we may address shortly. But the pendulum experiment is significant in

---

<sup>41</sup> (Maran, *Astronomy for Dummies*, p. 42).

## *Terra Firma*

demonstrating a likely rotation of the earth.



Leon Foucault (1819-1868).

**Foucault is thought by many to have ultimately proved that the earth rotates on its axis.**

Another supposed “proof” given to show that the earth turns is the “Coriolis Effect.” This is illustrated in the fact that military gunmen firing their large guns southward found that they had to make a calculated correction in order to strike their distant target. At best, the Coriolis effect, can only be very slight and almost imperceptible, hardly proof enough itself that the earth is careening through space. Again, if the reason for this centrifugal



# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## Foucault's pendulum hanging from the ceiling in the church of the Pantheon in Paris.

force is that the earth is moving so fast, gravity included, why then is it that when we jump in the air we always seem to land in the same old spot? If the effects were much more severe, as it seems they should be in this scenario, then football, basketball, and baseball games would really be a challenge----for one team, at least!

Sir Isaac Newton was the first to explain how gravity holds us (and our atmosphere) toward the center of the earth and keeps us on the globe. But the earth's is probably not the only gravitational pull affecting us. The sun, moon and the planets also have gravitational pulls, enough to raise the ocean 18 feet in the middle and cause our tides. These gravitational attractions are at the same time distinctly directional. But which bodies are moving and which ones are not has still been a matter of conjecture, until maybe recently. So the Foucault Pendulum and the Coriolis Effect do seem to only prove, at the very least, that there *are forces and movements* ----SOMEWHERE.



Almost perfectly spherical (round) earth as viewed from outer space.

TERRA

FIRMA



View of the earth from the moon.

## *Terra Firma*

Absolute proof for even a rotating earth has really been quite scarce until probably recently. One writer searched the entire 29 volumes of *Encyclopedia Britannica* and found little or no such proof. What was offered, he reported, was that according to scientists, the earth has supposedly become an “oblate spheroid” because it has been spinning for so many billions of years!<sup>42</sup> If it is thus, it is not easily ascertainable by such mortals as ourselves, because the earth from space appears almost perfectly spherical!

It seems if the centrifugal force is great enough to have caused such a bulge, then it seems some of us lighter objects should be flying off the planet as we speak! At the very least people should be able to jump higher at the equator than people who live north or south of it. Basketball should be more popular at the equator than at other places! It is doubtful that this is true at all. While there must be some force to be observed as the planet rotates it cannot be very much, otherwise the people near the poles are at a disadvantage to those near the equator. I wonder if it is easier to get up in the morning at the equator? If so, maybe I should move there!

But the Bible pictures the earth for the most part holding still (Psalm 93:1), rooted to the foundation (Job 38:4) in space (Job 26:7 “hangs the earth on nothing.”) that God created for it. It is basically spherical (Isaiah 40:22 mentions the “circle of the earth”).

Yet for the most part the earth is probably a relatively stationary object. It defies the author’s system of belief to reason that the earth is moving at a rate of 68,000 m.p.h. and between a million to two million miles a day (18 miles per second!). At the very least, perhaps according to the theory of relativity, it is moving

---

<sup>42</sup> "The centrifugal force of Earth's rotation makes the planet bulge at the Equator. Because of this, Earth has the shape of an oblate spheroid, being flatter near the poles than near the Equator. Correspondingly, one degree of latitude is longer in high latitudes than it is in low ones." (*Britannica*, vol. 4)

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

only enough to offset the movements of the other heavenly bodies in relationship to it.

However, it is very likely that the earth is indeed rotating. It is either rotating or the universe is revolving around it. It is easier to reason that it is the earth itself that turns, with the evidence we can come closer to verifying.

### **A Biblical Rotating Earth?**

What is a stunning development to this author's view is that when studying the astronomical comments in the ancient book of Job it may have actually always been the Bible position that the earth rotates on its axis. Not that men in past history saw it that way. But the import of the following verses are astounding when explicated carefully:

These particular verses highlight the miracle of morning and evening and link it to creation week. They say of the dawn:

“Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know its place.... It is turned as clay to the seal; and they stand as a garment [fabric, tent?].”<sup>43</sup>

First one must understand what is meant by a typical seal of ancient times. A significant number of the seals that would be used requiring a “turning” action were cylinder seals. Rolling the cylinder made a better impression in that it did not stick and mar the impression unnecessarily.

Cylinder seals have been found in abundance in the Middle East. They are circular cylinders made mostly of stone or baked clay. If read correctly, this verse seems to say that the heavens and the

---

<sup>43</sup> Job 38:12, 14. (KJV)

## *Terra Firma*

earth have a similar relationship as the seal to the clay, or the clay to the seal. As the seal rotates upon the clay so the stars seem to roll about the earth, being stamped by their own unique markings and configurations. It is more than inferred by the context that it is this very motion of rotation that causes darkness to turn to morning and daytime to darkness!



Mesopotamian cylinder seal (ca. 2,000 B.C.)

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

What is particularly impressive about this description is that God himself is pictured as speaking in this passage. The Creator of the Heavens is offering comment, speaking from his own divine knowledge. He is giving explanation about what he is able to do to bring about daylight and darkness through the exercise of his omnipotent power!

Therefore it may even be “biblical” to accept the modern determinations of science in regard to the rotation of the earth at one revolution per day.

But at the very least, it makes the best sense to this author that the earth if it is moving, is moving through space at a *much slower pace* than 67,000 m.p.h. If we take our revised distance to the sun ascertained in the previous chapter, (ca. a million/plus miles away), then the earth would only need to orbit about one/93<sup>rd</sup> the distance, and thus would be traveling more like 750 to 1,000 m.p.h. If it is moving one way at about 1,000 m.p.h. and rotating the other way at about 1,000 m.p.h. at the equator, perhaps then surface life finds itself in almost perfect equilibrium. For the most part, *terra firma*, (firm earth) would then essentially rest below our feet.

# 6

## **Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon, Awesome as the Host**


In this chapter we will look more closely at the actual movements of the sun, moon, and stars in relationship to this earth. We will try to create a more reliable framework for these heavenly orbs in terms of motion and distance.

The moon is closest to us and is therefore the most easily observed. So do the movements of earth's moon offer us any information that helps us to understand the movement of the earth and the movement of other bodies within our own solar system?

In the typical Copernican Model accepted today the moon makes the following movements in its orbit around us:

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

The moon to our own view, as we all have observed, passes through phases:



In this typical heliocentric diagram of the phases of the moon the sunlight is coming from a stationary sun and the moon takes a MONTH to orbit the earth.


The inner circle shows what actually happens on the moon, the outer circle demonstrates how it appears to an observer on earth.

The moon moves at a rate of about 2,000 mph and changes position about 13 degrees per day to an observer on earth.

This explanation makes complete sense for the most part, and thus it has become widely accepted. In other words, it works.


First, for interest, what causes an eclipse of the moon?

## *Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*



When the earth moves between the sun and the moon, it casts a shadow on the face of the moon, blocking or partially blocking our view of the moon. This is called a lunar eclipse.

The moon moves in a roughly elliptical orbit around our earth in one month. The fascinating pictures below represent a time phase transit of the moon over a period of about four hours. The pictures taken from space allow us to stand back from the scene and survey the movements of the relative objects. These pictures are probably to me the most informative pictures relative to the rotating earth and the revolving moon ever to be taken.




Series of images showing the Moon transiting Earth, captured by NASA's EPOXI spacecraft.

**Credit:** Donald J. Lindler, Sigma Space Corporation/GSFC; EPOCh/DIXI Science Teams

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

While the sequence doesn't *ultimately* prove that the moon orbits the earth due to its own movement and not an *aether*, the passage of the moon and the time calculations relative to its transit fit in everyway the mathematical speed, distance, and orbit that astronomers have determined are to be expected. A larger sequence of the photos is given to provide more detail.



One enlarged sample from the same sequence follows on the next page:

*Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*



[http://www.nasa.gov/topics/solarsystem/features/epoxi\\_transit.html](http://www.nasa.gov/topics/solarsystem/features/epoxi_transit.html)

What is amazing about these pictures, if their data is honest, is that they generally confirm our beliefs about the behavior of the moon and how it revolves monthly about our earth. The distance to the moon is known quite exactly and the monthly orbit of the moon is also ascertainable. Mathematically the speed of the moon is about 2,100 m.p.h. In looking at this sequence one can see the moon transits the earth in roughly four hours. From one side of the earth to the other would be roughly 8,000 miles,

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS


therefore it should take the moon if it is going about 2,000 miles per hour about four hours to visually pass by the 8,000 mile backdrop of the earth, and this it does.

There is much more data available about the moon's orbit, its libration and habits that are very interesting. This is available in many other astronomical works. But for the present let us explore the observable habits of the sun as well, and especially how they relate to our earth and moon in the eclipse cycle.

### Solar Eclipses

Solar Eclipses are somewhat similar to lunar eclipses but the timing of them is very much shorter. A lunar eclipse will last up to several hours while a solar eclipse may only last about ten minutes. Solar eclipses cannot be seen everywhere on earth and are quite rare for a particular observer. A lunar eclipse can be viewed much more often.

### Solar Eclipses



When the moon moves between the sun and the earth it casts a shadow or umbra on the earth, blocking or partially blocking our view of the sun. This is called a solar eclipse.

The movements of the sun and the moon in relationship to this earth tell us much about how our solar (or "earth") system works. Not only do the movements we observe every day or night

## ***Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon***

provide us with important information of this nature, but also the eclipses and their cycles do as well. These eclipses are fascinating to observe, and can be predicted. They vary from partial to full depending on the time and place they are viewed on earth. Most people have seen several lunar eclipses. But again, real solar eclipses are very rare and last at the most only a few minutes.

The fact alone that eclipses happen with perfect predictability is really a powerful argument that our local universe is governed by a divine power. If things were just exploding about randomly in space, or were bouncing about in entropic fashion, eclipses would rarely occur, and not on schedule. But they seem to be planned into our local system, and I believe are intentionally integrated to verify the signs and the seasons God originally ordained. The whole circumstance is so incredibly amazing!

The sun, of course, is seen on one side of the earth for about 12 hours, on the average, and again depending on when and where you are located. The moon, on the average moves around us in approximately 13 hours, and thus its position for viewing falls backward or regresses about an hour each day. If you see the moon come up at about 10:00 P.M. on a given night (it would probably be close to full if this were the case), then the following evening you need to wait about another hour to see the moon rise. It is entertaining to take mental notes on the movements of the moon from night to night and throughout the month (which I, the author, love to do). For thousands of years every person was well aware of the patterns and phases of the moon (completing its cycle every 27-28 days), but today with artificial calendars this attention and interest is largely lost. But the tradition still survives in the name of a 30-day period in the word “month,” which really comes from “moonth.”

Below is a table of approximate moonrise and moonset times for the east coast of the U.S. at latitude 45 degrees and using daylight time. You will notice that the moon has about the same 12 hour period of earth orbit as the sun. Try looking up every night and

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

checking it for yourself. For convenience the sunrise and moonrise are more closely equated on the table but they actually vary enough to cause the full cycle of lunar phases:

## Apparent Diameters

An item of interest is the fact that though the sun and moon are at different distances from our earth, they *appear* to be the same size. This is a remarkable circumstance, for if the formation of our solar system were totally left up to chance it is highly unlikely

### Moonrise Table

	Moonrise	Moonset		Moonrise	Moonset
 New moon	06:00 AM	06:00 PM	 Full moon	06:00 PM	06:00 AM
 Young crescent	09:00 AM	09:00 PM	 Waning gibbous	09:00 PM	09:00 AM
 First quarter	12:00 PM	12:00 AM	 Last quarter	12:00 AM	12:00 PM
 Waxing gibbous	03:00 PM	03:00 AM	 Old crescent	03:00 AM	03:00 PM

that this would occur. There seems to be absolutely no natural reason why this providential coincidence should exist.

The sun is at the right distance, the moon is at the right distance, and though they aren't the same size or in the same orbit, they

## ***Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon***

appear to be so. This is quite amazing when you think about it. I, of course, do not leave such things up to chance, but recognize an intelligent purpose behind the whole arrangement! The heavens have a direct Creator.

When airplanes, trains, and other forms of public transportation show up at the terminal or depot at a certain time we don't think for a moment that the transportation authorities didn't have a time schedule set up by intelligent transportation planners in the company office. Yet the cosmos works with accuracy within microseconds, day after day, for millennia, and secular scientists reason that it all happens by odds and chance. What gives?

Evidence supposedly exists that argues that the earth is so exactly placed in its celestial setting that if it were as little as a few feet closer or farther away from either the sun or the moon, life on this earth the way we know it would not be possible. Arguments are also available to demonstrate that the earth, sun, and moon are all appropriately spaced to within but a *few feet* of the ideal and the necessary. The evidence of design in this circumstance is overwhelming.

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS


## The Moon



### The Movements of the Moon

It is therefore quite certain, that the moon is indeed revolving around this earth as in the present scientific model, at the known distance of an average of 240,000 miles from earth. It is also defendable that the moon makes a full revolution every month or about every 28 days. The earth serves as a barycenter for the moon's orbit.

## *Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*



The moon orbits the earth every month.

Encyclopedia Britannica:  
"The Moon rotates about its own axis in 27.322 days, which is also the time that it takes to complete one orbit around the Earth. As a result, the Moon always presents nearly the same face to the Earth. Whereas the actual rate of rotation is uniform, the distance through which the Moon moves in its orbit from day to day varies somewhat. Accordingly, the face that the Moon turns to Earth is subject to a corresponding cyclical variation, the lunar globe oscillating slightly (as seen over time by a terrestrial observer) with a period nearly equal to that of revolution. The amount of this apparent oscillation, which is called libration, is commonly between 6 and 7 degrees."  
*(New Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 17, p. 299).*

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## The Movements of the Sun

When it comes to the movements of the sun, I am suspecting that something significantly different may be happening as relates to the typical Copernican/heliocentric model and it is this:

Using a variety of factors I am proposing that the *sun is possibly revolving around the earth*, behaving much like the moon, at least in a relative sense. However, because the earth is indeed rotating, giving us our days, the sun takes an entire solar year to complete its orbit. As the Psalmist says, the sun makes an orbit from one end of heaven to the other (Psalm 19:1-6). Or, in other words, it completes a circle and meets up with itself again.

This is drastically different than the Copernican model because the earth would not be revolving around the sun in this scenario, but *vice versa*. The sun in this model would behave very similar to the moon. The difference is that the moon takes one month to make a revolution, but the sun takes one year to complete its orbit at a distance significantly farther out.

On what basis can we determine or dare to suggest that the sun could be orbiting the earth? Before this writer is shipped off to the “loony bin” let’s look at this a moment.

I propose there could be several possible reasons:

### **1. The stars seem to maintain their relational configurations.**

First, in the following chapters we may address more specifically the distances to the stars and planets. But as one might now expect, I’m beginning to believe that the distances to these are generally hyper-inflated by evolutionary astronomers just like everything else. This condition of things may even be verifiable at the present moment. One wrong assumption leads generally to another. So I wonder if we will likely find in time that some of stars are probably much closer to us than has been typically

## *Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*

reported. But for now, let us reason for interest on the premise that they are indeed much closer to us than the current models allow.

One reason therefore, why I would find it difficult to believe that the earth is circumventing the sun in a huge elliptical circle as believed for the last several hundred years, is that during the year some stars, likely close to us in our own system, should change their positions relative to each other, due to perspective, as the year progresses. While modern science tells us these stars are all at incredible distances from us, I'm not so sure. Therefore if they are indeed quite close to us and "belong" to us as the Bible says, then their closeness should show us significant observable differences if we are indeed so dramatically moving around in space.


The best evidence so far from astronomy seems to indicate that the stars are at varying distances from us. So in a sense one star is almost behind another star, or another star is nearly in front of another star to our perspective. Therefore, as the earth moves from one position in the solar system to another there should be a slight yet perceptible change in how the stars align themselves to our view.

Yet basically, there is very little or no alteration. The stars maintain their same position relative to each other in the sky throughout the year. The Big Dipper always maps out like the Big Dipper, regardless of the time of year. Orion looks like Orion, all through its viewable season.

I once was pastor of a church that had a sharp, white steeple. A few blocks away stood another church building that also had a steeple, almost identical in appearance (except theirs had a better paint job!). Often when I approached my church, laterally and at some distance along a country side road, my daughter and I used to like to watch the steeples "cross." First my steeple would be on the right and the other church's steeple would be on the left. A few more yards and the steeples would join. A little farther on

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

I would notice my steeple would be on the right and theirs would be some distance to the left. The steeples, though in fixed locations, “moved” relative to my perspective at the time.



## *Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*

2008 October 15

Camera Orion

Credit & Copyright: [John Gauvreau](#)

**APOD Explanation:** [Orion](#), the Hunter, is one of the most easily recognizable [constellations](#) in planet Earth's [night sky](#). But [Orion's stars](#) and [nebulas](#) don't look quite [as colorful](#) to the eye as they do in this lovely camera image, taken [early](#) last month at the [Black Forest Star Party](#) from [Cherry Springs State Park](#) in [Pennsylvania, USA](#). In this single exposure, cool red giant [Betelgeuse](#) takes on a yellowish tint as the brightest star at the far left. Otherwise Orion's hot blue stars are numerous, with supergiant [Rigel](#) balancing Betelgeuse at the upper right, [Bellatrix](#) at the upper left, and [Saiph](#) at the lower right. Lined up in [Orion's belt](#) (bottom to top) are [Alnitak](#), [Alnilam](#), and [Mintaka](#) all about 1,500 [light-years](#) away, born of the constellation's well studied [interstellar clouds](#). And if the middle "star" of [Orion's sword](#) looks reddish and fuzzy to you, it should. It's the stellar nursery known as the [Great Nebula of Orion](#).

[http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0810/orion\\_gauvreau\\_big.jpg](http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0810/orion_gauvreau_big.jpg)

Theoretically, some stars scattered throughout the firmament should find themselves in at least slightly altered configurations to our view as the year advances. Stars that are close together should shift slightly against each other. But they do not. For thousands of years, the stars remain close to where they are *relative to each other*, day after day, month after month, year after year, even century after century, and millennium after millennium.

(picture opposite)

Orion on Film

Credit & Copyright: [Matthew Spinelli](#)

**APOD Explanation:** [Orion](#), the Hunter, is one of the most easily recognizable [constellations](#) in planet Earth's [night sky](#). But [Orion's stars](#) and [nebulas](#) don't look quite [as colorful](#) to the eye as they do in this lovely photograph, taken last month from Vekol Ranch south of [Phoenix](#), Arizona, USA. The [celestial scene](#) was recorded in a five minute time exposure using high-speed color print film and a 35mm camera [mounted](#) on a small telescope. In the picture, cool red giant [Betelgeuse](#) takes on a yellowish tint as the brightest star at the upper left. Otherwise Orion's hot blue stars are numerous, with supergiant [Rigel](#) balancing Betelgeuse at the lower right, [Bellatrix](#) at the upper right, and [Saiph](#) at the lower left. Lined up in [Orion's belt](#) (left to right) are Alnitak, Alnilam, and Mintaka all about 1,500 light-years away, born of the constellation's well studied [interstellar clouds](#). And if the middle "star" of Orion's sword looks reddish and fuzzy to you, it should. It's the stellar nursery known as the [Great Nebula of Orion](#).

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap030207.html>



**2003 February 7**

## ***Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon***

As one can see, the stars of Orion align similarly, even though they are photographed about six calendar months apart from each other and when according to Copernican theory the earth would have traveled 180 million miles away from its original location. The configurations could be super-imposed upon each other with little difficulty.

What this seems to suggest is that the earth is somewhat stationary in relation to the correspondingly somewhat stationary stars in our celestial system.

However, the sun's position *does* "change" relative to the background of our galaxy, or whatever our system really is. There are roughly 12 major constellations through which the sun passes in its yearly motions. These are the well-known signs of the zodiac. The sun moves to our view about 30 astronomical degrees per month and ends up in the same place in the zodiacal circle after the passage of a solar year. So it makes complete sense that what we see is what we get. The sun could be slowing moving in a large circle around us every year. It is circling the earth, and not vice-versa, similar to what biblical apologists have always claimed.

Astronomers would hasten to tell us that the stars are so far from us that such a shift would not be noticed. Only the slight and imperceptible shifts used for stellar parallax measurements are granted. Yet they also tell us that the stars are moving at *incredible* speeds, mostly away from us, but in all directions (expansion). Even this should cause some changes in perspective. It should have at least changed more than it has in the last few thousands years. Yet it hasn't because the constellations mapped on ancient monuments look almost exactly the same today as then. Supposedly some shafts in the ancient pyramids of Egypt match the configurations such as those in the belt of Orion. Though there have been shifts due to the precession of the pole star, or perhaps because of the shifts of tectonic plates or subsidence, the modern configurations of the constellations quite accurately match the ancient records.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Further, it shouldn't take billions of years, taken the drastic movements and speeds proposed by scientists for the stars to see significant shifts in the stellar arrangements. But these enormous hyper-inflated constructions and time scenarios come about because there has to be some explanation to justify what scientists propose.

This author is at the present writing in the midst of testing some of the conclusions about how much the stars really do shift when stellar parallax is being applied. What seems to be the case so far, is that while there are probably definite shifts and movements in the heavens because God's universe is not static, scientists may be largely mistaken in some of their readings because they ASSUME the earth is moving through space at multiplied thousands of miles an hour---when it is not. Because the earth is actually relatively still, the micro shifts of the heavenly bodies, because they are so small (since the earth is largely stationary) can only be interpreted by scientists as they appear to them, as happening at enormous distances from us---- yet in reality perhaps they aren't.

It works out mathematically that if the sun is about four (4.16) times farther out from us than the moon (as determined in our initial chapters), and that if it were traveling at roughly the same speed as the moon, the circumference of the sun's orbit is exactly the length needed for the sun to make a circuit of the earth in a year.

### **2. Thermal wake of the sun**

Another reason why I believe the sun may be the principle body that is moving, and not the earth, is what I would call the "thermal wake" of the sun. Again, I am presently testing this concept. If the sun is indeed moving, and we know it is incredibly hot, there ought to be some evidence left behind in its spatial path indicating where it has passed.

## ***Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon***

What seems to be impossible to find is thermal imagery of the heavens *around* the sun. All the infrared imagery taken from space all frames the sun, cropping it incredibly close, yet the area farther out, around the sun is consistently left out of the picture. Whether this is by design or not, I do not know. But certain photographs seem to indicate that the thermal effects in the sun's environment may show some kind of direction.

Astronomically, this author would reason that it is important to have the sun in a transitory mode because of its great heat. Having the sun rooted to a particular spot would be dangerous for our local universe. It makes most sense that the Creator would have the sun move about in a regular orbit about the planet it serves.

Science even teaches that the sun is moving, though it certainly does not teach it is moving around the earth. But if it is indeed moving, why not have it "slowly" revolve around the earth, as the moon does? It seems that incredible problems would emerge if the sun were allowed to sit in virtually one place all the time. It needs to move so it doesn't continually fry its static surroundings. Why not have it orbit our earth as always thought, but not daily, of course?

### **3. Unnecessary Earth Danger**

Another reason why it makes sense that the sun might do the chief amount of moving is that it defies belief for a creationist, at least this one, to believe that a creator-designer would have a habitable planet careening through space at the reckless speeds popular science proposes. Not only would this tend to create certain problems for the inhabitants of that planet, but it also submits that planet to unnecessary danger. At any rate, no habitable planet should be going 67,000 m.p.h. It's just too dangerous! A heavenly policeman would need to turn on his siren! But our planet is still here, sheltered and relatively safe for

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

the last several thousands of years. Why?




## The Crown of the Sun

Credit & **Copyright:** [Hartwig Luethen](#)

**APOD Explanation:** During a total solar eclipse, [the Sun's extensive](#) outer atmosphere, or corona, is an inspirational sight. The subtle shades and [shimmering features](#) of the corona [that engage](#) the eye span a brightness range of over 10,000 to 1, making them notoriously difficult [to capture](#) in a single picture. But this composite of 28 digital images ranging in exposure time from 1/1000 to 2 seconds comes close to revealing [the crown](#) of the Sun in all its glory. The [telescopic views](#) were recorded near Kochenevo, Russia during the August 1 total solar eclipse and also show solar prominences extending just beyond [the edge](#) of the [eclipsed](#) sun. Remarkably, features on the dark near side of the New Moon can also be made out, illuminated by sunlight reflected from [a Full Earth](#).

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap080808.html>

## *Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*



Does the earth orbit the sun every year or the other way around? Actually either scenario is astronomically feasible.

According to the Book of Genesis, the sun was not created until the 4th day. The earth was created **FIRST**.

Hundreds of verses refer to the sun as **RISING** and **SETTING** every day while not **ONE** verse ever refers to the earth as **MOVING**: "The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose. (Ecclesiastes 1:5). "The mighty God, even the **LORD**, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof (Psalm 50:1).

For thousands of years men believed that the sun went around the earth---however, daily. What Copernicus and others determined was that the earth orbited the sun instead. Gradually, the tide shifted in favor of the Copernican view, but the shift was based more on its popularity with astronomers, not necessarily based on evidence. The church, for the most part held to the view that the earth remained the center of the local universe.

What few know, even today, is that it really has never been "proven" even before the present hour that the earth orbits the sun. It was simply chosen as the easier model to understand relative to the motions of the planets, therefore it came to be

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

largely accepted.



Medal of Cardinal Richelieu.



Reverse of medal shows a stationary earth at the center of the universe.

Not all scientists believe that the earth revolves around the sun:

Tycho Brahe, A famous associate of Copernicus and Kepler, and whose findings were known by Galileo, taught that the sun orbits the earth and that Venus and Mercury circled the sun. He worked out a model that preserved the Ptolemaic system somewhat, and raised again the issue of “epicycles.”<sup>44</sup>

Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D., geocentrist astronomer has recently written:

“...The world has just as many myths today as it had 3000 years ago. Can we help if the humanists and Bible critics have swallowed every myth we have today while rejecting the Truth as myth? Having said that, we need to prove our point for we are, after all, challenging the established [heliocentricity based] belief system.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Epicycles are described as smaller orbits of planets that could happen inside greater orbits of bodies such as the sun.

## *Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon*

\*\*\*\*\*

The following four quotes are from Sir Fred Hoyle, one of the most brilliant astronomers of recent times, and a dedicated Christian. They are interesting in this regard to say the least. Endnotes accompany the statements at the end of the chapter according to the general citation taken:

"We know that the difference between a heliocentric theory and a geocentric theory is one of relative motion only, and that such a difference has no physical significance."<sup>2</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

"Tycho Brahe proposed a dualistic scheme... and in making this proposal he thought he was offering something radically different from Copernicus... [and] Kepler obviously thought so too. Yet in principle there is no difference."<sup>3</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

"Today we cannot say that the Copernican theory is "right" and the Ptolemaic theory is "wrong" in any meaningful sense. The two theories...are physically equivalent to one another."<sup>4</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

"Science today is locked into paradigms. Every avenue is blocked by beliefs that are wrong, and if you try to get anything published in a journal today, you will run up against a paradigm, and the editors will turn you down."<sup>5</sup>

Again, Dr. G.D. Bouw, physicist, and proponent of biblical astronomy and geocentricity (earth-centered, with adjustments), makes the following comments:

**Astronomer Dr. Bouw on Geocentricity and the Space Program:**  
"...Again, once more for the record: it has been shown at least six different ways this century alone that the equations and physics used by NASA to launch satellites are identical to the equations derived from a geocentric universe. Thus, if the space program is proof of anything, it proves geocentricity and disproves heliocentrism."<sup>6</sup>

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

\*\*\*\*\*

Another scientist writes:

"The evidence for heliocentrism is even weaker than the evidence for evolution."<sup>7</sup>

## Chapter Conclusion

It is suggested that the movements of the moon indeed closely match what has been determined for centuries. However, the movements of the sun may not be as automatically verifiable as most people have assumed since the beginning of the Copernican Revolution.

It would not shake this author's faith in the least if it should indeed be that the earth orbits the sun. It works astronomically. But there may be even better evidence to support the opposite scenario which still is astronomically possible as well.

Therefore it is suggested that it is as astronomically viable for the sun to orbit the earth as it is for the earth to orbit the sun. Further study and verification is needed before astronomers should reject the biblical norms and forever jump on the Copernican bandwagon.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>45</sup>

1 - Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D., "Draco the Dragon", The Biblical Astronomer, Vol. 12, #100, Spring, '02

2 - Sir Fred Hoyle, Astronomy and Cosmology, 1975, p. 416. (Quoted in Spring, 02 BA, p.64.)

---

<sup>45</sup> Fixed-earth.com

## ***Bright as the Sun, Fair as the Moon***

3 - Hoyle, Nicolaus Copernicus, 1973, p. 3, (Quoted as in #2.)

4 - Ibid. p. 88.

5 - Hoyle, Scientific American, March, 1995, p. 47, (Quoted on p. 73 of Spring, '02 BA.)

6 - G. D. Bouw, "News Extracts", Bulletin of Tychonian Society, Spring, 1990, #53, p.28, (Quoted p. 43, The Earth Is Not Moving, by Marshall Hall, 1994 printing.)

7 - Dr. Jim Paulson, Prof. Biochemistry at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, (Spring '02 BA, p.80.)

# 7

## **The Surprising Structure of Our Local Universe**

Near the beginning of this small book we listed several well-accepted facts as they apply to our local solar system and regions beyond us as well. However, so far it has been noted that many of these commonly accepted paradigms may not be as worthily established as they should be. The heavens may not in actuality function entirely the same way as presented in typical science textbooks and astronomical literature. Certain “facts” then may not be “facts” at all. Several of the typical conclusions don’t seem to hold water when given simple, yet careful consideration.

This chapter will extend our questioning further. If scientists can theorize and pedal their theories as “fact,” though in many cases

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

“proof” does not exist, why cannot we take solid biblical and scientific information and create our own working theories of our local universe? What we may need is a revised model for our local system, at least.

First we discovered that the commonly accepted values and distances built into the current astronomical models may be greatly exaggerated and inflated. Primarily we investigated the relative distance of the sun from this earth. If we are even remotely correct in what we calculated, the commonly accepted distance is in error by almost a hundred times. Therefore our entire model must experience a drastic reduction in scope. One writer has estimated that some of the prescribed distances to the stars could be in error by at least 25,000 times! Much of this is because these standard distances are based on an incorrect standard of the sun’s proximity to us, and because of erroneous conclusions concerning the sun’s relative motions.

Instead of the sun being 93 million miles away it is maybe about 1.0 million miles away. This is really quite close to us, comparatively speaking. Light traveling at its assumed speeds would reach us in less than ten seconds! The relative size of the sun would also shrink drastically to more realistic proportions. The sun would then be as far away as it “looks.” It is close enough to warm our planet, yet far away enough to not burn it to a crisp.

We thus deduce, so far, that our planet, specifically designed to be inhabited, is peacefully and placidly placed in its celestial setting by a Creator God. It is not racing and gyrating wildly, at least at such immortal speeds.

These few suggestions alone, if correct, would already wreak havoc with great portions of the Copernican Model. In this scenario almost nothing proposed by Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo and all their cohorts would work completely. A model accommodating these newly acquired suggestions can only work, when taking into account some severe revisions to what we are

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

commonly taught.

Next we must address the movement of the entire heavens, or at least our Milky Way System. How do the starry heavens move in relationship to our earth, and in relation to the planets?

In the following pages are several examples of time-lapse photographs aimed at the pole star (s). These interesting photographs tell an interesting story.

The typical explanation, of course, is that these star trails are made as a result of the earth turning. While this is physically defensible, in the past it has been extremely difficult to ultimately prove. For every action in our universe there is an equal and opposite reaction (Newton's Third Law?). Therefore while some movement is occurring somewhere, we cannot visually determine whether we are moving, or the sky is moving, or BOTH!

Many times while gazing at the moon and clouds at night, or while riding in an automobile, one can experience this phenomenon. Momentarily, if one is disposed, he cannot "visually" tell whether the moon or clouds are moving, or if the car is moving.

My children watch children's programs on television where the subjects are seen riding along in a moving car. However one can tell immediately that though it looks like the car is moving it really is not. Instead, the background is made to move so that the subjects can be filmed on the set, and not inconveniently out on an actual road.

Yet, it strains belief to think that the universe, with its incredible vastness, is on a daily basis, at least, revolving completely around us.<sup>46</sup> However, certain possibilities *relative* to this are too readily

---

<sup>46</sup> G. Bouw and others.

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

dismissed because our local galaxy is believed to be much larger than it probably is. So remember, we are indoctrinated in the current theoretical assumptions that these stars are at unbelievable distances from us and this makes certain suggestions impossible. The **nearest star** is supposedly over four light years away! (25 trillion miles!) Most are reckoned so far that mathematical exponents are used to express the distance. Trillions upon trillions, and trillions of miles! *Yet, friends, these enormous incomprehensible figures themselves should raise some questions in our minds!* Let us get used also to the idea that even though the universe is infinitely vast, no doubt, the astronomical information we are commonly given is perhaps usually and habitually, wildly out of proportion.<sup>47</sup>

From a creationist's viewpoint, what would be the purpose of God creating stars for this earth, but have them at such infinite distances? There is just something dubious about this whole scenario. It is my contention that the reason we have such an out-scaled universe is that the basic measurements are wrong by exponential proportions. While the universe can be infinite in any direction, modern science is being carried away with insanity about light years, parsecs, and so forth. Their ruler is much too long, and is leading all of us into a trap.

---

47


The nearest star to our own sun is Alpha Centauri, yet it is 4.326 light years away! One author explains the distance paradigm this way. He scales the sun and the closest star down to pinheads. Yet the equivalent distance would be 100 miles apart. Even in this scale Arcturus would be 37 light years away, Spica, 200 light years, and Deneb, 1,500 light years. And these are stars in our own galaxy. Friends, is it even possible to see *anything* outside our own galaxy in this scenario?---general facts taken from Custer, *The Stars Speak*, p. 9.

So conceived, "light from our sun takes 27,000 years to reach the center of our galaxy." *Stars Speak*, p. 138

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## The Size and Structure of the Universe


Star Trails:



"Star Trails in Northern Skies"

([http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/9809/northpole\\_malin.jpg](http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/9809/northpole_malin.jpg))

These two time exposures show the paths traced by the stars as they swarm around the Pole over a period of about eight hours. As the nearest bright star to the Pole, Polaris appears as the small bright crescent in the center of the images.



(<http://www.glyphweb.com/esky/stars/polaris.html>)

Here is another one with what looks like an exposure of an hour

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

or more:



"Palau"

([http://www.danheller.com/images/Palau/Scenics/star-trails\\_01.big.jpg](http://www.danheller.com/images/Palau/Scenics/star-trails_01.big.jpg))

### **Rotation of the earth**

It is easy to recognize from these star trails that either the earth turns or that the entire local universe turns in consistent fashion. The simplest explanation is that the world does the turning, for it strains the imaginations of some that the entire local universe at its great distances could complete such a cycle in only a day!

While there are a handful of creation scientists that believe this is what happens, it is a difficult idea. However, we must realize that astronomically, it is possible. Especially it becomes possible if the solar system is scaled down to a reasonable proportion.

But it seems the best evidence for this author, at least, to accept that the earth turns, and that the Bible even perhaps teaches such a doctrine. But it is an interesting pursuit, I believe, to consider

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

all the options, when attempting to build a model that makes sense. So we must remain open to all the possibilities.



(<http://rocketroberts.com/astro/circum.htm>)

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

Above is a two hour exposure taken in bright moonlight. The star trails betray obvious offsetting movements between the earth and our local system.



(<http://hou.lbl.gov/~vhoette/Explorations/StarTrails/index.html>)


The above photograph is interesting for a variety of reasons, but what is most noticeable is the difference in the color of the stars. (Sorry, this book is likely printed in black and white, but one can easily reference such pictures online, or in books).

In the picture stars of all colors can be seen, blue, green, yellow, and red. It seems that if indeed the universe is expanding away from us and everything is so "red-shifted" that this circumstance would not come about or remain as it is presented to us. Of course when it comes to the *different colors* of the stars, science indicates that this is due to intensity, and for the most part that makes some sense. But that the color's hue is closely related to whether the star is coming toward us or going away from us still leaves some of us with questions.

But whatever the reason for the stars colored appearance, the beauty of the universe that God has built is what strikes this

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

reader. I believe the various colors betray the same interest and design as we find in the rainbow and in the beauties of all creation. Astronomers get all wrapped up in the thermal properties of the stars and fail to notice the beauty there. When we see various colors in the natural world we do not fail to appreciate their colors. We don't exclusively base our appreciation on their elemental and thermal properties and intensities! There are thousands of colors on display in the natural world regardless of the heat and the speed of certain objects. These things were made to be colorful on purpose, and to be enjoyed visually. It is my contention that the stunning colors in the universe are actually expressions of God's creative design, and are not just for sterile scientific diagnostics, and the like. They should be also acknowledged as God's special handiwork and artistry. And that they are!



Sometime soon, step outside on a starry night and look at the

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

stars. Ignore largely what modern science tells you about them and simply look at them as the ancients did long ago. While people in former times generally knew the stars were at great enough distances that they could not reach them, they also noticed that they were close enough to easily observe them every night!

Note also the lights of a distant satellite, or passing airplane. Even such lights as these, while knowingly close to the observer, have relatively weak intensities when compared to some stellar objects (suns, etc.). Yet they are easily seen and look very similar to the stars themselves. Sometimes I have momentarily mistaken an airplane for a star or planet, and was corrected only because it subsequently moved! The same can be said of distant satellites, incredibly small objects, which mostly have nothing but reflected light emanating from them!

Notice also the reflective brightness of the moon, a celestial object which has no light giving properties within itself. Yet sometimes one can work at night by the moon's illumination, or observe readily about them in the darkness---a circumstance that would otherwise be impossible, except by the incredible, yet even "reflected" light of the moon.

We are told that these multiplied objects that we see are all distant blazing suns. We are told this because nothing at the proposed distances could probably be seen otherwise. Yet again, perhaps we should question the wisdom of these conclusions. Even with the added clarity of the scopes such as the Hubble Telescope, many of the stars still look like stars, and not suns. In fact the stars form crystalline figures to our view, a property typical of reflected and concentrated light and not direct or diffused and scattered light, like sunlight.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> E.G.White on reflected light: While these comments by the writer, Ellen White, are probably not intended to be scientific comments, or may represent the typical thinking of her day, they are nonetheless interesting. While Ellen White was not an astronomer, it is noteworthy that in vision she actually

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

In this Biblical star series we have returned time and again to the famous passage of Psalm 19. We opened the very first book with the immortal words of this psalm. Yet even after examining these words in considerable detail, many have largely overlooked their astronomical value. Poetic in nature, we principally looked at the literary and theological significance of the words, and so we should. But largely missed, perhaps, is the incredible scientific value of the remarks made there, given in explanatory fashion relative to the movements of the heavens.

### Psalm 19 <sup>49</sup>

*For the director of music. A psalm of David.*

1 The heavens declare the glory of God;  
the skies proclaim the work of his hands.

---

visited outside our system. What an advantage this would give anyone interested in astronomy!

*Light was before them. As the moon and the stars of the solar system shine by the reflected light of the sun, so, as far as their teaching is true, do the world's great thinkers reflect the rays of the Sun of Righteousness. Every gem of thought, every flash of the intellect, is from the Light of the world. In these days we hear much about "higher education." The true "higher education" is that imparted by Him "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." Col. 2:3; John 1:4. "He that followeth Me," said Jesus, "shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."*

[The Desire of Ages \(1898\), page 464, paragraph 4](#)  
[Education \(1903\), page 13, paragraph 3](#)  
[Gospel Workers \(1915\), page 50, paragraph 2](#)

<sup>49</sup> Psalm 19 (New International Version) (NIV)  
Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by the [International Bible Society](#)

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

2 Day after day they pour forth speech;  
night after night they display knowledge.

3 There is no speech or language  
where their voice is not heard. <sup>[a]</sup>

4 Their voice <sup>[b]</sup> goes out into all the earth,  
their words to the ends of the world.  
In the heavens he has pitched a tent for the sun,

5 which is like a bridegroom coming forth from his pavilion,  
like a champion rejoicing to run his course.

6 It rises at one end of the heavens  
and makes its circuit to the other;  
nothing is hidden from its heat.

First observe that while these words are definitely poetic and written in symbolic metaphor, they are also written FOR THE PURPOSE of giving physical descriptions of the heavens or outer firmament, and they are particularly directed toward the movements of the sun. In certain respects, therefore, these words could be classed as “scientific,” or at least, physically explanatory.

Verse 4 informs us that the heavens, or outer firmament, form a “tent” to house the sun. To further extrapolate, the starry host themselves are described as providing a canopy or curtain over the sun itself. The sun is housed in, under, or about this canopy, and moves relative to the canopy’s DEFINED space.

In at least fifteen other biblical references God is described similarly, as “spreading out the heavens<sup>50</sup> like a “curtain” or “tarpaulin,” referring specifically to the then current practice of using such materials to form a tent in which to live. Therefore

---

<sup>50</sup> See **Appendix E** that lists close to 15 different references where it says that God spread the heavens out like a curtain.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS


this delightful Psalm pictures the sun as an abiding resident of the starry heavens themselves. Actually, to be more precise, the sun is pictured as a NOMADIC resident of the heavens.

Further a delightful romantic figure emerges in this astronomical lesson. In eastern circles nomadic weddings were celebrated with the use of tents. The groom and his groomsmen would wait until total darkness, and then finally sally forth from the groom's tent in celebration to go to the bride's home, to claim the bride. She would be brought back to the groom's tent to celebrate their union and the couple would begin their marital existence in the groom's domicile or tent. The coming of the bridegroom was accompanied by a procession of lights, white, reflective garments, and great fanfare.

Of particular interest astronomically, is this picture of the bridegroom emerging from his tent. The bridegroom here appears, as it were, all dressed in bright garments, ecstatically buoyant, himself the focus of the festival. Yet by inference he is accompanied or followed by several other groomsmen and relatives, who would ALSO typically be carrying lamps or instruments of light (planets?). This is a sublime picture. The sun or bridegroom emerges from the darkness of night, but comes forth gloriously, his procession punctuated by the presence of other lamps, or stars. The bridegroom's brilliance subsequently grows out of the brightness of dawn into the power of noonday.

Secondarily, the sun is described as a strong, fast moving athlete--or runner. In the biblical eras athletes would coat their bodies with oil, for it was believed this would enhance their speed and would also make their physique more intimidating. Such runners would glisten in the sunlight. The sun's powerful appearance accords to such a figure. The sun is intensive and strong. A particularly strong athlete, of course, would embrace the challenge of winning (hype), and would come forth with confidence and with the brash certainty of completing his race or contest without failing (the "rejoicing" adverb probably modifies the bridegroom rather than the strong man).

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*



Every race has a prescribed course that the contestants are to follow. Today we classify especially swift runners as “track stars” because they follow a “track,” or a prescribed course. This description in Psalm 19 details that the sun itself has a track it follows. Notice that there is no “stationary” sun spoken of in this inspired metaphor. The verses even detail that the sun has a “circuit” from one end of heaven to the other. The word “circuit” comes from the same root as the word “circle,” or orbit. The sun follows this circuit through the heavens. It is described even in the terms of a very swift, moving, racer, because the sun at least “appears” to advance quickly across the sky each day.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

That “nothing is hid from its heat” or light is not meaning to convey the idea that the sun illuminates even underground caverns. It is saying that its light ultimately goes to both sides of an object during the passage of a day, and in the end provides complete coverage to most surface objects.

When I worked for my father in construction we often noticed this circumstance and tried to use it to advantage. Sometimes, for instance, we would be putting siding on a house in the summertime heat. The sunlight could be quite unbearable when one was working on the sunny side of the building or roof. So we would work in the shade during the morning hours on one side of the house, then switch to the shady side of the building in the afternoon on the opposite side of the building. But in the end, as far as the house or structure was concerned, “nothing was hid from the heat thereof,” “from one end of heaven to the other.”

If taken as true astronomically, these verses could provide some stunningly important information. They suggest that the *sun moves* through our local sky, or at least offsets the movement of our earth. It also infers, perhaps, that the sun in a way leads the planets (the wedding party), acting as if it is guiding them along with its gravitational or electromagnetic qualities. This would be similar to the bridegroom’s party which follows him from the tent, in darkness, emerging toward ever increasing light in the morning, then returning to the total darkness of the wedding pavilion, at the hour of night. Like a wedding, the sun, moon, and planets have their appointed “time” ordained as well.

What is arresting about this revolutionary idea is that it fits almost perfectly with the determinations we have made so far in this book. Instead of the typical heliocentric models popular today, the Bible over and over again seems to support a more geocentric approach. The sun and the moon both seem to be conceived, orbiting the earth, according to their respective times and velocities.

I am only at this point suggesting that what could be happening in

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

our local universe may be much different than we have been taught. The Bible descriptions may be closer to reality than some of the typical claims of scientists and astronomers. While our conclusions must be tentative, the evidence seems to lend itself to possibly a different model. What I am proposing is a model which we might describe as follows. But remember, this is only experimental at this point:

### **An Experimental Model**

In this model, our earth sits largely stationary near or at the center of a galaxy or group of planets or stars. In a typical month, our moon revolves around us once. Because of the actual orbital movement of the moon and the speed it is moving, it appears to move about an hour less distance than would be demanded by a rotating planet earth (circa 12 hours).

A little farther out, at the appropriate distance (4-6 times?), the sun is found orbiting the earth yearly. It passes through the twelve major constellations or semi-permanent background of the stars throughout the year. As conventionally conceived, the earth by some mysterious mechanism, indeed rotates daily, or every 24 hours, giving us day and night.

At *roughly* the same orbit, the major planets follow the sun around the circle. This is a revolutionary paradigm, I know. The stars in this model may not all be gigantic suns, but would usually be smaller celestial objects that are illuminated by the brightness of our nearby sun.

Since it is known that elliptical and other types of galaxies demonstrate fluctuating or undulating orbits within them, it would work that our seasons are caused by such movements and not by an awkwardly tilted earth.

Imagine the sun as a spherical magnet in our model. Likewise the earth and the moon, and the planets of various sizes also have

## **THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS**

magnetic qualities (gravitation). But with the sun as a principle force, it pulls along the smaller or nearer objects at a prescribed rate, except such objects as Venus and Mercury which are so close to the sun, because they revolve around the sun itself much like moons do. But the other heavenly bodies are pulled along as the sun moves through its course, or perhaps they simply orbit in their respective places for other reasons.

Depending on the properties inherent in each object, such as their size or proximity to other like objects, or their general composition, these specified objects follow along in their orbits appropriately. Some naturally fall gradually behind maybe because of the larger distance of outer orbits, or because of the varying gravitational properties within themselves.<sup>51</sup> Gaseous planets would behave much different than would solid ones, etc.

### **The Current Popular Model**

The current astronomical model popularly promoted is radically different than what we are suggesting. The current model places the sun at the center and the planets at varying distances from the sun, and then the stars at incredible distances from us throughout our swirling galactic system.

### **The Distance to the Planets and Nearby Stars**


As this book is written, the author is carrying on his own experiments with regard to the astronomical information typically provided to us. When he began the book, his intention was to

---

<sup>51</sup> Certain other objects may seem to progress much more slowly because they are in the outer reaches of the galaxy or grouping, and they appear to lag behind. Maybe they even form visually what an obvious pattern typically seen in spiral and pinwheel shaped galaxies. But the evidence is not clear that this is the case. The local stars seem to all be at relatively the same distance from us.

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

simply look at the beauty and order of the universe and teach based on those aspects the incredible glory of the heavenly Creator. He simply aimed to write a basic primer on astronomy, explaining to those interested, the basic facts he had learned since childhood.



<http://scienceclass.ning.com/>

While the basic purpose of the book has not changed, the “discoveries” made in conducting a simple search concerning the wonders of the heavenly worlds has led this author into realms that he never intended to go. Sometimes he has been disappointed, sometimes consternated, and sometimes thrilled. And in light of eternity the quest has only begun.

However, in a nutshell, what I have encountered personally is the proverbial “can of worms.” I thought it would be easy to simply

## **THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS**

explain our solar system to others as it had been explained to me. I planned to parrot the information given in popular literature and apply it to the Creator's work. I never expected for it to "not add up." But for now, the questions outweigh the answers. And to summarize the whole endeavor, it doesn't seem like the conventional knowledge of the universe is really correct about much of anything. This has been very disturbing to the mindset of this author. And maybe we all need to be awakened in a way.

Even these questions, however, have a certain intrigue attached to them, and lessons as well. It reminds all of us that we can't just by searching "find out God." Our Creator will always be several steps ahead of us. Just about the time we find we think we understand how it all works and have it all put together, something will come along to blow all the circuitry out of our cute little machine. Curiosity is actually a wonderful thing, and leads to understanding. Therefore, we must remain curious AND cautious in our determinations about such things. Unlike modern science, which seems to know just how many billions of years it all took, and how it came about, it is wiser to be conservative and teachable about the Creator's ways. But this does not mean we cannot make prayerful conclusions about where the evidence seems to lead.

The tests applied being applied at the present moment certainly do not produce the expected conclusions, even for this author. But for the present, he would rather work with these apparent "facts" than trust some of the common "insanity" that is in print and that dominates the literature and the airwaves. Give it time, and maybe he will adopt some of it. But as we challenged in the beginning, we should first question everything. There can be no hurt in such a practice. It is the best method possible.


### **The Planets**

Let's discuss the planets for a moment. In the typically

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

heliocentric model the planets are circling the sun in wider and wider circles, or orbits. They are distributed at varying distances throughout the solar system. The earth is the “third rock from the sun.” The outer planets move at a slower pace to our view because they are farther out and have longer orbits. This makes perfect sense to us. Many of us know the order of these, and some even have a memorized understanding of their believed relative distances from us:

The sun is first orbited by Mercury, then Venus, then our Earth. Outside of this we have Mars (the asteroid belt), Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Uranus, and Pluto, though Pluto has been demoted. And there are dwarf planets apparently too.



Yet according the measurements now being applied, this arrangement finds little verification. The most stunning circumstance is that these planets all seem to measure at roughly

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

the same distance from us as the sun! Not exactly, but in the relative range of the sun's orbit. At this point it is just too unbelievable to adopt. But this seems to be the consistent finding.

### The Stars

The second theory that arises from further measurements and reckonings is that the near and visible stars that we typically see in the night sky, at least those that to our view that stay close to the ecliptic, **seem also to be relatively close to us, as well, their distance being just a little beyond the sun.**


It almost looks like the sun, the planets, and the nearby stars all inhabit the same relative band of space! How can this be?<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> This seems to be apparent for the following reasons:

1. Measuring geometrically, similarly to the way in which we measured the relative distance of the sun we find that the measurements to the stars that are close to the regular path of the ecliptic are very close to the SAME distance as the sun, usually just a bit farther out, as if they form a canopy effect just beyond the orbit of the sun. At this point I'm saying the some VISIBLE stars, at least, appear to be within range of the sun, perhaps at varying depths from near the sun's orbit to maybe several hundred thousand miles beyond.
2. Secondly, we are in the process of cataloguing light phase data that seems to indicate that our nearby stars could be reflecting light from our same sun. The phases are consistent with their position in relation to our sun.
3. Light intensities emanated by the sun can find similar patterns by comparing them with distant stars. The time differential of these light patterns show the stars quite close to the sun at least during part of the year.

*The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*



The principle problem may be that we are so indoctrinated into a certain view of our local system, that we cannot readily think outside of it. Yet in time, what if we were forced to do just that?

Here again, is what a revised model of our local system might look like:

The sun is as it were may be leading, or passing through a “scattering” of multitudinous celestial objects. It is like it is leading a procession, at least as regards the planets. The part of this that accords with what we know is that the planets indeed do follow the general path of the ecliptic, though some vary from the exact line of the ecliptic, out or away from it. But they are ALL

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

about the same relative distance from us. The sun, (not the nearby moon) and the planets, in other words, all travel the same highway----but apparently they use different “lanes.”

The stars themselves are the scenery that the sun and planets pass by. Many are very near the sun’s path itself. Others, of course are only illuminated by it. Nonetheless, they are almost like a canvas or nylon tent that provides a house for the sun to inhabit directly within and *beneath* it.

Now this all sounds very fanciful and strange, I know, and it is only a suggestion. But this is where we find ourselves in this celestial odyssey we are taking.

These ideas would demand an incredible shift in the stellar paradigm. Science teaches us that the stars are all blazing suns in various states of life. Some are hot, some are cooling. Some are blue, red, yellow and whatever. This suggested scenario almost makes this impossible, for if they are suns, and they are at the same relative distance as the sun, they are awfully small suns, and don’t look like suns whatsoever.

The scenario that makes the most sense in this configuration is that the local stars are mostly NOT suns at all. They are actually stars! Novel thought! Like the planets, they reflect the light of the sun. They are made up of various materials or have varied atmospheric properties. But the local stars are not monstrous objects such as supposedly Betelgeuse is concerned, thought to be incomprehensibly enormous. Betelgeuse is just nearer or larger or brighter than the other moonlike or asteroid like objects beside it.

What seems to be indicated is a local universe that could be likened to a hollow glass ball. At the very center would be our earth, a nucleus with its counterpart, the moon circling tightly about it. Then there is a large open area between the nucleus and the outer canopy. Just beneath this canopy (a “dome tent” for the sun) is the orbital plane of the sun and then the planets. Just

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

beyond this is the range of the stars, represented generally by perhaps the outer surface of the glass ball (the *rachea*, or outer firmament). Outside of this would be other systems or universal expressions.



Such a scenario, necessitating the sun to pass close to this outer “canopy” of stellar material may provide us with a source for asteroids, comets, and meteors. Instead of a mysterious Oort Cloud, which is a total invention anyway, certain of these types of objects may come into our atmospheric space because the sun in its undulating orbit has passed near enough to them to change their state of rest. They are activated, fragmented, or born from the sun’s activity as it passes near them or envelops them, and/or spits them back out.

The planets would likewise simply be generally larger than the nearby “non-wandering” stars. They behave differently because of their varying sizes, compositions, and positions, and according to how gravity would affect such objects. Precessions and retrogrades could possibly be explained by the clocklike motions of the heavenly parade, of parts or all of the celestial or galactic

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

system over time.

Such adjustments to our celestial models could solve a host of astronomical problems. The star light and time problem largely dissipates because the starlight of the nearest stars can reach us in a matter of minutes if not seconds. The stars or galaxies that are farther from us probably belong to another system anyway, and are not part of the world's original creation account, though their Creator is the same. Both the Bible and Science could come together in apparent harmony.<sup>54</sup>

### Atomic Structure

Of note is that what we have independently built in our own personal laboratory is the typical structure of an atom. Atoms are believed to have a definable structure where there is a nucleus, then a large space between them and the outer orbits of the electrons. The space in the atom is believed to be the greatest part of the atom, mass wise. This also accords with this supposed structure of our local system. In addition, our sun is certainly an electrically charged orb, though I believe it is thought to be negatively charged.


It is not a new idea that God typically creates a *macro* structure that in turns looks like the *micro* structure. Why wouldn't the universe follow the same pattern as its basic atomic structure? It is an interesting thought, at least, that the layout of our local universe is a macrocosm of the atom itself. In the structure we are building and in the atomic structure being uncovered by scientific inquiry *may* be found a working model of the heavens near and away from us!

---

<sup>54</sup> I'm not pretending all questions would be answered for many difficulties and unknowns still exist. It is just a model that accommodates biblical theory in a much more reasonable framework for some of us.

*The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

**A model of the Helium atom**



-  - **PROTON** - positively charged subatomic particle
-  - **NEUTRON** - neutral subatomic particle
-  - **ELECTRON** - negatively charged subatomic particle

**The Biblical Model of the Universe**

In the end, therefore, Psalm 19 may not be as antiquated and crude as many a scientist might think. It may be very close to the truth, if not the very truth itself.

At any rate, the heavens, in whatever form they exist in, will

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

always declare the glory of God, and show his brilliant creatorship and design. Of that we can be sure, for yes, billions and billions, and trillions of years!

### Precession of the equinoxes

Before we end this strange chapter, (I admit it!) we must say a word about the issue of the precession, or the recession of the pole star.

It is verifiable that the position of the sun against the backdrop of the constellations has experienced a slow and gradual slide over the centuries. While the sun appeared in maybe Aries at the Spring Equinox maybe two thousand years ago, we know that today it has slipped back and appears in Pisces at the same time of year. In fact we are now entering, as the popular occult teaches, the “Age of Aquarius,” the constellation before even Pisces.

Likewise and because of this, the “pole star,” Polaris, was probably not always the pole star. Thousands of years ago the celestial pole was situated slightly different. Many believe that many thousands of years ago the pole star was actually *Thuban*, a storied star in the constellation *Draco*.

The commonly accepted explanation for this is as follows:

The reason for this slide or discrepancy is attributed to a “wobble” at the North Pole of our own earth. As the north pole of our earth “wobbles” ever so slightly our view of the stars gradually changes---but only over long periods of time.

But here is the “kicker.” The term “wobble” is really misleading because it makes one think of a spinning top that loses momentum. But the determinations of science tell us that it will take 27,000 years for the earth to complete just one wobble!

## *The Surprising Structure of Our Universe*

There is just something dubious and suspicious about this whole scenario. While this explanation is astronomically viable, it just doesn't feel right. The God who makes other stellar motions not vary even thousand's of a second over long periods of time, yet makes the earth "wobble" imperfectly at its pole, is inconsistent.

While I believe the precession exists and is actually a providential wheel or gear in the great celestial clock marking out great "chunks" of time, I would prefer to not believe it comes as the result of a "flaw" or a multi-millennial "wobble" in the earth's movement.

I believe there can be other better and more believable ways of explaining this celestial movement. Perhaps it can simply be explained as a designed micro-slippage of the sun's rotation about us from year to year. Simple as that.

### **Retrograde Motions**

Finally, a word about the retrograde motions of the planets. While enough is not known by this author to make certain comment about them at this point, he is certainly aware that they exist and must be accommodated in any model of the heaven's movements.

However, the proposed model we have explored briefly in this chapter leaves several possibilities of how these could be explained, perhaps even identically with the current theories of dynamics as they relate to elliptical orbits. Several possibilities exist.

### **Conclusion**

Someday it will be thrilling to see just how the universe really does work. While the preceding pages may not be accurate in any way in the end, it is the firm conviction of this author that

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

whatever the redeemed find when they reach the heavenly realms will incite in them nothing but wonder and awe at the precise and wondrous works of the Almighty God. The heavens will always be telling the glory of God, and all the host of heaven will bow before their maker saying “Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty!....Just and true are Thy ways!” (Rev. 15:3)

### Great Astronomy Texts of the Bible:

Genesis 1: 14-19

Job 38: 4-15; 31-34.

Psalm 8:1-9

Psalm 19: 1-6

Psalm 33: 6,9

Psalm 147:4; 148: 1-6

Isaiah 40:22, 26

Amos 5:8

(Some others: Job 22:12; Jeremiah 31:35,36; I Cor. 15:41; Nehemiah 9:6; Hebrews 1:2)

# 8

## The Big Bang and Other “Special Creations”

The first sentence of astronomer Carl Sagan’s 1980 book, *Cosmos*, reads:

The *Cosmos* is all that is  
or ever was  
or ever will be

What he means by the word “cosmos” is the entire universe, with all its atoms, galaxies, natural laws---everything. He then goes on out of pure assumption to explain the universe as coming about by a spontaneous, self-generating, evolutionary “big bang” about 16 billion years ago. A concentrated “kernel” of “mass energy” suddenly exploded and began to expand.

It did---did it????

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Let me tell you right up front that the next few pages are quoted almost totally verbatim from a general source. The reason is that this author does not feel even remotely qualified to represent the tenets of the “Big Bang” theory. I will be the first to admit that I understand little of it, and do not adhere to its principles. The naked and barren idea is neither informative nor helpful to me.

But I believe that it wise to have a general knowledge of what we as creationists are up against. It is also necessary that Christians not make charges or claims that may not even be true. Thirdly, it actually exposes the embarrassing weaknesses of the theory to read from its own exponents the preposterous things it claims. Therefore having noticed this article that lists no author I felt that it summarizes and succinctly explains the general tenets and history of “big bang” cosmology. It is included in this book for educational purposes only. It at least was written by a Christian or someone who at least respects Christian values, and is informative. Some brief comments will follow the article:

### **Big Bang Theory - The Premise**

The Big Bang theory is an effort to explain what happened at the very beginning of our universe. Discoveries in astronomy and physics have shown beyond a reasonable doubt that our universe did in fact have a beginning. Prior to that moment there was nothing; during and after that moment there was something: our universe. The big bang theory is an effort to explain what happened during and after that moment.

According to the standard theory, our universe sprang into existence as "singularity" around 13.7 billion years ago. What is a "singularity" and where does it come from? Well, to be honest, we don't know for sure. Singularities are zones which defy our current understanding of physics. They are thought to exist at the core of "black holes." Black holes are areas of intense gravitational pressure. The pressure is thought to be so intense that finite matter is actually squished into infinite density (a mathematical concept which truly boggles the mind). These zones of infinite density are called "singularities." Our universe is thought to have begun as an infinitesimally small, infinitely hot, infinitely dense, something - a singularity. Where did it come from? We

## ***The Big Bang and Other Special Creations***

don't know. Why did it appear? We don't know.

After its initial appearance, it apparently inflated (the "Big Bang"), expanded and cooled, going from very, very small and very, very hot, to the size and temperature of our current universe. It continues to expand and cool to this day and we are inside of it: incredible creatures living on a unique planet, circling a beautiful star clustered together with several hundred billion other stars in a galaxy soaring through the cosmos, all of which is inside of an expanding universe that began as an infinitesimal singularity which appeared out of nowhere for reasons unknown. This is the Big Bang theory.

### **Big Bang Theory - Common Misconceptions**

There are many misconceptions surrounding the Big Bang theory. For example, we tend to imagine a giant explosion. Experts however say that there was no explosion; there was (and continues to be) an expansion. Rather than imagining a balloon popping and releasing its contents, imagine a balloon expanding: an infinitesimally small balloon expanding to the size of our current universe.

Another misconception is that we tend to image the singularity as a little fireball appearing somewhere in space. According to the many experts however, space didn't exist prior to the Big Bang. Back in the late '60s and early '70s, when men first walked upon the moon, "three British astrophysicists, Steven Hawking, George Ellis, and Roger Penrose turned their attention to the Theory of Relativity and its implications regarding our notions of time. In 1968 and 1970, they published papers in which they extended Einstein's Theory of General Relativity to include measurements of time and space.<sup>1,2</sup> According to their calculations, time and space had a finite beginning that corresponded to the origin of matter and energy."<sup>3</sup> The singularity didn't appear *in* space; rather, space began inside of the singularity. Prior to the singularity, *nothing* existed, not space, time, matter, or energy - nothing. So where and in what did the singularity appear if not in space? We don't know. We don't know where it came from, why it's here, or even where it is. All we really know is that we are inside of it and at one time it didn't exist and neither did we.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

### Big Bang Theory - Evidence for the Theory

What are the major evidences which support the Big Bang theory? First of all, we are reasonably certain that the universe had a beginning. Second, galaxies appear to be moving away from us at speeds proportional to their distance. This is called "Hubble's Law," named after Edwin Hubble (1889-1953) who discovered this phenomenon in 1929. This observation supports the expansion of the universe and suggests that the universe was once compacted.

Third, if the universe was initially very, very hot as the Big Bang suggests, we should be able to find some remnant of this heat. In 1965, Radio astronomers Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson discovered a 2.725 degree Kelvin (-454.765 degree Fahrenheit, -270.425 degree Celsius) Cosmic Microwave Background radiation (CMB) which pervades the observable universe. This is thought to be the remnant which scientists were looking for. Penzias and Wilson shared in the 1978 Nobel Prize for Physics for their discovery.

Finally, the abundance of the "light elements" Hydrogen and Helium found in the observable universe are thought to support the Big Bang model of origins.

### Big Bang Theory - The Only Plausible Theory?

Is the standard Big Bang theory the only model consistent with these evidences? No, it's just the most popular one. Internationally renown Astrophysicist George F. R. Ellis explains: "People need to be aware that there is a range of models that could explain the observations....For instance, I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its center, and you cannot disprove it based on observations....You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds. In my view there is absolutely nothing wrong in that. What I want to bring into the open is the fact that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide that."<sup>4</sup>

In 2003, Physicist Robert Gentry proposed an attractive alternative to the standard theory, an alternative which also accounts for the evidences listed above.<sup>5</sup> Dr. Gentry claims that the standard Big Bang model is founded upon a faulty paradigm (the Friedmann-lemaitre expanding-spacetime paradigm) which he claims is inconsistent with

## ***The Big Bang and Other Special Creations***

the empirical data. He chooses instead to base his model on Einstein's static-spacetime paradigm which he claims is the "genuine cosmic Rosetta." Gentry has published several papers outlining what he considers to be serious flaws in the standard Big Bang model.<sup>6</sup> Other high-profile dissenters include Nobel laureate Dr. Hannes Alfvén, Professor Geoffrey Burbidge, Dr. Halton Arp, and the renowned British astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle, who is accredited with first coining the term "the Big Bang" during a BBC radio broadcast in 1950.

### **Big Bang Theory - What About God?**

Any discussion of the Big Bang theory would be incomplete without asking the question, what about God? This is because cosmogony (the study of the origin of the universe) is an area where science and theology meet. Creation was a supernatural event. That is, it took place outside of the natural realm. This fact begs the question: is there anything else which exists outside of the natural realm? Specifically, is there a master Architect out there? We know that this universe had a beginning. Was God the "First Cause"? We won't attempt to answer that question in this short article. We just ask the question:<sup>55</sup>

---

#### <sup>55</sup> Footnotes:

Steven W. Hawking, George F.R. Ellis, "The Cosmic Black-Body Radiation and the Existence of Singularities in our Universe," *Astrophysical Journal*, 152, (1968) pp. 25-36.

Steven W. Hawking, Roger Penrose, "The Singularities of Gravitational Collapse and Cosmology," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, series A, 314 (1970) pp. 529-548.

Mark Eastman, Chuck Missler, *The Creator: Beyond Time and Space*, (1996) p. 11.

W. Wayt Gibbs, "Profile: George F. R. Ellis," *Scientific American*, October 1995, Vol. 273, No.4, p. 55.

See <http://www.halos.com/reports/ext-2003-022.pdf>

See <http://www.halos.com/reports/arxiv-1998-rosetta.pdf> and

<http://www.halos.com/reports/ext-2003-021.pdf>; see also

<http://www.halos.com/reports/arxiv-1998-redshift.pdf> and

<http://www.halos.com/reports/arxiv-1998-affirmed.pdf>

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

### The "Colossal Crock"

If you read the previous article you may have noticed that one phrase crops up several times. That is the phrase: "we don't know." This could not be said, at least as often, if the *Big Bang* was not a theory with so many problems. To put it as kindly as we can, the *Big Bang* theory is as vacuous as is the space or the lack thereof in which it supposedly occurred.

While we have no problem with the idea of an expanding universe the entire enterprise lacks sufficient proof and verification. The theory still leaves us with no reasonable beginning. The entire theory is built upon a sandy foundation of faulty measurements, phony math, nebulous relativity gymnastics, backwards physics, and a host of unanswered questions.

It is the opinion of this author that there is very little, if anything, that is wholly consistent with biblical creationism, or with common sense, for that matter. It is therefore recommended that the Christian thinker consider well the negative disposition and characteristics of this theory and concentrate their attention on explaining: "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."

If someone asks you if you believe in the "Big Bang theory" tell them that you do. But tell them that God is the true author of the *Big Bang*. (Psalm 33:6,9)

A Christian was once asked if he believed in the *Big Bang*. He confessed that he did. He then explained: "Yes...God spoke--- and 'BANG!'----it was done!"

This is, no doubt, closer to the way it really was!

# 9

## Hubble's Rubble

Edwin Hubble is considered to be one of the greatest astronomers of all time. The great "Hubble" telescope has been named after him.

Hubble was among the first astronomers to identify galaxies as "Island Universes." For many years astronomers could see "hazy" patches in their telescopes but could not ascertain what these really were. Hubble's work at Mt. Palomar, etc. introduced the idea that the universe was largely made up of galactic systems, and that our own Milky Way galaxy was just one of them.

Astronomers have largely presumed upon Hubble's conclusions. Hubble's Law, or constant, is widely accepted today. Hubble's Constant is basically explained by the fact that the *redshift* value

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

of the object under study is generally consistent with its calculated distance.

The cornerstone of Hubble's astronomical philosophy is what is known as the "Redshift Theory." The measurement of light as demonstrated in Doppler Redshift has become the cornerstone of the Big Bang Theory itself.

Let us make an attempt to simplify this concept to the reader unacquainted with the "Redshift Theory."

Gases such as hydrogen or helium are known to manifest a specific color that can be identified on the color spectrum. An instrument called a spectrometer measures just where on the light spectrum a known element should be.

Now when scientists look into space they will see these colors manifest when looking at stars and nebulae and such. This is how they can claim to know what gases are out there. If it is the color of hydrogen then they reason it is hydrogen gas. The properties of radiation that are known are compared with what is seen and measured in the stellar realms.

*Redshift* occurs when one determines from the spectrometer that the gas that is seen is say supposedly hydrogen gas but that it appears slightly "redder" on the spectrum than normal hydrogen. The wavelength is slightly longer. Or to the contrary it may appear as leaning toward the bluer side of the spectrum. The amount of this difference is the spectral "shift."

When looking at galaxies thought to be farther out in space it has been noticed that they often appear to have a "redshift." Interpreting this circumstance is where the redshift becomes a factor.

It is the belief of scientists that when an object travels at great speeds away from you it appears more to the red end of the spectrum. If it is coming rapidly toward us it is believed to read

## ***Hubble's Rubble***

more on the blue side of the spectrum. This is supposedly because the properties of light are similar to the Doppler Effect in sound. A passing car or train will change pitch as it comes toward you and then goes past you. Light is believed to behave like this when it is traveling toward or away from us.

This theoretical leap drives the entire quickly expanding universe concept. Because distant stars or galaxies appear to be “red shifted” it is reasoned that they are retreating from us at screaming speeds (recessional velocity). They are going at about perhaps 8/10ths of the speed of light, because if they were going as fast as light really travels away from us, we would never see them on earth. Extrapolating from this the age and size of the universe is often mathematically determined.

Little resource is ever bent to the concept that anything else could cause *redshift*. The Redshift Theory has become adopted as standard science, and all estimates and measurements seem to be somehow related to it in current astronomical literature. There is a passionate obsession with redshift dynamics and how it relates to Einsteinian physics and general relativity.

## **Starlight and Time**

With the adoption of the theory of a quickly expanding universe came a problem for creationists known as the “starlight and time” problem. With the stars and galaxies presumed to be at such great distances from us---even exponential light year distances--- a creation model is hardly acceptable. Even at the speed of light the starlight from certain distant stars could not reach us in even many thousands of years. How then could a seven day creation week, and a short chronology for the earth and firmament make any sense at all? (Unless you accept the instant maturity model).

Let us suggest immediately that the starlight and time problem only exists for a creationist when that creationist buys into the over-calculated and hyper-inflated conclusions of the “Big Bang”

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

paradigm. The suggestion repeatedly made in this book is that the exaggerated habits of evolutionary thinking pervade all the teachings of mainline astronomical science. While space is indeed vast, there may be no reliable reason to conclude that our local universe, the one we typically view, is even a fraction of the size purported in popular literature.

In an effort to try to understand the claims of redshift proponents this author has done some limited study. Of course, he is not an authority on such things and has neither the time nor the resources to test many of its typical claims. Judging from the typical conclusions made by current science, however, and how these deductions are formulated and adopted, this author is largely unconvinced on the concept of redshift dynamics, even though certain scientists like Dr. Gentry seem to accept it as a viable dynamic of light.

It may be that there is indeed a redshift effect, and there is no objection to a constantly expanding universe. But my recommendation is for the student of these things to wait out the jury a little in the matter of red shifts and all the purported effects of it.

There are a few opponents of the conventional thinking about the causes of redshift. One of these is Halton Arp. His work in the field of astronomical redshifts is summarized in the following piece:

Halton C. Arp is a professional astronomer who, earlier in his career, was Edwin Hubble's assistant. He has earned the Helen B. Warner prize, the Newcomb Cleveland award and the Alexander von Humboldt Senior Scientist Award. For years he worked at the Mt. Palomar and Mt. Wilson observatories. While there, he developed his well known catalog of "Peculiar Galaxies" that are misshapen or irregular in appearance.

Arp discovered, by taking photographs through the big telescopes, that many pairs of quasars (quasi-stellar objects) which have extremely high redshift  $z$  values (and are therefore thought to be receding from us very rapidly - and thus must be located at a great

## *Hubble's Rubble*

distance from us) are physically associated with galaxies that have low redshift and are known to be relatively close by. Arp has photographs of many pairs of high redshift quasars that are symmetrically located on either side of what he suggests are their parent, low redshift galaxies. These pairings occur much more often than the probabilities of random placement would allow. Mainstream astrophysicists try to explain away Arp's observations of connected galaxies and quasars as being "illusions" or "coincidences of apparent location". But, the large number of physically associated quasars and low red shift galaxies that he has photographed and cataloged defies that evasion. It simply happens too often.

Because of Arp's photos, the assumption that high red shift objects have to be very far away - on which the "Big Bang" theory and all of "accepted cosmology" is based - is proven to be wrong! The Big Bang theory is therefore falsified.


What appears in several of the following photos are distant quasars or parts of galaxies protruding from galaxies. The significant part of Arp's work is that he has found significantly different redshift values when comparing the center of the systems with the parts that seem to be attached.

Arp has photographed and measured hundreds of these anomalies, assuming the redshift value of the same attached object should be identical but it is not. Astronomical scientists refuse to acknowledge that the shifts are really valid. They say that the quasars are really behind the system or that something else is wrong, or they say it is merely two objects coincidentally aligned.

The apparent stubbornness of science to admit a problem posed by these pictures, or sometimes the determined reluctance to admit to the pairing of both blue and red shifts in the same area of space is even more obvious than the quasars in the photograph.


Any school child can see that certain of these quasars likely belong to the same system:

THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS




QUASARS, REDSHIFTS  
AND CONTROVERSIES

by Halton Arp




## *Hubble's Rubble*



On October 7, 2002 the Astronomy Picture of the Day issued a Hubble Space Telescope image of these same objects. The orientation is different. After processing this HST image in the same way as the above amateur image, the following were obtained:

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

NGC 4319 and Markarian 205




Hubble  
Heritage

NASA and The Hubble Heritage Team (STScI/AURA) • Hubble Space Telescope/WFPC2 • STScI-PRC02-23

(a)


(b)



## *Hubble's Rubble*

NASA scientists cannot see any connection between these two objects.

The official explanation of the NASA image states, "Appearances can be deceiving. In this NASA Hubble Space Telescope image, an odd celestial duo, the spiral galaxy NGC 4319 [center] and a quasar called Markarian 205 [upper right], appear to be neighbors. In reality, the two objects don't even live in the same city. They are separated by time and space. NGC 4319 is 80 million light-years from Earth. Markarian 205 (Mrk 205) is more than 14 times farther away, residing 1 billion light-years from Earth. The apparent close alignment of Mrk 205 and NGC 4319 is simply a matter of chance."



Repeatedly there is found evidence of a physical connection between two objects that have vastly different red shift values.

Writes our reporting astronomer:<sup>56</sup>

Instead of nominating him for a prize (and simultaneously reexamining their assumption that "redshift equals distance"), Arp was (and continues to be) systematically denied publication of his results and refused telescope time. One would at least expect the

---

<sup>56</sup> Attempts are still being made to trace the original source of this information.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

"powers that be" to immediately turn the Chandra X-ray orbiting telescope, the Hubble space telescope, and all the big land based telescopes toward Arp's exciting discoveries in order to either confirm or disprove them once and for all. Instead, these objects have been completely excluded from examination. Official photographs are routinely cropped to exclude them. Those familiar with the Galileo story will remember the priests who refused to look through his telescope.

Arp does not take the position that redshift is not a factor in distance measurement but he alters the equation to include more factors. But his work should be appreciated and studied more than it is. The values found in the same system are radically different than would be expected and there is likely a definite reason for this. This reason has not been discovered yet by responsible science.

Again, while there might be such a thing as observable redshift, the reason for the redshift may not be that the objects are moving at 6 to 8/10ths the speed of light away from us. Stars or galaxies that are blue, red, and yellow, or whatever may be just that--- blue, red, and yellow. Are the things that are colored in our local world varied only according to their distance from us? The idea is preposterous!

Or there is the "tired light" theory, or aged elemental light, or a number of other possibilities to explain this theoretical phenomenon. Wavelength, it is believed, can be affected by gravity or perhaps a variety of other factors.

Or there is what I simply believe at this point, and that is that the light radiation that reaches us from the stellar regions has to pass through many and various gases and light filters. Many of these would be in the environs of the stars or galaxies themselves, giving each set its own distinctive light qualities.

The farther the objects are from us, the more likely there will be found interstellar elements between us that would alter or mingle the qualities of light. Scientists continually speak of interstellar

## *Hubble's Rubble*

gases and dust, and it is well known that enormous amounts of these materials and other particles exist in space. These would create all kinds of light filters and gaseous mixtures. It is not necessary to have these stars moving at such immortal speeds in order to account for a slight shift in color!

The same phenomenon occurs in much simpler circumstances. Living in the western part of the United States where we frequently have forest fires one often notices how the light of the sun shifts dramatically toward the red end of the spectrum because of the smoke particles and emitted gases in the atmosphere. Call it what you will, a filtering out of the blue light, or whatever, the end result is a red shift. Yet the sun is at the same distance as it always was. It is not receding from us like a scared rabbit! Certainly it is not receding from us at near the speed of light!

The same phenomenon is experienced in the everyday world. When the sun rises or sets it takes on a redder color because we see it laterally, or sideways, through the thicker or polluted sub stratosphere.

Therefore I choose to simply wait out the matter of red shifts until I feel science brings more openness and honesty back into the process.

## **What are Galaxies?**

While there are many mysteries that we cannot have the answer for at this time it seems that a major adjustment must be made to explain what galaxies are and what size they are.

The first conclusion I would suggest is that certain galaxies, like M31, thought to be the closest galaxy to us, yet believed to be multitudinous light years away, simply cannot be the case.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS



The distance to the galaxies, by virtue of the fact that they inhabit similar mathematical space as nearby stars simply requires that they can't be as far away as thought. Therefore they may be much smaller comparatively to what was once thought. Present thinking makes such galaxies scores of light years across! I suspect this is simply more of the hyper-inflated evolutionary doctrine we keep returning to in this book.

Secondly, a simple look at the night sky may not in total reveal a consistent galactic shape for our galaxy. There are stars in every direction, and while thicker in some places than others (Milky Way Dust Clouds), reality teaches us that there are "solid" stars everywhere we look. Therefore, our local universe may not be as "galactic" as commonly thought.

## *Hubble's Rubble*



Galaxies seem to look like “storms” in space. They are perhaps fragmented stellar objects that have settled out (due to gravity or polarity) into the swirl formation about the eye of the event. They remain where they are, lying in state, as beautiful heavenly “fireworks” that demonstrate sparkling color and reflective qualities. They may even indicate “something” that God is in the process of making or changing.

The thing that makes the most sense to me about galaxies is that they appear to look like what a “captured” comet might look like. If a comet were sucked into a cavity of gravitational equilibrium they would spin out and stop while subject to the resident forces in the area, or become victim to some kind of Coriolis effect. It seems they would look like what water (clouds=water droplets) looks like in a hurricane. Plus comets are thought to be composed largely of water or ice.

Even if galaxies are swirling universes of billions of suns as science proposes this in no way invalidates the need for a Creator God to have made them and to continue in the work of sustaining them. It does not affect a Christian’s faith in the least if galaxies indeed exist, and our world is indeed a mere planet in the Milky Way Galaxy. God is all the greater. But at present it may be wise to question some assumed facts in the area of structure and

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

size, and hold the bold assumptions of popular science in tentative consideration, until all the data is in and safer conclusions can be arrived at.



2003 September 16

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap030916.html>

APOD: Hurricane Isabel Approaches

## *Hubble's Rubble*



Hyatuke, *Wikipedia*

When we look at a hurricane from space we do not believe that it is a galaxy. So why necessarily think that a distant galaxy is an island universe?

I know that such suggestions will be considered laughable by modern science that buys the conclusions of godless theorists as quickly as they can, and refuses to believe the true Creator God for as long as they can. But since no one has seen, measured, or touched these things, why can't our guess be just about as good as theirs. And I suspect that our guess is on much better grounds than that of the typical secular humanist.

Further, I suggest that many of the conclusions about galaxies, red shifts, black holes, big bangs, and energy and light formulas

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

could someday melt into “relative” nothingness. Hubble’s theories could become Hubble’s “rubble.”



While we cannot prove with any certainty what galaxies and other heavenly displays really are, there can be no harm in questioning and wondering about them. Modern science studies these things and has superior tools to monitor and measure them. They may actually exist in the general forms in which science explains them. It only seems to make the most sense that we not automatically accept the secular explanations of these things, especially when they contradict the biblical norm and standard.

At the very least, enormous changes will be required of present science to make biblical sense of our universe. But the one constant that will not change is the fact that the Christian God is

### *Hubble's Rubble*

the Creator of the Heavens. His ways will always be past finding out. Great and marvelous are His works!

# 10

*"You made the heavens, even the highest heavens, and all their starry host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them. You give life to everything, and the multitudes of heaven worship you." (Nehemiah 9:6)*

## **Is There Life on Other Planets?**

Is there "intelligent" life on other planets? Do other beings exist, and do other planets exist alongside our own?

These may seem like sensational questions; ones to be classed with such subjects as "Roswell, New Mexico," and "Alien Abductions." Yet they seem to be questions that may be answered in a general sense in the Word of God, the Bible.

Of course, the Bible answers are given in factual and non-

## *Is There Life on Other Planets?*

sensational contexts, and do not invite us to entertain for one moment the ridiculous escapades of science fiction, or to engage in the over enthusiastic pursuit of the paranormal and the mysterious. They are given in the sober context of theology and the plan of God's salvation as it pertains to our universe. These serious and more grounded concepts invite us to see that God is interested in giving us general information that can inform the Christian about the universal parameters of His great purposes.

It has become the conviction of this author that while not much is thought to be said about this subject in Christian writings, such as the Bible, there may be more references to "alien" life than most people originally think. Because of this, I believe God wants us to be reasonably informed about our part in the *universal* scheme of things.

Many are acquainted with the "Great Controversy" motif that stands behind the entire chronicle of salvation history. In this motif, there once existed a perfect government in heaven ruled by the omnipotent and loving God of the universe. This was spoiled and interrupted by a serious rebellion in the heavenly realms, by a high ranking ring leader, Lucifer. At first God allowed the heavenly beings to make their own choice as to which side they would take in this cosmic conflict. Finally, however, it eventually became necessary for Lucifer, who had become "Satan," to be banished from heaven. To date, the conflict continues, this earth being a chief battlefield, because this earth is the only realm that has come directly under the dominion of Satan and the sin he has infected it with. The coming of Christ to this world was in part effected to bring about the reclamation of this world, to bring back God's full dominion of it, along with the faithful who stand with God on his side.<sup>57</sup>

In the masterful description of this cosmic "star war" in the book

---

<sup>57</sup> A must read for those who have not already read it is the book, *The Great Controversy*, by Ellen G. White. Without doubt, this inspired volume is among the greatest books ever written for our spiritual generation.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

of Revelation (chapter 12, verse 12), this cosmic war is spelled out, even with the use of “astronomical” terms. In this passage it says concerning the ultimate and anticipated victory of Jesus Christ, *“Rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them.”* Then in contrast to this circumstance it follows by saying:

*“Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and the sea! For the devil is come down unto you having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.” KJV*

“The heavens” here are described as “inhabited,” and the joy found there is experienced in corresponding contrast to the woe that is to be inflicted in the last days on those who “inhabit” the earth.

The prophetic writer Ellen White has aptly described “our little world as the lesson book of the universe” (*The Desire of Ages*, p. 19). There are others then, who are aware of our earthly challenges and who watch us with interest. In other places our world is described as the “one lost sheep,” and the other “ninety-nine just and righteous sheep” are said to symbolize the unfallen worlds that God has created and who have not to date embraced the rebellion of the Evil One.

In the book of Isaiah, even in the second verse of the very first chapter we find these words:

*“Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.”*

Again in Jeremiah 2:11a, and 12 we find similar wording:

*“Hath a nation changed their gods? . . . Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, be horribly afraid (appalled), be ye very desolate (downhearted), saith the Lord.”*

In these passages God is not speaking to the heavens as some

## *Is There Life on Other Planets?*

vast, inanimate puff of air, or field of space. He is speaking to something that has intelligence, and can “hear.” Behind this direct message to Israel, God is, no doubt, rhetorically speaking to the observing heavenly worlds who are distant and wondering witnesses to the wayward acts of the earth and its people.

In the New Testament the apostle Paul several times refers to “principalities and dominions” over which God is Lord (Ephesians 1:21; 6:12, Romans 8:38; Colossians 1:16; 2:10,15). These “dominions” and “powers” exceed the boundaries of just one place (singular) called heaven, where God lives. They infer that God has many “realms” over which he is king. God in certain pictures wears many crowns, as ancient conquering kings wore, to denote the vast and universal scope of His dominion and power.

Some philosophers and theologians have discovered that in ancient times such groupings of realms were called “fullnesses.” Therefore when the word “fullness” appears in Scripture, it may sometimes refer to the grouping of God’s realms, or domiciles, or property, or “churches.” It speaks of the richness and plenty to be found under God’s universal sovereignty, for in the Bible someone who was “rich” was also said to be “full.” God’s kingdom is vast, his domain is full, and there are great riches “in the heavenly places in Christ.”

Hebrews 1:2 says that God “has in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.” It does not say: the “world,” *singular*, but says: “worlds,” *plural*.

This author has often puzzled over the words in Job, where it says, “*When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.*”<sup>58</sup> There are many explanations for this text. Some say it is simply talking about the angels of God

---

<sup>58</sup> Job 38:7 The context hosts a discussion between God and Job about the laying of the foundations of the world.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

rejoicing at creation. Others have even gone so far as to conclude that in the original Edenic world the stars actually made music that could be heard in auditory fashion by an observer on earth. And there is even scientific plausibility for this. But while these explanations may have elements of feasibility in them, I suspect that this verse is saying more than this.

What I suspect is, is that the creation of the world by God, whenever it happened, was accompanied by great rejoicing, not only by the angels *but by all the inhabitants of the universe*. The “sons of God,” is a designation given to all of God’s created beings (Adam was called such), and in a way even God’s created systems and planets could be meant. They are said to be “born” of God, because God “created” them. They are “stars of the morning,” because the morning is the beginning of day, and thus an apt symbol of the creative process.

Angels of God are directly symbolized in Revelation, in several places as “stars.” They are bright gems of light that are around God’s throne and serve his purposes. Therefore, in these verses in Job, several things may be inferred. One is that God is the creator of these stars and these worlds, and another is that the planets and the beings that are on them are alike all “sons of God” who rejoice in His presence and in His creative acts.

In this chapter we must reference a vision that was given to the writer Ellen White. I choose to believe it was a genuine vision from God and should be published or shared more often than it is, because God obviously had a purpose in giving this vision. I think part of his purpose in giving the vision was to address our curiosity about the subject of “other worlds” and more importantly to impress upon us the importance of faithfulness to Him, as well as to engender the joy of anticipation that can be part of the experience of the waiting saint:

## *Is There Life on Other Planets?*

**Ellen G. White Estate**  
***Early Writings* (1882), page 39-40, paragraph 3**  
**Chapter Title: Experience and Views**

The Lord has given me a view of other worlds. Wings were given me, and an angel attended me from the city to a place that was bright and glorious. The grass of the place was living green, and the birds there warbled a sweet song. The inhabitants of the place were of all sizes; they were noble, majestic, and lovely. They bore the express image of Jesus, and their countenances beamed with holy joy, expressive of the freedom and happiness of the place. I asked one of them why they were so much more lovely than those on the earth. The reply was, "We have lived in strict obedience to the commandments of God, and have not fallen by disobedience, like those on the earth." Then I saw two trees, one looked much like the tree of life in the city. The fruit of both looked beautiful, but of one they could not eat. They had power to eat of both, but were forbidden to eat of one. Then my attending angel said to me, "None in this place have tasted of the forbidden tree; but if they should eat, they would fall." Then I was taken to a world which had seven moons. There I saw good old Enoch, who had been translated. On his right arm he bore a glorious palm, and on each leaf was written "Victory." Around his head was a dazzling white wreath, and leaves on the wreath, and in the middle of each leaf was written "Purity," and around the wreath were stones of various colors, that shone brighter than the stars, and cast a reflection upon the letters and magnified them. On the back part of his head was a bow that confined the wreath, and upon the bow was written "Holiness." Above the wreath was a lovely crown that shone brighter than the sun. I asked him if this was the place he was taken to from the earth. He said, "It is not; the city is my home, and I have come to visit this place." He moved about the place as if perfectly at home. I begged of my attending angel to let me remain in that place. I could not bear the thought of coming back to this dark world again. Then the angel said, "You must go back, and if you are faithful, you, with the 144,000, shall have the privilege of visiting all the worlds and viewing the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

handiwork of God."<sup>59</sup>

It is not fanciful, therefore, to believe that life does exist on certain other planets. While it is doubtful that there are other such habitable worlds immediately nearby to our earth or even in our own solar system, they most certainly exist in the vast array of the universe, where billions of other systems with their associated solar subsystems are likely to be found.

Even those of the secular scientific community are interested in this possibility. Below is a news flash that was shared with me recent to this writing:

### Scientists Reveal 'Cousin' Solar System

Tuesday, November 06, 2007 By Ker Than

Scientists announced on Tuesday the discovery of a fifth planet in a distant star system that now looks like a "cousin" to our own.

Known as 55 Cancri, the sun-like star harbors the most number of planets ever discovered outside our solar system.

"We now know that our sun and its family of planets is not unusual," study team member Geoffrey Marcy of the University of California, Berkeley told reporters in a teleconference. "Architecturally, this new planetary system is reminiscent of ours, albeit souped-up. All the planets in this new system are more massive by factors of 5 to 10."

Four of the planets had been previously detected, but the existence of the fifth planet took 18 years to confirm. It is about 45 times more massive than Earth and might be similar to Saturn in its composition and appearance.

---

<sup>59</sup> The misinformed charge that this planet was supposedly Jupiter or the like. Ellen White never said any such thing, and it is most unlikely that Jupiter is inhabited or ever will be. Some observers, such as Joseph Bates were known to have surmised some things about Ellen White's visions, but their relative ignorance of present astronomical facts in no way invalidates what God may have shown Ellen White in vision.

## *Is There Life on Other Planets?*

55 Cancri is 41 light-years away in the direction of the constellation Cancer and is visible with binoculars. The system contains a clutch of four inner planets that are separated from an outer planet by a huge gap.

"We haven't found a twin of our solar system, because the four planets close to the star are all the size of Neptune or bigger," Marcy said. Although more than 250 extrasolar, or "exoplanets," are known, only one other star, mu Ara in the southern sky, is known to have four planets. Astronomers expect many mufti-planet star systems to be found as technology improves.

### **Possibly Habitable**

The newest member of Canal 55's family lies within the star's habitable zone, the region around the star within which water can exist in its liquid state. Though the planet is a giant ball of gas, liquid water could exist on other undiscovered rocky planets in the system. Marcy said he's optimistic that continued observations will reveal a rocky planet around the star within five years.

Such a potentially habitable planet could reside in the nearly 700 million-mile (1.1 million-kilometer) *wide* space that separates 55 Cancri's four inner planets and its outer one.

I would bet you that gap isn't empty," said study team member Debra Fischer of San Francisco State University. "What we see in our solar system is that we, are full up on planets. There are very few tiny windows where you can drop even a moon-sized object in and have it survive in a stable orbit."

Another possibility is that a moon in orbit around 55 Cancri's newly confirmed planet could harbor liquid water, and perhaps life, the researchers say.

"If there were a moon around this planet, it would have a rocky surface," Marcy said. "Water on it could in principle puddle into takes and oceans, serving as the solvent for biochemistry.

### **'One Small Step'**

Michael Briley, an astronomer at the National Science Foundation who was not involved in the study, said the discovery marks an "exciting step" in the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

search for worlds like our own.<sup>60</sup>

<http://www.foxnews.com/printer>

Life on other planets is a biblical possibility. It will be exciting someday to find out more about the other worlds in our universe. It will be the privilege of faithful Christians to visit these worlds and learn about their history and unique place in God's great universal plan.

While such supernatural beings we are told have abilities to know some of what is happening on our own little planet earth, it is very unlikely that they need to visit us in strange little spacecrafts to gain a knowledge of us. They are not showing up as little green men in Roswell, New Mexico, or flying around in "flying saucers."<sup>61</sup> But it is totally acceptable to believe that other beings exist in our universe (much more attractive ones, I'm sure!), for even the sober prophets and apostles of the Bible tell us they do.

It is the settled opinion of most creationist Christians that it is God's nature to create. They believe, for good, solid, reasons that God has other beings in his vast domain, for it is God's pleasure and will to share his wonders with created beings that can enjoy

---

<sup>60</sup> friendly\_story/0,3566,308740,OO.h1zn1 11/6/2007

Alan Stem, associate administrator for the Science Mission Directorate at NASA headquarters in Washington who also was not involved in the study, said ""It is amazing to see our ability to detect extrasolar planets growing.

"We are finding solar systems with a richness of planets and a variety of planetary types comparable to our own," Stem said.

The planets were found using the Lick Observatory and the W.M. Keck Observatory in Hawaii using the so-called radial velocity, or "wobble," technique, whereby the presence of planets are inferred by the way they gravitationally affect their parent star's orbit. The newest world will be detailed in an upcoming issue of *Astrophysical Journal*.

"Finding five extrasolar planets orbiting a star is only one small step," Marcy said.

"Earth-like planets are the next destination,"

<sup>61</sup> For a brief discussion of the UFO craze and how to understand similar paranormal claims in our present world, please read my book, "The Signs of the Heavens."

## *Is There Life on Other Planets?*

them. God has no doubt created many worlds, and is creating more as we speak. Some of the interesting phenomena we may see happening in the outer reaches of our celestial system may actually be (well...is!) God himself at work.

God will always create, for it is his loving and sociable nature to do so. Perhaps, if faithful, we can all someday directly witness God's creatorship in action, and watch with greater fascination and wonder than we could even conceive of now, exactly what it is like to closely observe God actively at work in his expansive laboratory. As we witness these wonders we will exclaim, "Great and marvelous are thy works, O Lord God Almighty," "For you have created all things, and for your pleasure they are and were created." "You are the great *Creator of the Heavens*, and all that is in them!" Amen, and Amen!

# 11

## Where is the Center of the Universe?

Is there a center to the universe?

For the last several centuries men have debated this idea. Naturally in ancient times the size of the universe as we measure it today was not known. So earthlings naturally believed they were at or near the universal center.

When telescopes came into being the perceived size of the universe dramatically changed. Soon *heliocentrism* took over and the sun became the central focus. However, certain observers of the stars noticed the tightly bound constellation of the Pleiades and wondered if that was the center.

## ***Where is the Center of the Universe?***

With the ever expanding view of the universe coming into focus modern men no longer believe that the earth is even close to the center of the cosmos. Modern cosmology, of course, tends to view our Milky Way Galaxy as just one of many billions of galaxies, and we are neither at the center of our own galaxy or at the center of all the galaxies. Scientists reason that concentrated areas of our universe are the most likely sources of the expanding realms of space, growing outward according to the prevailing theories of today. Everything is expanding in every direction much like marks on a balloon that is being inflated, and one cannot really locate the center at this point.

Dr. Robert Gentry has popularized a view that according to his observations and reasoning teaches that we on earth must actually be quite close to the center of the universe, and suggests that the heaven of heavens, the place of God's throne may be somewhere nearby. Following is a newsflash produced recently that reports on Dr. Gentry's findings:

### **Center of the Universe: The Great White Throne**

BY RICH RICHARDSON  
Associated Press

In a stunning astronomical discovery, the Hubble telescope has taken pictures of the Great White Throne. In a series of telephone interviews, Drs. Robert and David Gentry said the universe has a nearby center that can be identified with the location of the Great White Throne, God's dwelling place in the heavens described in the book of Revelation.

They even go so far as to suggest that this discovery may have apocalyptic implications: Did the Creator long ago plan for this sign in the heavens to be discovered as a signal that the present age is nearing its close and will soon end with the second coming of Christ in power and glory?\*

Art historian Tom Chippendale, of the Tate Museum, said the throne was in the French provincial style, while Harvard zoologist Edward O. Wilson identified the animals to either side of the throne as

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

belonging to the genus *Capra* and *Ovis* respectively. Unfortunately, the low resolution of the photographs did not permit a more precise taxonomical classification.

William Lane Craig hailed the finding as a splendid addition to the cosmological argument, while William Dembski cited this discovery as a paradigm-case of specified complexity and intelligent design.

However, Richard Dawkins dismissed the “Goddidit” inference as a massive “cop-out” and “science-stopper.” “It wouldn’t be the first time that our smart genes played a dirty trick on their robotic, blindly programmed replicators,” he explained.

Attorneys for the ACLU petitioned Judge Jones to place a gag order on Observatories within the Continental United States and Hawaii.

\*<http://www.halos.com/videos/index.htm#cou>

So where is the center of the universe? Are we near it?

Perhaps we are. If Dr. Gentry is right then it is probably nearby. It can be explained as if one finds himself swimming in the middle of a large lake, yet that person doesn’t know if he or she is in the exact middle of the lake or not. However, if the swimmer notices that all the power boats are going away from him in every direction, and he can assess the relative distance to these boats, then he could likely reason that he is somewhere around the middle of the lake or at least the relative middle of what is happening.

According to Dr. Gentry’s work this may be what our local universe turns out to look like. God rules from somewhere near our present location. According to his theory, the red shift<sup>62</sup> values attached to the galaxies that are considered farthest away argue the likelihood of a nearby center of the universe.

However, even though this might actually be the case, it is not the

---

<sup>62</sup> Of course, this necessitates an acceptance of red shift dynamics as a reliable way to measure the relative distance of celestial objects.

## *Where is the Center of the Universe?*

general opinion of science that everything is moving away from our particular part of the universe. The common expansion theory of the Big Bang is that the universe would seem to expand from every place in the same way everywhere, therefore it would look the same to the observer *wherever* he was in the universe. But this does not make entire sense to some observers (this author included, and Dr. Gentry and his son, David.) but it, at least, demonstrates the slippery relativity “cop-out” style of modern physics. There is no *absolute* to pin anything up against anything. Its “willy nilly.” All normal reasoning retreats into one black hole or another.

To the best I can understand it, that while Dr. Gentry accepts red shift dynamics, universal expansion, and Einsteinium general relativity, he interprets it differently than mainline science does. His work focuses on modern science returning to the actual “Rosetta stone” of Einstein’s physics, which according to his research demonstrates that the universe is indeed expanding at a rapid rate from a nearby center.

While neither Christian nor agnostic might have any problem with a quickly expanding universe (God is, no doubt, an ongoing Creator), it may not be of much consequence where the center of God’s universe is at present.

What is important is that we do know where it WILL BE!!

It will be here on this earth.

“And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell among them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them and be their God.” Revelation 21:3

The book, *The Desire of Ages*, by Ellen G. White, provides us with the following statement. Considering the great controversy that is raging between forces in heaven, our world, as insignificant as it might be otherwise, figures prominently in the eternal scheme of things. Says the statement:

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

“Our little world is the lesson book of the universe.”<sup>63</sup>

The entire universe is watching what is happening on our small planet. Our own earth, the only place marred by the effects of sin is a living demonstration of the controversy between good and evil and is the battlefield in this conflict. It is here on this earth that the Son of God came, to deliver men from sin, and to prepare for them a place where he can recreate in them his perfect image and glory.

The God of the universe will someday make this earth over new, and cleanse the heavens above us that have been polluted by the effects of man's and Satan's evil devices. God promises to make this earth the capitol of his kingdom of Grace and Salvation. So in a sense this earth will be a central focus of God's great work of creation and redemption. Geocentrism will be back in vogue.

Knowing how God works, one who knows the end from the beginning, it seems very possible that this world has always been near the center of this eternal realm. Though science in their estimation has reduced greatly the importance of our little globe, yet in God's value system this earth will be raised to eternal prominence. It will be the place of his throne, a monument of his marvelous work of redemption. All nations shall come and worship before him, for his judgments will be made manifest.

---

<sup>63</sup> p. 19.

# 12

## The Properties of Light and Color

**“And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.”  
Genesis 1:3 KJV.**

I have always wondered why all that happened on the first day of creation was the creation of light. Why didn't more happen than that? Light? Nice. But so what?

Part of the answer may be that God started his creation with the most important “singularity” of all. In creating light itself, with its properties and descriptors, he was creating that which was most like himself, and which is likely the most basic building block of the cosmos.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

In at least an elementary way we might describe light as energy. Wherever we see the release of energy in our universe light seems to be present. The sun is a powerhouse of energy and physically is a source of light and life. Electricity gives us light, heat, and power. Electrical impulses behave according the laws of light. Fire, another release of energy, produces light.

It is of no small interest to this author that modern science, and especially the proponents of the “Big Bang,” take the polar (pun intended) opposite position when it comes to the origin of our universe. Creationism teaches that the “Light” that enlightens everything and that created everything was God through Christ (John 1:1-4). The universe we know then was created “in” darkness, but not as a *result* of darkness. The light was and is seen as a demonstration of God’s creative power in action. The light is the hero of the plot, not the darkness.

The claim of those devoid of Christian values is the exact opposite of this, purporting that the universe began from darkness. Think about this. The preponderance of evolutionary thinking is obsessed with “Black Holes,” and even “anti-gravity” or “anti-energy.” These “Black Holes” somehow created an “implosion” first *and then* an “explosion” or “expansion” that spawned our ever-expanding universe. This makes no sense. I’m no Einstein, but I have *enough* IQ to determine that when compared to the biblical model this is totally reversed, and in a way, unreasonable. Everything in this scenario seems to be reversed or mutated from what would be naturally expected. It is contradictory to what we naturally observe today. I suspect it is *quantum gymnastics*, even, perhaps, theoretical and cosmological “junk.”

My open bias and retort is that this is exactly what we should expect from those devoid of “light.” The Gospel of John teaches<sup>64</sup> that Satan’s followers “love the darkness more than the

---

<sup>64</sup> John 3:19-21 “And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the

## *The Properties of Light and Color*

light.” It has been the purpose of the Ruler of Darkness to cast darkness upon all of God’s light and open creative purposes. It is my opinion that this explanation of origins hails straight from the darkened halls of the University of Satan itself. It has black, Satanic marks all over it. It’s an easy read.

To many the creation account in Genesis seems simplistic, almost mythical in its presentation and content. But as time continues, and scientific knowledge increases, *Genesis*, at least to this author, starts to sound more scientific and reasonable all the time.

With the creation of the first three days we have the elemental building blocks of the universe, somewhat even as proposed by Einstein and others. The famous formula,  $E=mc^2$ , whatever it is supposed to mean, uses similar components. Energy equals mass, times the speed of light, squared.

In the first day of creation we have light or ENERGY introduced. In the second day VOLUME is created. In the third day physical MASS is created. Then appropriately on the following days each of these elemental conditions are “filled” with the physical “inhabitants” of these elements. The sun, moon, and planets are “lights” made on the fourth day, equated to the light created on the first day. The fifth day the fishes and birds are made to fill the volume of sea and atmosphere, and finally on the sixth day man and creeping animals fill the land masses. The seventh day completes and celebrates the whole of creation. The entire creation is in logical, even poetic order. It all starts with the basic building blocks of energy, mass, and volume---components deemed necessary for a beginning by even the greatest of scientists.

The creation of this earth and its environs follow a very specific

---

world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds be reprov'd. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought of God.” KJV

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

creative pattern. There are actually several ways of looking at this. The one basic elemental circumstance, the process of life and creation is that of dividing, in order to bring about the addition of multiplication. Division courses through the creation narrative.<sup>65</sup>

The conception of life today begins with the division of one cell-- in humans the egg that has been penetrated by the sperm. That first cell divides, then divides again until the embryo is formed. Thus is “created” a newborn child. Likewise the creation account seems incredibly scientific!!

Light is created first, not so much because light had never existed before, but that in the primeval state of the *tohu* and *bohu* for our local system, at least, it had not reigned in separation from the darkness in the environs of the earth. So what is happening in the first day is that the light is being separated from the darkness, and this creates the bipolar day itself, evening and morning. Through the division of light from darkness the DAY ITSELF is created.

On the second day the pattern continues. The waters below are separated from the waters above. Ocean and atmosphere are divided unto themselves.

On the third day, the land, physical mass, is divided from the waters.

On the fourth, fifth, and sixth days these forms are filled.

- The light of the first day is awarded physical light forms, the sun, moon, and stars created the fourth day.

---

<sup>65</sup> Note that in a sense “subtraction” is absent from the creation narrative. While Adam’s rib is taken, he is still left with the rib, so it again is the addition of multiplication through division. Big Bang cosmology seems to require a reversal or implosion into a black hole before the real thing happens; subtraction and negativity being the “heroes of the plot.” I’m not a philosopher--- its just a thought---but it seems modern theory is antithetically reversed to what it should be. And who would do that?—S. Behrmann

## *The Properties of Light and Color*

- The fifth day the fish fill the waters below, and the birds inhabit the firmament above.
- On the sixth day, the land masses are inhabited with creatures of all kinds.

But even these “fillings” are in a sense corresponding divisions between themselves:

On the sixth day the division continues in the formation of man and animals:

Yet man and animal must too be sub-divided---Male and Female.

On the seventh day, sacred time is separated from secular time in yet another division. Now the creation is completed and once again can be further divided, and replicated, in mankind and animal being “fruitful, and multiplying.” (replicated division!)



## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

### Light

To return to our original intent, the first and greatest of the elemental components is light. Light is in itself a marvelous thing.

Light is really where we get color. When light is bent through a prism we are able to see the color spectrum in such richness that it boggles the mind. The prism “divides” the color out due to the process of refraction.

Wondrously the eyes of humans are made to see only a portion of the total light spectrum. Infrared and ultraviolet, along with other radio waves, microwaves, gamma rays, x-rays, and other rays are found on either side of our visible spectrum and cannot be seen with our eyes, but can be detected and measured only with modern instruments.



© Sigurður H. Stefniðsson

## *The Properties of Light and Color*

Of interest is the fact that different “visible” heavenly bodies in our local universe bear a color found somewhere on our spectrum. But our own sun, our local source of light and energy emits a form of light found *exactly in the middle* of our own native color range, somewhere in the green or yellow part of the spectrum. Our eyes are calibrated exactly to perceive the range of color emitted by our own sun. I don’t believe this circumstance evolved as many do. I believe it is just another mark of God’s creative purpose, where God deliberately matched our eyesight with the color range created in the sun. We were made for each other!

Light, at least in the environment in which we measure it, has a definite and consistent speed. This is commonly known as 186,000 miles per second.

The speed of light has become the foundation block of modern astronomical theory. It is from the speed of light that Einstein and others have developed the theories of relativity and from which the “Big Bang” philosophers have sought to measure the size and expansion rate of the universe.

But I believe God’s creative light should be used rather to support the creative aspect of God. Consequently, I think the constant speed of light, and other properties of light at least in our local universe, will in time be used to exonerate biblical astronomy, or the Creator God, contrary to the way it is used today in scientific theory today.

I have this perspective because evolutionary/Big Bang paradigms are perhaps setting traps for themselves. One trap is making the “exploded” universe so large that observable phenomena will be seen that can only be explained by movements faster than or contrary to the speed of light. Scientists are presently becoming aware that certain enigmas exist when holding to the theory of a *big bang*. For if the universe is exploding outward at a speed a

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

little less than the speed of light, what happens when you see movements in space reckoned to be so massive that speed *in excess* to the speed of light would be required? Such data seems to be coming in.

There is also a “horizon problem” in all of this for *Big Bang* scientists. Some scientists are therefore being forced to conclude that the speed of light is either not constant or that something else is wrong. The “horizon problem” is one that notes that if the universe started with one super-heated event, then the universe should show that it is now cooling at the center, and heated at the outermost reaches. While redshifts seem to supposedly predominate the furthest galaxies and objects---there are exceptions. Instead of having a hot part of the universe and a colder, or older part, there seems to be hot and cold all over the place, or at least they sometimes appear in places they shouldn't be.



It seems to this author that while we can measure the speed of

## *The Properties of Light and Color*

light in our own local universe, it is presumption to assume that uniformly light always behaves in exactly the same way in the entire universe, or that we are today aware of *all* its properties. Can there be no additional factors that would mitigate our view and understanding of distant objects? It seems there has to be.

While God has made light behave a certain way, it is presumptive to assume that there is nothing faster than light *or that we know everything about it!* Simply stated, God is faster than light, or he couldn't have created it. He is not limited to any supernatural speed control. He is policed by nothing. He makes the rules and uses his elemental powers how he needs or wishes. At his pleasure, they are and were created.

Light is not only the energy source for heat and illumination, but it is certainly the palette of incredible color and interest. God could have created the universe in black and white. But he didn't. What is often forgotten is that some of the richest and grandest displays of art and color are in the heavens above.

While we view trees and flowers on earth, all of these pale in some respects when one looks at God's heavenly canvass. Astral photography is becoming more and more popular now because instruments are available that catch these magnificent shows of God's power and light. I admit I covet greatly some of these scopes and cameras because of some of the beautiful images that come back from space. The Hubble telescope and others return to us incredible sights that take away one's breath at times.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS



One delightful pursuit is to observe or view the *aurora borealis*, or the northern (or southern) lights. What seems to be happening from scientific observation is that when heightened activity at the sun commences (solar flares, or sunspots), that the radiation coming towards our earth is attracted to our poles where the gases of oxygen and hydrogen are excited. This causes the atmosphere to glow in a variety of interesting ways. Having lived in Alaska for several years I have been deeply moved by these heavenly fireworks. The colors and motions that can be viewed or captured are simply amazing.

*The Properties of Light and Color*



**Aurora Borealis**



## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS



The accompanying pictures are not in color for some of our readers (economics were the factor), but these can be better viewed anyway at a number of websites, and in other photographic venues. They represent some of the most delightful colors and configurations imaginable.

Apparently the sun rotates on its axis about every 27 days. Therefore, if one particular show of the northern lights occurs, one can often see a competing demonstration 27 days later.

### **Nebulae**

Among the grandest of all color displays are in the nebulae in the heavens. Outshining them all for brilliance is the Orion complex. Nebulas, which are probably gas clouds in the sky, come in all shapes and sizes and are always interesting to view and study.

## *The Properties of Light and Color*



### **Stars**

Even the stars themselves are not just white, when viewed under a telescope or more closely. Some are red, green, yellow, blue, and various other shades. A disgusting habit of modern science is to obsess on the temperature and magnitude of the star, and insert impersonal and sterile information about “big bang” dynamics into it, noting its temperature, age, etc. Stars are always pictured in one state of dying, or another. I rather like to think of them as "living!" They are evidence that God superintends his grand creations.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS



What is commonly overlooked is that whatever the physical reason for the stars' appearance, I believe God deliberately painted the sky with stars of color, and placed them there with that very purpose, though there are others, of course. God is a God of vivid color. The color sends us a message that God wants us to be enthralled and enlivened at what he made for us. He wants us to recognize that he is the God behind it. He lives! He creates! The universe is not a dying ember, headed for oblivion. It is a living orchestra of heavenly music, a vibrant body of life, a flamboyant canvass of eternal color and interest.

In the Old Testament Scriptures the rainbow of color was a sign of a covenant that was intended to be eternal. The entire color spectrum is found in the heavens, and through these God is sending a message of eternal love and favor, "as the stars forever." They declare his love, his majesty, and his creatorship. The heavens declare the glory of God.

We see only a distant glimpse of the true glories of the eternal

## *The Properties of Light and Color*

realms. Someday, if faithful, God's saints will enjoy the wonders of the universe in ways we cannot even conceive of today. What a day, glorious day, that will be!

# 13

## The Sabbath and the Heavens

Do the seventh-day Sabbath and the heavens have anything in common? At first one would naturally think they do not. But there may be more of a relationship than most people realize. This association begins, perhaps, with the number “seven” itself:

### **The Number Seven**

Certain students of the starry heavens have noticed that the number seven seems to be discernible in many of the star groupings or constellations. There are actually many more stars in each constellation, of course, sometimes hundreds and thousands depending on how magnified the view of the beholder. But to the unaided eye there are often seven principle stars that make up a major constellation.

The most conspicuous examples are some of the most important

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

and well-known constellations in the sky. One is *Ursa Major*, known as the “Big Dipper.” Four significant stars mark the four corners of the “dipper,” and three other stars constitute the handle. In all there are seven significant stars in the major constellation.

The same is also true of the *Ursa Minor*, or the *Little Dipper*. It also has roughly seven stars completing its general outline. Yet another example might be the *Northern Crown*, *Corona Borealis*. In sacred lore it is a crown with seven principle stars that relate to the “coming king” of the universe.

A further prominent example is *Orion*, probably the most important constellation in the heavens. There are four major stars, Rigel, Betelgeuse, Saiph, and Bellatrix at the four corners of the major grouping. But the three stars, known as the belt, or the “Three Kings” angle up towards the center of the constellation. There are other dim, or “cloudy” stars in the constellation, of course, including the great nebula in the “sword.” But the unaided eye will easily notice the seven brightest stars in a class by themselves.



## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Another famous star grouping is known as the Pleiades. This tightly bound group of stars is mentioned in the book of Job, and has been known from ancient times as the “seven stars.” These stars are in the constellation Taurus. They represent a sacred “congregation of the righteous,” that have the number “seven” associated with them, in star lore. In the book of Revelation (Rev. 1) they are equated with churches, seven in number. I think it quite interesting that the number seven in star lore is repeatedly equated with God’s true church.

The number seven shows up in God’s creation in various ways. The honeycomb is configured in this way, the cells having a seven-fold arrangement. If you take a circular object, such as a penny, you will find that exactly six other pennies will fit around it with the sides touching, so including the penny in the middle you will have the total number seven<sup>66</sup>. Time to this moment, as measured in days, has since ancient times been represented in cycles of seven.<sup>67</sup> Thus we have the seven days of the week. These in turn were directly associated with the seven major celestial lights in the firmament----- the sun, moon, and the five major visible planets.

Creation of this earth according to the Bible took seven literal days. It cannot be reasoned that a God who can speak worlds into existence even needed that much time to make our world. He could have done it in micro seconds. And he definitely didn’t need to “rest” at the end of the first six days. He obviously not only created the world in creation week, but he also created *the days themselves*, measured from even to even. He took seven days for a specific reason. *It is because seven is the creation number and everywhere is equated with God’s creative acts.*

---

<sup>66</sup> Another row outside will arrange 12, a number for heavenly and permanent completeness. But this is a further discussion.

<sup>67</sup> The biblical system carried this much further than the week. There were sabbatical years (7X), jubilee years (7X7), and even 490-year probationary periods (70 X 7).

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

Even in the understanding of the ancients there were five planets, plus the sun and the moon, which moved according to their respective orbits. Thus there were seven heavenly bodies to complete the heavens that worked in cycles. The days of the week are now named after them.

Today we know that Uranus and Neptune are also planets in our solar system, along with the tiny and lonely Pluto (and other dwarf planets), but these were not known to the ancients.

Pluto has now been demoted (plutoed) to a non-planet. But this is also interesting because if excluding the sun and moon, which really aren't "planets," we are left with exactly seven "planets of knowledge" in our own solar system. Our earth is, of course, the eighth, but our local universe remains to us "world-centric" and so we, ourselves, don't see the earth as a planet.

In a vision the prophet and writer, Ellen White, viewed a planet that from her perspective had "seven moons." What this planet was and where it was we do not know, though the Adventist pioneer, Joseph Bates, and others may have surmised it was Jupiter. Jupiter supposedly has about eight to fourteen moons, though it always depends on how one classifies the number and size of some satellites. Some asteroid types of satellites seem to be presently broken into two or more pieces from possibly one original mass. It is also possible that new satellites are captured into the orbit of a planet or at other times leave the orbit of a planet. Perhaps Ellen White did see Jupiter at some time, but it is most unlikely that the planet referred to above was Jupiter.

The point is that the number seven often comes up in the stellar worlds, and in exploring the creation of God. I suggest this is no accident. I believe it is a "mark" of God's creation. When it appears systematically one has to wonder why. I believe that God is thereby saying "it is MY 'mark,' and I am telling you that I am the one who created this thing!" The number seven in many cases seems to be God's "seal," "patent," or "trademark."

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Even earthlings refer to the land masses of our planet as the seven continents.<sup>68</sup> Similarly we will say of a well-traveled sailor that he has “sailed the seven seas.”<sup>69</sup> Why does it so often work out that there are there are seven denominated continents, seas, or whatever, even in the writings of secularists? Because I believe God is subtly leaving us a trademark of His creatorship. The Bible says, “The earth is the Lords” and all that is within it. Psalm 24:1.<sup>70</sup> The world is His because He made it. He has carefully marked it with His own seal of ownership.

It is of great interest to this writer, that in the realms of biblical truth and history there is also a delineated “mark” of God’s physical creation. It is called the seventh-day Sabbath. Exodus 31:13, Ezekiel 20:20, and other prophetic passages teach that the seventh-day Sabbath is such a specific mark of God’s creation. It

---

<sup>68</sup> Asia, Europe, Africa, Australia, North America, South America, Antarctica.

<sup>69</sup> Pacific Ocean, Atlantic Ocean, Indian Ocean, Arctic Ocean, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea, Caspian Sea.

In Medieval European literature, the Seven Seas referred to the following seas:

the Black Sea

the Caspian Sea

the Persian Gulf

the Red Sea

the Mediterranean Sea, including its marginal seas, notably the Adriatic Sea (which is listed separately among the Seven Seas) and the Aegean Sea.

the Arabian Sea (which is part of the Indian Ocean)

East Indies

In Colonial times the Clipper Ship Tea Route from China to England was the longest trade route in the world. It took sailors through seven seas near the Dutch East Indies: the Banda Sea, the Celebes Sea, the Flores Sea, the Java Sea, the South China Sea, the Sulu Sea, and the Timor Sea.

The Seven Seas referred to those seas, and if someone had sailed the Seven Seas it meant he had sailed to, and returned from, the other side of the world.[12]

[edit] Modern

After the Europeans discovered America, some people used the term Seven Seas to refer to seven of the biggest bodies of water in the world: The Arctic Ocean, the Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea, the Caribbean Sea, and the Gulf of Mexico.

Some modern geographical classification schemes count seven oceans in the world: The North Pacific Ocean, the South Pacific Ocean, the North Atlantic Ocean, the South Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, the Southern Ocean, and the Arctic Ocean. [13]

*Wikipedia*, “Seven Seas”

<sup>70</sup> “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell within. For He hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.” Psa 24:1,2. KJV These verses annotate the creation of the seas and the land masses by the direct fiat of the Divine Lord and as belonging to God.

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

is called the “Seal of God” (a seal was a specific tool for **marking** a new “creation” or “document”). The Sabbath commandment of Exodus 20:8-11 contains the elements of a political seal, giving the title, name, and territory of the One placed over the given realm. There are even arguments that the word “**Sabbath**” means something like: “at the sign of the respected Father (Abba, or “revered father” is in the exact center of the word),” or “at the house of the signified (seal of) Father.” God’s universe is his “house”, and the sign over the door of his house boldly announces that He is the builder and owner of it!

“For in six days the Lord God created the heavens and the earth,” and “rested the seventh.....” Exodus 20:8-11 (fourth commandment).

## **The Zodiac and the Lunar Calendar**

Also of interest concerning the Sabbath is the theological and symbolic meanings found in the major constellations of the night sky. Some of these star pictures have been systematically explored in a companion book in this series called the “Torah of the Heavens.”

The ancient zodiac consisted of twelve major constellations which housed the sun in any given month of the year. In what is now the spring months of March and April, the sun resided near the constellation “Aries,” at the springtime of the year, and so on. The months of the year were related to the knowledge of these constellations.

Furthermore, many ancient cultures had two major calendars arranging these months. One was a civil calendar and the other was a religious calendar. These often began six months removed from each other. The civil calendar was used for the reigns of kings and for civil and fiscal matters, and the religious calendar was used for the reckoning of religious holidays. Thus, in a sense every year had two New Year’s Days.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Many ancient calendars, particularly those tied to astronomical movements were thought to begin in what are now the fall months of the year or during the present months of September and October. This was the beginning of the official year, when the new moon appeared, while the sun was near Virgo. Partway into Virgo, and later in history some into Libra, the year would begin at about the time of the fall equinox:

Virgo-Libra  
Scorpio  
Sagittarius  
Capricorn  
Aquarius  
Pisces  
Aries

Aries, the month of the Spring Equinox, would come about during the seventh month, or the *sabbath* of the civil months. It was the beginning of the religious calendar of feasts and celebrations, and so was also considered the “first month” of that calendar. To this we will return shortly. But of momentary interest is the fact that in a sense there seems to have been a “Sabbath” also placed in the *civil* calendar, or in even public or official time. This hints that the Sabbath exists not just for religious reasons, but for secular and official seasons as well. Sabbath is to be a civil calendar consideration, too. And indeed the Sabbath was made (“made” is a substitute word for “created”) for “man,” (Heb. *adam*)----and not just the Jews, or some other religious discipline like them.<sup>71</sup>

Anyway, to explain further, let us ask what is represented in the constellation Aries? Aries is a Ram, or a sheep. What is significant is what the Lamb or Ram is *doing* or not doing in the ancient “star picture.” Even from ancient times this lamb is described as reclining and resting, peacefully gazing forward,

---

<sup>71</sup> Mark 2:27,28

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

despite the angry and rushing bull, Taurus, on one side and the ferocious, tugging sea monster, Cetus, below. Aries then, is clearly AT REST!

In the majority of the other constellations kinetic action is taking place. Taurus is a rushing bull. Sagittarius has an onrushing centaur. Other figures are a dashing charioteer, or an angry lion stomping on a serpent. Winged horses and winged feet also appear, a striking scorpion likewise resides in the heavens above, a writhing snake is seen, fishes swim, a man carries (works) and pours water, and so on. But the lamb in Aries, according to the ancient testimony, particularly “lays down” and “rests peacefully.” The figure is one of intentional and obvious repose.

All of this is significant because this lamb was also equated with the Passover Lamb of the Exodus of Israel and the redemption that was afforded by the same slain Lamb that was sacrificed for centuries from, and even preceding that date. The Lamb in the biblical book of Revelation is the Lamb of God, the Lamb of Redemption, that “takes away the sin of the world.” It is in this same redemption that all humanity has “rest” from the bondage of sin. (The same theme appears repeatedly in this “sabbath” star picture).

There are enormous ties between the Exodus of Israel from bondage (during Aries) and the later sacrifice of the Lamb of God at the *very same Passover celebration* centuries afterward. There are also enormous ties also between the Sabbath and the Passover, and the rest of redemption offered and provided by the Lord Jesus Christ. It is of signal interest that such beautiful “Sabbath” symbols reside in the dome of the heavens, standing above us every night.

In the parts of the heavens where the “millennial” or the “extended” Sabbath is represented, the constellations of Gemini and Cancer, symbols of Sabbath rest are also appropriately found. In Gemini, the two heroes are “sitting” and “resting.” There is “war no more.” They have laid down their weapons and have

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

exchanged them for harps. In Cancer, a major constellation found next to the latter part of Gemini, are found groups of the faithful assembled, resting in sheepfolds, both small and large. They are in other nearby symbols pictured as pilgrims and travelers that have arrived safely home to rest and rejoice. They are even seen in these varied symbols as assembled for “church,” some in large groups, and some in smaller convocational fashion! (The big or little dippers that are really “folds”)

### The Seventh Month in the Religious Cycle

In the religious cycle of the biblical calendar, the month of Aries was the first month. Therefore the “seventh” month of the religious calendar came in the fall months of the seasonal year sometime in September or October. Because of the precession of the equinox, the time has slipped a few degrees from its original placement in the seasonal year, and now comes *before* the fall equinox. But the heavenly configurations remain appropriate and large enough for the occasion, even to this day.

Throughout biblical history the seventh month came roughly at the *end of Virgo* (a very large constellation), and into the constellation of Libra:

1. Aries
2. Taurus
3. Gemini
4. Cancer
5. Leo
6. Virgo
7. **Virgo-Libra**

The constellation of Virgo, or the Virgin, is a very expansive constellation and covers more time than one typical month. Libra, in essence occupies the latter part of the constellation of Virgo and represents the *corresponding location* in the heavens to the oppositely placed Aries, the Lamb, we have previously

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

considered!

In the constellation Virgo, the position of the Virgin is notably significant. The Virgin is also “lying down” and resting, complete with the trophies of a completed harvest! The virgin, or young woman particularly, is not in a standing position visually, but in a reclining one, typical of rest. Sabbath symbols consistently appear in all of the appropriate places! This is no accident. It can't be.

Further, the correlate constellation “Libra” is known as a “scale” representing and recognizing the cost of redemption. Like Aries, it is *not a distinct* constellation (and so is Virgo), signaling a kind of “pause” in the heavenly cycle.

The Sabbath is, of course, such a “pause.” It is also a sign of redemption. In some zodiacs *the weight* that pays the cost of redemption, found in the scale, is portrayed in the form of a lamb. Thus the Sabbath, like the Passover, is interestingly symbolized as a time to consider and reflect (remember) relative to the cost of redemption---a time to give consideration and judgment to the sacrifice of the redeemer!

The word, Libra, seems to be related to the word “liberation,” the result of the price paid for our redemption. The Sabbath celebrates this theme consistently throughout all literature and practice. It is a time to celebrate man’s deliverance or *exodus* from the bondage of sin. The Sabbath in both Scripture and the Heavens is never a sign of bondage---as many uninformed Christians often charge. It is consistently a sign of just the opposite, freedom and deliverance from sin and bondage.

Thus this area of the heavens can be summarized theologically as “Rest AND Redemption.” There could hardly be a better thematic descriptor of the Sabbath truth than this. The message is as blatant and clear as the noonday sun. Alas, it shouts from the stars themselves!

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

There will always be those so ill of mind that they cannot grasp these thematic correspondences with biblical truth. They will charge that such readings are “post hoc rationalizations” and the like. But I contest they are no such thing. They were written in the sky long before these detractors were born, and will continue long after their demise. The heavens will continue to declare the glory of God, and will testify to their Creator, world without end. How is it that the best symbols of rest and repose are situated directly opposite each other in the heavens, and represent appropriately the biblically prescribed sabbatical times of the year?!

Also prominent in the Libra star grouping is the constellation “crux,” the Latin word for “cross.” The famous Southern Cross, no longer visible in the northern latitudes, is a direct symbol of the price that Christ paid for the sins of the world. The significance and movements of this interesting constellation is discussed in the other star books.

Also in this constellation grouping is found the Northern Crown, or the seven starred crown of victory given to those redeemed by the Savior of mankind. Crowns are associated with rejoicing and victory, the acts of worshipping on Mt. Zion, and with the lasting rewards of the faithful and the ongoing perpetuity of those rewards.

### **Will the Sabbath be kept in Heaven?**

Isa 66:22-23

22 *"For just as the new heavens and the new earth which I make will endure before Me," declares the LORD, "So your offspring and your name will endure.*

23 *"And it shall be from new moon to new moon and from Sabbath to Sabbath, all mankind will come to bow down before me," says the LORD. (NIV)*

I believe that the Sabbath will be observed in heaven and the new

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

earth for many reasons. The first is that God and his purposes do not fundamentally change over time. God ordained the Sabbath in a perfect world (Gen. 2:3). Why wouldn't he have it in the renewed Eden, where everything from the first Eden will be restored in the "paradise" of the second Eden?

Another reason for the perpetuity of the Sabbath is that the Sabbath celebrates rest and redemption. This is what the people of God will be experiencing throughout eternity. We believe that the saving power of God will be the science and song of the redeemed throughout eternity. This is exactly what the Sabbath represents and celebrates. Why would God discontinue a prescribed avenue for celebrating his redemptive activity and take it away from his creatures? I think it is ridiculous and inconsistent to think that he would. The first day only can represent the beginning of creation. But beyond this the seventh day instead represents a completed creation, and in the sense of redemption, a completed re-creation. It's a *commemorative* birthday celebration honored by rest and focused upon redemption.

Further, the Sabbath itself is the biblical memorial of creation, creation of much more than our miniscule world. If the Sabbath was ordained as a memorial of the world's original creation, why wouldn't it be ordained as a memorial of the earth's RE-CREATION (or the other world's creations)? And this is exactly the sense of Isaiah 66:22-23. It begins by saying: "For just as the new heavens and the new earth...." Think about what these words are saying, and what God is saying in this passage! God equates his **new creation** directly with *Shabbat*!

In addition, the fact of God's creation stands as always---from before this world was created till endless eternity afterward. It is God's nature to create. He is probably creating hundreds of things right now as we speak. Therefore the arrival of the saints in heaven changes nothing in regards to God's creatorship and the celebration of it. Revelation 4 pictures the whole of creation as praising God continually, never resting. Why can't these

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

creatures cease praising God? Because creation never stops praising its maker! It cannot. It is always there and remains steadfast. It will always speak, throughout all eternity. God's marvelous works never cease. Unlike our puny works that rot and degrade, God's works are ongoing and lasting.

Some object, and even laugh at Sabbath-keeping Christians, for the teaching that this verse in Isaiah 66 justifies the perpetuity of the Sabbath. They charge, "Well, if you are going to keep the Sabbath, you will have to keep the new moons, too!"--- "Ha! Ha!"

This scenario portrays the typical attitude and ignorance of the people making these charges. First of all, why not celebrate the new moons in the new earth? In Bible times they were also known as *sabbaths*, (small "s"), and were extra, dedicated holidays (like our U.S. "Mondays"), or opportunities for people to bring their offerings of thanksgiving to the Lord! Apparently these folk don't want to do that.

The words "have to" also betray the thinking of these critics. They are unable to tell the difference between a privilege and a requirement. The Sabbath, rightly understood is not a pain, but a privilege! This passage is not describing people who are *complaining* about "having to go and worship the Lord," but instead they are pictured as sublimely happy to do so for whatever excuse they can drum up! Who wouldn't want to go on holiday, day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year? This is the ultimate point of the passage, anyway.

Some people say that there will be no sun or moon in the new earth (Revelation 21,22). The Bible does not say that at all. It says that the CITY doesn't NEED the sun and moon in them, because God's light and presence are eternally there. But it does say in the very same passage that each MONTH, the Tree of Life will change its fruit. The word "month" comes from the word "moonth." It therefore literally teaches that moons or months will be honored or recognized in the new earth. So!

## ***The Sabbath and the Heavens***

While Isaiah 66 is not an exact description of what heaven will be like (children won't die at a hundred, blood sacrifices will not be made, etc.) it will be fulfilled "in principle" in the new heavens and earth. Opponents of the Sabbath truth tend to make the Sabbath a Jewish institution that was abrogated at the cross. But there is another thing they fail to notice. The verse says that in the idealized new earth that "ALL FLESH," or "ALL MANKIND" will come to worship before God ON the SABBATH. This is also pictured in Revelation 21 and 22. If God then originally designed back in the days of Isaiah that even the Gentiles or the "nations" would *finally* keep the Sabbath in the future, why in the world(s) wouldn't he plan to do so in heaven or in the NEW earth?!

The number seven, and the Sabbath, are expressively written into the language of the stars and into all of God's broad creation. It is doubtful that either will be totally retired, just because of this tiny earth's destruction and re-creation. It seems to be already written in the stars to the contrary.

### **Orion and Seven**

In the center of the constellation of Orion is a very interesting figure. The belt and sword of Orion can be thought to look like many things. Some see a sickle, another figure associated with the Second Coming of Christ. Of course, remember that for many, many reasons, the constellation Orion is known as the "Second Coming" constellation, the time that commences the millennial Sabbath of completion. Orion itself is also generally understood to be the grandest constellation in the heavens.

In the very center of Orion is a belt and sword, and in the center of these lies the great nebula itself. It is through this "general" area that many Seventh-day Adventist Christians believe Jesus will come. Adventists are particular proponents of the Second Coming of Christ, for this is what their name means: They are

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

repeatedly associated by definition with the number seven, and the seventh-day Sabbath, and with the *coming* or *advent* of Christ.

If one looks at the complex of brightest stars in the center of the Orion grouping, it is not too difficult to make out the rough outline of the number “7.” The three stars of the belt compose the top bar, and the stars of the sword can represent the angled vertical bar. The center of this bar, which is the visual center of the “seven” and the visual center of the entire constellation is the grand nebula. The nebula is not a single star at all, but looks like one from a distance.<sup>72</sup>

The modern Arabic “seven” probably developed from a series of similar looking numerals used in ancient times. But particularly significant is the number seven in the Hebrew language.

The Hebrew and Babylonian languages actually used letters for their numbers. In Hebrew, *aleph* represented “one,” *beth*, represented “two,” etc. The seventh letter of the Hebrew alphabet is *zayin*, and looks very similar to the formation we find in the sword and belt of Orion. The modern “z” in the word *zayin* also has similarities to the general shape of the modern “seven,” for it was also known as the *numeric seven*. But some stylizations have come to the letters from how they were actually written in ancient times, and these have no doubt seen various alterations in the modern computer fonts we have now, and so forth.

The hill upon which the temple complex was situated in old Jerusalem was called *Mt. Zion*. To any Judean, this would mean, “The Seven Mountain,” or probably, “the mountain among seven” because it was a popular concept in Israel that Jerusalem was built on seven hills or mountains, and that Zion was the mountain “in their midst.” The Jerusalem temple was idealized

---

<sup>72</sup> The number “seven” or a “Z” can also be seen in the greater outlying constellation as well. In a way the constellation is a large, capital “Z,” for which we derive the spelling of Zion. The Greek zeta, ζ, is similar as well in both phonetic sound and in general shape.

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

in literature as Mt. Zion, the place of God's sanctuary or his *church*; the dwelling place of God, and the church home of God's true priesthood and congregation. Heaven has ever since been equated with Mt. Zion, **Sabbath** celebrations, and the glorious destination of the redeemed pilgrims of earth.

Not dissimilar to the letter "zayin," we find the "seven" number in the exact and prominent center of the Orion complex. And in the "center" of the "seven" is the grandest of all nebulae, for centuries associated with the glory of God and his heaven, God's home. We are not saying that this is where "heaven" is---this we do not know---but it cannot escape our notice that the prescribed place from which God supposedly approaches at his coming would turn out in this case to be "Zion, the city of God," and those who later stand and serve the Lord on Mt. Zion as faithful and royal priests, also have the number seven and the Sabbath associated with them (Revelation 14:1 ff: Mt. Zion<sup>73</sup>).

### **The Heavenly Zion and Orion**

Therefore, what we seem to notice here is that the constellation Orion has within it the general configuration of the letter, "zayin" or the number, "7." Even the outlying portion of the constellation presents the figure of a "Z," the English/Arabic equivalent of the letter, "zayin;" and within any modern "Z" one can easily find the configuration of the number "7." But the centerpiece of Orion really does resemble a "zayin."

ⴒ, "Zion"

The striking similarity between the formation in the center of Orion, and the ancient letter "zayin" is really quite amazing. The top bar of the "7" matches "The Three Kings, or Belt; Alnitak,

---


<sup>73</sup> Also the number 12, and 144,000, but this is another discussion explained elsewhere. Cf. *The Days of the Seventh Angel*, Vol. 5).

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Alnilam, and Mintaka, and the leg of the "zayin" matches the dim stars coming down the *sword* of Orion that house the great nebulae, in its very center.

But it goes further. Says one source:

The meaning of Zayin--Zayin is a paradoxical word, since it means "weapon" or "sword," but derives from a root word that means "sustenance" or "nourishment." ....Since Zayin represents both the number 7 and a sword.....<sup>74</sup>



---

<sup>74</sup>[www.hebrew4christians.com/Grammar/Unit\\_One/Aleph-Bet/zayin.html](http://www.hebrew4christians.com/Grammar/Unit_One/Aleph-Bet/zayin.html)

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

Therefore, not only is there a relationship between Zion, the number 7, and what appears in the orion complex, but we also know that in Hebrew mysticism the word "zayin" has the meaning of a "**sword!**" Even to the ancients it looked like one, hanging from Orion's belt.

Consistently from the past and to even the present this line of stellar objects stringing down from the belt in Orion has been identified with a sword. It is called the "sword" of Orion, and in the exact middle position of this sword is the great nebula of Orion which has fascinated astronomers for centuries, and is no doubt the most famous of all nebulae. Angels with swords guarded the gate of paradise in the Edenic world. Why wouldn't a sword still guard the gate of heaven? This is a most interesting circumstance.

Orion, the "second coming" constellation, is associated in a number of ways with the heavenly realms. It has associated with it with: the number "7" in several forms, the motif of Zion, the city of God, a sword, and the grandest of all heavenly nebulae--- "smack dab" in the middle of the entire complex, and exactly centered in the central number form as well. But I think it is directly associated with the Sabbath too, because of the references to Zion, worship, mountains, and the number "7."



Modern stylization of the letter "zayin."

Mt. Zion was where the Sabbath was celebrated century after century, and is likely where God's people in Isaiah 66 are pictured as coming to "worship" before the Lord. Isaiah does not say it is Mt. Zion in chapter 66, but it is assumed so, because the nations come to "worship" and they come to worship "before" God. There is only one place any biblical person would believe

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

that could happen. That was at God's temple on Mt. Zion. Therefore the Sabbath could be written subtly into the very center of the Orion constellation itself.<sup>75</sup>

### **The Sabbath a memorial of all creation, including the heavens**

Another aspect relating the starry worlds with the Sabbath is the meaning of the Sabbath itself.

The weekly Sabbath is a direct memorial of creation of the heavens themselves: "For in six days the Lord created HEAVEN and earth, and the sea, and ALL that in them is." (Exodus 20:8-11)

Of particular interest are the verses in Job 38 where it reports that when this world and its immediate surroundings were created that the angels of heaven, and likely the witnessing universe, celebrated the works of God on the final day of creation---the Sabbath.

*"When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy,"*

says the ancient book of Job. It had to be at the completion of the new<sup>76</sup> creation that this celebration took place. It could not be before, for earth and local sky had not been completed yet. It was not later because the celebration *completed* the work of creation at the moment it was finished. Therefore this celebration happened *on the earthly Sabbath*, and begs the question if this same Sabbath time would coincide with a Universal Sabbath. It would also make sense that this is God's prescribed plan when he

---

<sup>75</sup> The "seven" in the constellation is discernible, yet is slightly incomplete in a certain "open space" between the upper bar, or belt, and the leg, or sword below. It is not impossible that this seven will somehow be completed with the approach or coming of Christ through this area at the center of the complex.

<sup>76</sup> The word, "morning" hints that these stars were *new*, or *beginning* stars, thus associated with the earth's creation.

## *The Sabbath and the Heavens*

creates something new. All heaven and earth are enveloped in one grand celebration of God's marvelous works and creative glory.<sup>77</sup>

The writer Ellen White indicates several times in her commentary that such a celebration occurred on the Sabbath of creation<sup>78</sup>:

Therefore it is incomprehensible to believe that the heavens, which are awesome physical marks of God's creative power would not be considered by divine fiat as memorials of his creation, even by themselves. The "heavens" are particularly mentioned in the fourth commandment. **The day that memorializes in time all creation is naturally and canonically the seventh-day Sabbath.** Thus in the Sabbath, and in the sky, the forms of time and space are thus brought together to honor the God of wonder and might.

---

<sup>77</sup> It also causes one to wonder that when the world worships the Creator God on other days than the true Sabbath if they aren't as a result totally out of sync with the rhythm of worship and blessing found in the entire cosmos.

<sup>78</sup> Ellen G. White Estate *To Be Like Jesus* (2004) page 162, paragraph 3. Chapter Title: Chapter 5 - The Day That God Made Holy:

“In the beginning the Father and the Son had rested upon the Sabbath after Their work of creation. When "the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" (Genesis 2:1), the Creator and **all heavenly beings** rejoiced in contemplation of the glorious scene. "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy"” (Job 38:7).

Other similar references:

[The Desire of Ages \(1898\), page 769, paragraph 2](#)

[Maranatha \(1976\), page 371, paragraph 1](#)

[My Life Today \(1952\), page 364, paragraph 2](#)

[To Be Like Jesus \(2004\) , page 162, paragraph 3](#)

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## The Sabbath and Starlight

Finally, the stars in general are somewhat connected with the Sabbath in another particular way. A popular Jewish tradition regards the passing of the Sabbath as connected with the appearance of the stars. Of course, the Sabbath is kept from even unto even, or from sundown to sundown. Leviticus 23:32 But many Jews have for centuries measured the end of the Sabbath, not when the sun goes down, but to the time that at least three ( or 3+, up to seven) visible stars are observable in the evening sky.

While such a tradition would be considered legalistic<sup>79</sup> by some I am ready to admit I kind of like it. Instead of suddenly and abruptly ending the Sabbath the moment when the sun slips over the horizon, it is felt to linger a little this way, hanging on a bit, as if our time with God is let go reluctantly. Or on the other hand, the entrance to the Sabbath can be more gradual and quiet, and not so abrupt. This way one can guard the edge of the Sabbath not so much in terms of legality, but rather with a blessed attitude of gentle beauty, softly and sacredly watching the talking sky. Wonderful! I say!

The celebration of the Sabbath privilege therefore probably resides in the sky in many ways. These are but a few observations that can be made. The Sabbath, or at least the *benefits* of the Sabbath, will be celebrated continually and joyously throughout the vast, created universe throughout eternity. *Shabbat Shalom*. May the blessed *Lord of the Sabbath* be praised by all heaven and earth----both now, and forever, and ever, Amen!

---

<sup>79</sup> The Sabbath was never intended to ever be “legalistically” kept. It is always to be revered as a privilege similar to a marriage anniversary day. Jesus made this strikingly clear. Without discarding the Sabbath he attempted in his teachings to restore the Sabbath to its rightful place as a blessing to man, animal, and to the entire creation.

# 13

## **The Great Wonders of the Heavens**

We have reached the final chapter of this book and the reader is to be congratulated for showing this level of interest in the created heavens. Before we lay down the subject of our discussion let us take a moment to simply gaze into the vast reaches of space and admire the order, symmetry, and glorious expression given by the heavens themselves, just as they are. Words are inadequate to properly represent the noble impact that the heavens can have upon the heart and mind of man.

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## Design in the Universe

To begin with the heavens themselves speak of incredible and wondrous design. It defies every level of belief to accept that the myriads of stars in the sky that move with perfect precision and order have not been placed in their settings according to some definite purpose and are not most carefully ordered by a divine hand.

Dr. Edwin Frost, for many years the director of the Yerkes Observatory, once wrote:

There is no evidence that the universe is automatic, or that it has within itself the power to make the laws which govern it. Mere matter cannot be endowed with such capacity. The universe is not a haphazard aggregation of accidental bodies moving without system or order. It is the work of Omnipotence”-----*The Heavens Are Telling*.<sup>80</sup>

Wrote the famous Sir Isaac Newton:

“This universe exists, and by that one impossible fact declares itself a miracle; postulates an infinite Power, a whole greater than any part; a unity sustaining all, binding all worlds into one. This is a mystery, the unquestioned miracle that we know, *implying the very attribute of God*.”<sup>81</sup>

Earlier in the book we noted that the odds of finding what order that is known to be present in the universe---without divine superintendence or intelligence---would be like a *google*; one with one hundred zeros after it---to one.

A grand harmony exists from the smallest atom to the vast reaches of the cosmos. Golden “strings” of consistent physical symbiosis unites every part into one grand scheme. This is why all the “sons of God” shout for joy. The heavens declare the

---

<sup>80</sup> *Wonder Worlds*, Philip L. Knox, 1964, Los Angeles, Voice of Prophecy Book of the Month. P. 13.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid*.

## *The Great Wonders of the Heavens*

glory and creatorship of God.

The heavens were intended to draw the mind and heart to God. Through Isaiah the prophet<sup>82</sup> who lived 800 years before Christ the divine command comes:

*"Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number, he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth." Isaiah 40:26.*

H.M.S. Richards, an avid Bible student and beloved commentator of yesteryear also had an interest in astronomy and in the beauty manifest in the heavens. Of this passage in Isaiah he writes:

Here we are told to lift up our eyes on high and look toward the skies where the stars are blazing forth. We are not only to see the stars, but we are to behold who has created these things. In other words, we are to see, as it were, God's signature written on the skies. By seeing His works, we see Him and know that we are looking at the works of a divine Creator. We perceive God's existence and His attributes by the things that He has made, "even his eternal power and Godhead." Romans 1:20.<sup>83</sup>

The sky does not call only to Christians, but its voice is a call to the entire universe. "There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard."<sup>84</sup>

About 300 years after Isaiah wrote the divine command, "Lift up your eyes on high," even the great Greek philosopher Plato said:

"Astronomy compels the soul to look upwards and leads us from this world to another."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> I, the author, believe Isaiah was a sacred astronomer himself. Isaiah as a writer shows specific interest in the heavens in many passages. It was during his life that the sun went back ten degrees. He oft refers to the heavens and betrays an above average knowledge of heavenly phenomena.

<sup>83</sup> H.M.S. Richards, *Astronomy and the Bible*, p. 11.

<sup>84</sup> Psalm 19:3

<sup>85</sup> Richards, p.19

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## The Beauty of the Heavens

Of particular note is the pure, stunning beauty that is found in the heavens. Sometimes the sight of heavenly dome takes the breath away. The heavens are the subject of the poets and the romanticists. There is nothing like the glorious canopy of the stars. Says Dr. Stewart Custer:

“Writers have vied with one another in finding words eloquent enough to describe the night skies. Dryden called the stars “the gems of heaven that guild night’s sable throne.” Carlyle spoke of “eternal fields of light.” Lord Byron termed the stars “the poetry of heaven.” Longfellow called them “forget-me-nots of the angels.” Shakespeare referred to them as “these blessed candles of the night,” and saw the night sky as “the floor of heaven...thick inlaid with patens of bright gold.”<sup>86</sup>

Millions of people today really never see the stars. City lights and indoor living blocks them from the eternal beauty of the stars, glories that were a common and regular sight to ancient men. Their inspiration and beauty is taken for granted in this modern world, and I believe this has a direct effect on man’s view of God. H.M.S. Richards has a point when he writes:

Just suppose that the stars should come out only one night in every hundred years, or five hundred years, or even once in a thousand years. As the time drew near, millions of people would be waiting for the great event, and most of them would not sleep even one hour that night. They would stay out all night to see the march of the blazing constellations-what a sight! And they would talk about it as long as they lived, and tell their children and grandchildren.<sup>87</sup>

It is a tragedy that modern men and women do not appreciate as they should the beauty that is available to them every day in the wondrous created works all about them:

---

<sup>86</sup> p. 17, *The Stars Speak: Astronomy in the Bible*, Stewart Custer, Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Carolina, 1977.

<sup>87</sup> Richards, p. 11,12

## *The Great Wonders of the Heavens*

In *Coronet* magazine some years ago there was a story about Ernest Ek who, in the twilight of his life, first saw the heavens. He was blinded at the age of two, and at fifty underwent surgery that ended a lifetime of blindness. For 48 years he had seen only darkness-just a little shade of difference between day and night. He had never seen the stars. He had never seen the sun.

His first day of sight was the entry into a new world. He said that breakfast that morning was the most wonderful meal he had ever eaten, because it was the first one he had ever seen. He described his surprise at the beauty of those white and yellow fried eggs, the golden toast, and the intricately sectioned grapefruit. Everything looked so good, he wondered how he ever could have been hungry before when food was only a taste. At the end of that wonderful day came the evening and his first night with eyes to see. As he stood at the open door he wondered why people said that the night was dark. To him the sky was luminous with stars. He said, "I knew then why people often look upward as they pray, because my faith turned instinctively toward the velvet sky as I spoke in my heart a prayer of thanks."<sup>88</sup>

Whether one notices the signs that God placed in the heavenly skies seems to be dependent on one's attitude toward God and one's openness to God's Spirit and ways. One man easily sees the power and beauty written there, others cannot seem to see the "forest for the trees," or shall we say the "sky for the stars." It all depends on the spiritual tuning of the heart's radio toward God.

Westminster Abbey is one of the most interesting buildings in the world. Here are memorialized many great men and women of history. We are told that as you walk down one of the marble lined halls you can see two marble tombs side by side. These two tombs are the tombs of two great men of the past who have greatly influenced the scientific thinking of the world. They are Sir John (William) Herschel, the great astronomer who died in 1871, and Charles Darwin, the naturalist who died in 1882, eleven years later. Here they lie, side by side. Charles Darwin's inscription-his name, the date of his birth, and the date of his death appear on his stone slab. On Sir John Herschel's memorial-

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

his name, the date of his birth, the date of his death also appears --  
-but they are followed by these unforgettable words from the Bible:

*"Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth. " Isaiah 40:26*

What a difference it makes how one *views* the natural universe!

### Incredible Timing in the Universe

In the other star books in this series, particularly in the book the *Clock of the Heavens* we noticed how in probably hundreds of instances in history the heavens were speaking the story of salvation on earth with precision and accurateness. Not only do the heavens chronicle the days or years of such happenings, but in many instances mark the very hours in which these earthly events occurred. Some charge that these readings are *post hoc rationalizations* and the like. In this I contend they are dreadfully wrong. They cannot all be! An honest look at the timing and providence of these events can leave no other conclusion that there is divine hand superintending the cosmos, who both knows the future and has creative ability innate in himself. There is really no other answer.

Also we have noted that the heavens act as one gigantic clock that works with absolute precision, hardly even varying thousandths of a second over hundreds of years in its consistent revolutions and movements. That such an incredibly large instrument as the universe can progress with such accuracy is simply astounding. The heavens, their order and design can only be attributable to one thing. They were created and are guided by the Omnipotent power of the Almighty God.

## *The Great Wonders of the Heavens*

### **Saros and Sothic Cycles**

It has been known for centuries that eclipses and astronomical movements follow a certain pattern. Eclipses of both the sun and the moon repeat themselves during what is called a “saros cycle.” A cycle is 18 years and 11 days. From ancient times astronomers were able to predict an eclipse based on this cycle. It is amazing that such a cycle exists and its exactness and regularity points to the orchestration of an unseen divine hand.

The Sothic cycle was observed by the Egyptians for millennia. It represents a complete revolution of an astronomical cycle that would last about 1,200 years. Today we correct our calendars with leap years, so these are not noticed. But astronomically they still exist and are interesting to study and relate with ancient history.

The daily, monthly, yearly movements of the sun and moon, the satellites and stars in the cosmos are daily testimony to a well-ordered plan. Someone is caring for the universe.

### **Providential Indicators**

In our local heavens, in particular, are circumstances that defy time and chance. The sun is exactly the appropriate distance from this earth. Some say that if it were even as little as a hundred feet closer or farther away that life on this earth would not be possible. The moon is also at the appropriate distance, or else our tides would overwhelm us. Not only are these things appropriately placed, but they have the same apparent diameter and fill their appropriate orbital place in the sky. The sun itself emits light in a spectrum that matches the spectrum of the human eye. The list is probably endless.

This order and design reaches throughout the cosmos, and speaks of the glory of God in every instance. These things did not come by chance. There isn't even a particle of likelihood for such a

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

chance.

### **The Testimony of the Heavens**

In the book the *Torah of the Heavens* we noticed how appropriately the heavens tell a story, an interconnected story that matches the biblical models with stunning accuracy and meaning. Somehow the One who created the heavens also foreknew the salvation history of our world at the same time, for history exonerates this circumstance over and over again! This thematic demonstration put on by the heavens themselves is incredibly amazing!

In the book the *Signs of the Heavens* we noticed several more ways God uses the sky to speak his purposes and to mark events according to a divine timetable. Things that have occurred in the heavens could have only come about as a result of divine instigation. The heavens speak to us at the supernatural level. We also determined that the God of the Sky is not finished speaking through the heavens. He will come through them to meet us and take us back with Him. He will continually speak through the vast reaches of the heavenly universe throughout endless ages. "Come, my friend, and take that journey with me, and with all the redeemed!"

***"The Heavens Declare the Glory of God!"***

### **The Creator of the Heavens**

The Living God is the *Creator of the Heavens*! This is the conclusion of the whole matter. His ways are past finding out, marvelous beyond expression, sufficient for all things. Great are

## ***The Great Wonders of the Heavens***

his works! He is the *Alpha and the Omega*, the *First and the Last*, the *Beginning and the End*. He is the *Sun of Righteousness*, with healing in his wings. He is the *Fairest of Ten Thousand*. He is the *Root and the Offspring of David*, the *Bright and Morning Star*.

Then let it be! Heaven and earth, sea and sky, worlds without end all continually shout with inexpressible joy: “Hallelujah! Hallelujah! For the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!”

# Appendix A

## Geometric Measurements and the Distance to the Sun

In this section we are attempting to offer additional evidence that might lead one to believe that the traditional distance given for the distance from earth to the sun should be questioned. Following are four separate geometric or observational methods of calculating the distance to the sun, all of which appear to greatly reduce the standard distance.

### Prevarications

As a pre-determinate to head off the ever-present critics who I predict will be quick to jump on these calculations as impossible, unscientific, and wildly incorrect, please let me generally qualify some of the claims here. They are not simply the result of religious fanaticism or the machinations of an ignorant hobbyist. They are the result of sober study, simple geometric measurement, and careful observation. They have been tested on scaled models and measurable diagrams and on various facsimiles of the cosmos.

I also realize there will be those who will simply not even seek a fair understanding of what I am trying to say. Some will misrepresent it. I can only hope that before wholesale accusations are made I will be given the opportunity to explain further in regard to the conclusions

## ***Appendix A***

made. I am willing to talk to anyone interested. They may show me my error, if they wish. But they may also need to be prepared to explain why simple geometry and math do not work, or how you can easily see around corners.

I am also aware also that there are further factors that should be considered before any absolutely accurate distances can be determined. For instance, the different planes of the heavenly bodies are not factored in some cases, which would very slightly skew the overall distances involved. Further, the base figures used are relatively close to what data is available but cannot in this book show detail enough to be absolutely accurate. In addition, astronomy programs slightly vary in their data, one from another. Extremely small angles can also be difficult to measure accurately. Then there is the whole issue of atmospheric refraction. For these and other reasons the conclusions then must be somewhat “general,” in nature.

But in a qualified sense it is my opinion that these measurements carry with them such a degree of overall viability that they cannot be shown to be fundamentally erroneous, at least to the degree of overturning the basic conclusions. Small errors or blemishes cannot blur an entire picture. The determinations are so obvious, elementary, and clear that it truly appears that the common claims of modern astronomical science cannot be even remotely close to the truth when distances to certain celestial objects are concerned. In the end we are seeking irrefutable, incontrovertible, undeniable evidence in this endeavor, and I confess that I believe we are quite close to it in the general and fundamental sense. Its right out where everybody can see it---*if* they want to.

### **Observation #1**

#### **Measuring off the moon's half phase**



The first method that might be used for calculating a mitigated astronomical unit (as compared to the commonly accepted unit/distance) uses the phase of the moon. When the illuminated moon is presented to the observer on earth as a perfect half, it

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

naturally forms a right angle from the position of the observer to the moon and also from the moon back to the sun.

So it is generally possible to roughly measure geometrically, when the moon is in this exact demonstration. The missing angles that are needed for calculation can be determined by offsetting or using the astronomical or horizontal grid.

We already know the distance to the moon at any particular time so that provides us with one reliable factor already.

For consistencies sake I am using the same astronomy software throughout the experiment (*Stellarium*, 11.4). But others work as well. The general calculations are as follows:

a) I am choosing the time/date of 02/21/2010 because the position of the moon is “generally” close to perpendicular -- if the observer is positioned at 90 degrees West (looking N., 0°), and on the equator. Correspondingly the sun is opposite and near the horizon, approximating a general 90 degree relationship. By carefully advancing the moon phase changes one second at a time, until the phase reaches exactly 50.0%, one should arrive in these circumstances, time wise, at 16 hours, 26 minutes, 59 seconds on 2-21-2010, Greenwich time (4:26:59 local). (Similarly the figure deduced with consideration of the International Date Line, as per *Cybersky* would be, 2-22-2010, UTC 00:19:45, but at 346°).

b) The moon at this particular moment in time reaches a 50.0% phase angle at the position noted on the astronomical grid (horizontal) as 342° 28' 07". To account for the disparity from 360 degrees and calculate the necessary correction in order to create a perfect right triangle for measurement reveals in this case a general differential of 17° 32'—measured in offset fashion against a perfect 360° position. This rounds out to 17.53° (in decimal degrees).

c) However, next we must consider the position of the sun at this precise second. We find that the sun is not situated directly on the horizon line but nearly 3° below it. (Again, to figure in this case we need to reckon on the basis of a near perfect right

## Appendix A

triangle). Therefore the  $3^{\circ} 18'$ , position of the sun below the horizon would have the geometric effect of diminishing the overall angle on which the calculation should be made. Therefore it must be subtracted from the 17.53.

d) Yet one more adjustment must be made to the  $3^{\circ} 18'$  to deduce a more accurate result. Why this is required will be explained further shortly (Observation #2), but it amounts to the fact that about 14.5' (minutes) needs to be subtracted from the  $3^{\circ} 18'$ . Therefore the subtrahend is to be amended by - 14.5' thus slightly diminishing the figure to  $3^{\circ} 3.5'$ .

Therefore the adjusted angle is  $17^{\circ} 32'$  minus  $3^{\circ} 3.5' = 14^{\circ} 28.5'$ . For convenience the figure can be rounded off and changed to decimal degrees= $14.50^{\circ}$ . (only 1.5 arc minutes different).

Now the final calculation can be made, as per this method:


The known distance to the moon at this moment in time, according to one program (*Stellarium*), is about 236,000 miles. (The data varies in astronomy programs, ranging from 233,150; 235,937; 236,727; 236,899. A moderate and generous average might be about 236,250 miles---the figure we will use). This provides the measurement for the short leg of the triangle. The tangent equivalent can be supplied for the 14.50 degrees serving as the working angle.

The distance thus calculated becomes ca. 943,565 miles. To be really conservative, we might round it off to 1.0 million miles (for the distance likely varies over the year), but it is probably less, ca. 950,000 miles (for the average distance from earth to sun in this circumstance). Such a small result is nothing less than stunning, and defies belief. But this is the data that is returned nevertheless.

**Diagram A: (Opposite) (Objects and alignments not to scale; and exaggerated for effect). The entire diagram is what the author calls "God's Eye-view." The reader is "virtually" looking down from a position significantly above the North Pole of the earth. The observer when on earth, however, would be standing horizontal and lateral in the picture, with only his eye above the surface of the earth at "0" altitude.**

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## General Schematic of Moon Phase Calculation



## *Appendix A*

Please observe that if the sun was near 93,000,000 miles distant these significant angles could never be deduced out of this configuration. It is impossible. If the sun is at the traditionally accepted distance it should appear positioned directly out from the observer (fractionally close to  $0^\circ$  or  $360^\circ$ , 90 deg., as shown in the drawing above; when the phase is 50%) from this geographic position. If the sun is at the standard distance one should be finding angles in the fractions of less than one astronomical degree, indicating arc minutes, and even arc seconds in this circumstance. Yet here it is offset by at least  $12-14^\circ$  on the inside! In astronomical standards this is an enormous angle, demanding that the objects in question have to be relatively close to each other.

The author has made making numerous attempts, and futile ones, to find astronomical dates or opportunities in which the 50% phase occurs when the moon is nearer to  $90^\circ$  perpendicular to the observer and the sun resting in a corresponding position of about 90 degrees. But it cannot be done. It simply becomes apparent from this circumstance that the moon cannot reach this exactitude of relationship because significant differential angles must necessarily appear, which always add up to about  $14^\circ$ . It is totally impossible to calculate otherwise. Yet if the sun were as distant as claimed this could not be the case. The sun could rest near the horizon, and the moon would reach 50% at near  $90^\circ$  around the globe, continuously.

One advantage to this method of measurement is that the angle is so large that the issue of horizon refraction can only be a minor concern. The moon is directly above the observer so the position of the moon really is not affected. How the light of the sun strikes an object, in this case the moon, cannot really lie to us in a geometric sense. It seems to be incontrovertible evidence that the sun is relatively close to us because the light from the sun strikes the earth at an angle largely different than it does the moon in this circumstance. There is no way around it.

Therefore we arrive at a figure of just under a million miles, as opposed to the traditional 93,000,000. There are further ways to corroborate these measurements, among them the following:

## Observation #2

### Measuring off the earth's horizon

Method #2 uses the earth's natural horizon to deduce a minute angle to the sun as described in chapter 4, "Question Everything." With this method an attempt is made to measure in a parallax manner off the earth's horizon and base the final trigonometric calculation off the radius of the earth.

But no calculation will approach reality until one major factor is considered. Let us take a brief moment and only refer to this initially: What first seems like a simple calculation or measurement becomes more complicated on the basis of a hidden geometric discrepancy. Ignoring a necessary correction for this errant horizontal measurement will significantly invalidate the calculated results.

But even before explaining the actual discrepancy in greater detail, for further clarity, let us set up and outline the basic mode of overall measurement. Hopefully the reader can use the following diagram to get a basic idea how this measurement is taken. Keep in mind also that the diagram is over-simplified for the purposes of this book.

The first task in this regard is to center the sun, on a given date, for convenience marked by the antemeridian or a position of 180 degrees--- at the earth's equator. The next task is to re-position oneself exactly 90 deg., east and west (90E and 90W) and check the position of the sun relative to the horizon (---pretending, as if, one could be two places at once!).

However, in most astronomy programs the geometric position given in this case makes the sun "straddle" both the natural horizons, above and below, equally. This supposedly represents the actual position of the sun in the sky, ignoring, of course, the issue of horizon refraction which supposedly places the sun (by appearance) about 28-34 arc minutes above the horizon. But we are only interested in the actual position of the sun, and so stick to the settings where it shows the sun perfectly where it actually is "supposed" to be. It is of manifold importance that all measurements be based on the geometric position of the object, and not based them in any way upon the supposed displacement that comes as a result of horizon refraction. The fundamental importance of this


## Appendix A

factor cannot be overstated!

The arbitrary assumption by astronomy programs that the sun is so positioned (equally vertically straddling the horizon) in this circumstance and presented in this way is however inaccurate, problematic, and erroneous. The error is not in the relative position of objects in the sky, which astronomy measures with notable accuracy. Neither is the error particularly in the position marked on the earth's surface in a sense. The error is in the position of sun relative to the **horizon**.

It is an astronomical certitude that the earth rotates on its axis, not in 24 hours, but rather in 23 hours, 56 minutes, and 4 seconds. However, astronomy programs in the interest of tracking the sky in continuous time, follow a complete 24-hour cycle. Geometrically the earth rotates about one degree extra in a given 24-hour period (sidereal time). Unfortunately because of the measurements we are trying to make in this instance, this central issue significantly skews the geometry of the sun's position relative to the horizon. It bends the astronomical grid slightly and deceptively.

Diagram B:




Astronomy programs therefore typically represent the earth as rotating exactly 90 degrees in six complete hours. But this is problematic and untrue in this instance; because for the earth to make  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a turn (90deg) takes instead of 6 full hours: 5 hours, 59 minutes, and 1 second. This then changes the position of the sun relative to the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

horizon for our measurements, and must be taken into account to get to the true angle we seek. For a  $\frac{1}{4}$  rotation adjustment, 59 seconds of time must be added or subtracted, depending on whether one is considering an eastern horizon or a western one.

Please recall that the positions on the earth and the positions in the sky are consistent, but that the correction can be made in the time, because the warp in time alters the objects position by several arc minutes in relation to the horizon. Therefore the position needs to be adjusted fifty-nine second's worth of rotation to approximate the real geometric position of the object in view, in this case the sun.

Assuming then that the natural horizon is indeed equal to the astronomical horizon in the astronomy program, and that by extending the astronomical grid into space over that horizon--- the horizon being almost totally flat---we can now, therefore, calculate a revised position of the sun.



### **Impossibility of observing the sun as straddling the horizon in this circumstance**

One will now notice, post-adjustment, that the center of the sun in this instance would not be positioned straddling the horizon, but rather near 14.50 minutes below the astronomical and true horizon. This matter is

## *Appendix A*

of paramount importance to consider. This is the approximate distance the sun is geometrically displaced in 59 seconds of time, and would be the correct position of the sun relative to the horizon. The standard position represented in astronomy programs is probably impossible and disingenuous as well.

Reasoning that the astronomical horizon is equal to perfect infinity, one can simply calculate from there the disparate angle that is deduced by this circumstance. Therefore, the distance the sun travels or is displaced must be marked according to its true movement-- the typical adjustment for horizon refraction excluded-- which in itself would skew the calculation by two or three arc minutes as well. All this is essential to account for.

Therefore, to arrive at our minute, and crucial angle we must first posit our original 14.50 arc minutes.<sup>89</sup>

### **Final Calculation/Method #2:**


The radius of the earth, 3980 (miles), is now multiplied against the tangent equivalent of the 14.50 arc minutes or an angle of .2416 (of one degree) and therefore gives a result of ca. 943,865 miles as the approximate distance to the sun. Notice this general figure is already within only 300 miles of our first figure (943,565), without even considering further possible adjustment from other minor factors! This parallel proximity can be no accident.

---

<sup>89</sup> (For the date in question the calculation came to 14' 31' [48' 24" minus 33' 53"---over 59 seconds]. This comes within only one arc minute in excess of 14.50', (in decimal degrees-- but now is in minutes and seconds), or 14'31". (This is, not surprisingly, the same angle we discovered in the previous method, only on a smaller scale, i.e., in arc minutes).

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Diagram C:



To comment further concerning the matter of arbitrarily placing the sun as “straddling” the horizon as found with typical astronomy programs; we must conclude that while this is convenient for tracking sky

## *Appendix A*

movements it should be exposed for the dubious assumption it is when attempting to measure the position of the sun relative to the astronomical horizon.

One reason this should be further questioned is that while it is astronomically “possible” for an “infinitely placed” object to appear near this astronomical extreme in this scenario, we should probably assume that the sun is not at a perfectly infinite position.

Second, the sun has a large apparent diameter to us, almost 34 arc minutes, or half a degree. Yet if the sun is ca. 93,000,000 miles away, it would consequently figure very close to mathematical infinity when calculating on the basis of angles. Mathematically, therefore, in this circumstance we should only be able to see the half of the sun “below” the horizon, yet not the half that is above! (Or no sun at all, since you can’t really “see” below the horizon! [See previous diagram] And you can’t see past infinity, or “above” the infinite horizon, refraction or not). Therefore it makes much more sense that the position of the sun in this circumstance should be pushed well below the horizon even if it is indeed much farther away than these experiments show.

This parallel calculation, therefore, gives further validity to our findings. The distance to the sun, therefore would not be as far as commonly taught. It is virtually and geometrically impossible. It appears to be less than expected or traditionally assumed, by almost a hundred times!

# Observation #3

## Photography

A third line of argument that can be applied toward a mitigated relative distance to the sun is found in space photography. Awesome photographic evidence is received back from space probes and space telescopes. It is easy to be so enthralled with the exciting beauty and the larger perspective these give us that one may carelessly overlook and ignore the incredibly diagnostic evidences that can be found in these very photographs.

Indeed a picture is worth a thousand words. This is especially true when stopping for a moment and critically examining what can actually be determined by a simple picture. The following photograph is taken from “Astronomy Picture of the Day,” a site that provides many such recent N.A.S.A. photos. I would consider the following picture to be among the most important photographs ever taken to date when considering the subject at hand. While we can’t always be sure without further analysis what doctoring may have occurred to these photos, in most cases they hopefully give us a candid and genuine look at the stellar realms. (The claimed distances must be taken with a grain of salt. They are based on the typical assumptions of astronomy, and were not measured with a literal measure).

First a disclaimer: We cannot take these photographs, of course, and accurately measure the compound angles that are necessary to get absolutely reliable celestial measurements and distances. But by considering a few simple rules that apply to distant perspectives we can arrive at some basic irrefutable conclusions. Let us take note of the following upon examining the plate:

First as to the position of the observer: While the moon and the earth aren’t exactly in line with each other we cannot assume that the sun’s light will strike them exactly alike in any scenario. This is true especially when considering the rotation of the moon around the earth and the various angles this will produce. But what is basically consistent in the photo is that the observational stance is basically beside the two celestial objects and produces phase angles near 50%. Notice that the horizon line on the earth (the illuminated part) is barely concave, demonstrating the position of the sun being but a minute

## *Appendix B*

number of degrees from being laterally perpendicular. The moon is likely the closer of the two objects. Yet the illuminated portion of the moon has a different, abbreviated relationship. This slight difference is very important.



What is most striking in the plate is that the phase angles do not match as closely as might be physically expected. This can most easily be determined by scanning the illuminated top lip of each object. The moon's upper curve is still leaning toward vertical when it is cut off by the shadow. The earth's illuminated surface by contrast comes on up and basically levels off to the pole. The moon is noticeably different. This is actually a stunning discrepancy.

One will immediately reason that this difference is to be expected because the two objects are at different angles from the sun. This is true. But the significant question is HOW MUCH difference should be expected, "if" the sun is at a distance of about 93 million miles distant from both the earth and moon?

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS



**NASA. Similar photo, from Mariner 10 (convex vs. concave)**

The fact is, that when considering such angles at celestial distances, there is only a minute difference between 93 million miles and infinity. Mathematically, even taking the average distance from the earth to the moon of about 240,000 miles, would only produce an angular irregularity of extreme fractions. The amount is circa .014 (thousandths) of one degree, probably not even an arc second! For all practical purposes, therefore, even if the earth and moon were completely separated laterally by ca. 240,000 miles there would no discernible difference in the angle of how the light strikes them from a distance of 93 million miles regardless of the moon's natural position. The earth and moon should appear practically identical **even at the most extreme difference** of position depth wise (or elevation wise, for that matter). But it is readily apparent that they definitely do not present themselves in this way! There are discernible differences, even to the naked eye.

Granted, the earth and moon aren't exactly in line with each other in the photographs--yet at the claimed distance of many millions of miles from which the photograph was supposedly taken there should be almost identical mirroring of the phase angles. Yet there is significant

## *Appendix B*

discernible disparity. Exact measurements cannot be determined, yet in terms of degrees (180 degrees are visible to our face, or what we can see illuminated) the difference could be as much as 15 degrees. My conservative estimate is at least 10-12 degrees, by physical “guation.”<sup>90</sup>

This is glaring evidence, before the eyes of even the most simple, that demands that the sun may not be the traditional distance---given to us for decades. It is geometrically impossible! It is visually impossible. Remember, that for the sun to be at the traditional expected distance the phase essentially cannot vary at all if the two bodies are in par positions. (They are offset, but even still the premise largely holds---)

Now it would be true that if the moon were full (from earth at this moment, and therefore in line with the sun—it would be to the extreme left) that the phase would be the same regardless of the distance between the earth and moon. But this photograph surprisingly betrays an easily discernible difference between the phase angles, and it is not even as extreme an angle as could be produced if the moon was directly in line with the earth (50% phase) and then out toward the observer in the photograph.

Using the phase percentages given us for the stages or phases of the moon and visually comparing them with the earth and moon in the photographic plate gives a general estimate of the disparate difference. Though this does not give us the exact angular difference (% phases and degrees are not directly comparable), it does produce enough of a difference to account for several degrees! This is what is significant. Remember again, if the sun is at the prescribed distance told to us by astronomers, there can virtually be no discernible difference at all! This argues plainly that the object sending light to the earth and moon in the photographic plate is relatively close enough to each of them to produce this disparity.

What we seem to truly have in the picture is precisely the presentation that would be expected if the sun is about a million miles from the two celestial objects. A disparate angle of about 10 (up to 12, even more/less) degrees works consistently. This can be verified by simple

---

<sup>90</sup> (By superimposing varying moon phase angles over the photograph: Moon:37%, +or-; Earth: 47%,+or-, one can easily see significant variance).

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

visual demonstration, and relatively simple and general mathematics!

### Observation #4

#### Comparing from the relative known position of the moon


The whole horizontal experiment used in the beginning can be checked by comparing the position of the moon relative to the horizon in the exact same circumstance, then building out proportionately to the mathematical position of the sun relative to the horizon, and so on. Therefore, on the same date as given in methods #1 and #2 (2-21-2010) one may check the position of the moon, centered at  $180^\circ$  and then have its position checked on the lateral horizons at  $90^\circ$ . How high or low the object is above or below the horizon makes it possible to determine an angle from which one can calculate a geometric result for the linear distance to the object in question.

The geometric position for the center of the moon in this experiment (same date as before) was determined to be:  $-57' 45''$  (or in decimal degrees convenient for calculation:  $-57.75$  arc minutes.) This amount is the equivalent of .9625 of a degree, representing a small but measurable angle below the horizon. The position of the moon is well inside and below where we think the sun appears in a relative position from the opposite horizons ( $-14.5'$ ).

Inserting the tangent equivalent of .9625 into the formula for right angles, and multiplying it by 3980 miles, the radius of the earth, gives a formula result of 236,899 miles as the distance to the moon. The known distance already given us is very close to the figure given in the prior experiments where we settled on a general figure of 236,250 miles in this same circumstance, (only 649 miles different!). This is as exact as one can probably make it, for the distances given us to the moon varies slightly between astronomical sources and programs (and varies over a given month), but usually is within a thousand miles of our favored figure for this calendar date. So we are well within the parameters of a reasonably reliable and accurate estimate.

## Appendix B

Diagram D:



No minor correcting horizontal adjustment needs to be made for the moon as in the case of the sun because the astronomy program has placed the moon in its correct position relative to the horizon. The same is not the case with the sun, because it is commonly and arbitrarily misplaced relative to the horizon (as straddling it, when by geometric correction it should be about 14.5 arc minutes below it when measured equally from opposite horizons).

This powerfully exonerates and corroborates our former experiments, for the moon is positioned precisely where it should be relative to the natural horizon, almost one degree below it. The sun in a parallel circumstance is about 42' above the moon's position (-57'), and about 15 arc minutes below the horizon, and works out consistent for the distance as was calculated in the former experiments. Then above this, is found absolute infinity, corresponding to the natural or astronomical horizon as it should be as well.

There does probably exist an infinitesimal dip from the astronomical horizon to the natural horizon, but it would be extremely small. The virtual surface of the earth is almost totally and perfectly flat, (almost, but not quite) falling ever so slightly away from the observer, and really would not affect the measurements significantly.

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## Providential Positioning of the Sun

A note of creative interest follows on the possibility that the sun's center, in the above diagrams, geometrically rests from equal vantage points just below the opposite horizon lines. The circumstance of the edge of the sun just reaching the natural horizon (2-3 arc minutes above at the most) deserves comment. What this ensures is that direct sunlight is guaranteed to reach exactly half of the globe; not more, not less. This is stunning in its exactness because if the sun were closer by a few thousand miles it would be incomplete in its total coverage; if it were farther away it would have total coverage, but would not send enough heat, or perhaps would cause some kind of other disequilibrium. But it is placed just exactly at the ideal distance from this earth to do its job.

Cogitate this circumstance for a moment. The sun has more than one task to do, and it needs to do all of its tasks in the maximum mode for the best effect. The sun is not only a coverage light for the earth, but it must also provide heat as well. If it is too close to the earth it would not give complete and moderate light coverage, at least as evenly and as brightly as possible clear out to the extreme edges. But if the sun is removed much farther away the light coverage might be adequate perhaps, (though weaker) but the radiant heat would be substantially less. But where the sun is placed is exactly in the ideal spot between the two opposite demands. The sun is far enough away to give the planet maximum coverage of light, but as close as possible to provide the necessary radiative heat and warmth this world needs. It's a case of minimum distance balanced against maximum coverage for total or maximum effect.

This cannot be happenstance, friends! It is just too perfect. It seems to demand that a creative force placed the sun in its position and its perfectly prescribed distance could hardly have come about by chance. It offers evidence that the order of the cosmos is planned with perfection. There are no inappropriate or irregular relationships. Everything is in perfect order, size, and symmetry. There is a Creator of the Heavens! God carefully engineered the right light bulb, with the right wattage, and placed it at the right distance, to rule the days of our planet. That too is the way Genesis describes it. One should see it no other way! The naturalistic odds of this circumstance coming out this way so perfectly by mere chance, considering the millions of miles of

## ***Appendix B***

space out there are astronomical! “Like it or not, O skeptic, there already is much more than ‘a divine foot in the door!’” The Creator leaves his footprints in a number of ways, and I believe this is just one of them. This just scratches the surface. A loving God rules this cosmos.

### **Lost in Space**

The evidence is strongly mounting that the sun’s distance from us, and most likely all the visible stellar cosmos, is strongly exaggerated, corresponding to the habitual over calculations of modern science found everywhere else. These desperate, erroneous physical theories of distance and time seem to drive all the escapades of modern scientific inquiry, and skews proportionately, I believe, the radical conclusions found in Einsteinium physics, Doppler red shifts, and in all the Big Bang cosmologies.

Scientists who insist on leaving the Creator of the Heavens out of their picture may be committing errors of astronomical proportions. In an attempt to create their own universe, despite their own smallness, they often arrive at conclusions that are patently false and even ridiculous. They are simply “lost in space,” it seems.

This is not said to scorn them, for this is not the purpose of this treatise. They will never read this anyway. The purpose of this book is to warn Christians about who they really should believe, and to demonstrate the dangerous nature of worshipping the false god of secular science and where it can lead them. In seeming to think they are wise, some Christians could end up nothing but fools, as the Bible itself predicts.

If, for instance, the ideas we have broached in this chapter and book were true, how very far off would be the seeming “experts” about things we can even see with our own eyes! They would be light years away from the truth! Everything would change. The sun, four times farther away from us than the moon, would actually match the size of the earth, yet modern science teaches that the sun is so large it could contain 1,000,000 earths! And perhaps with everything scaling down to its normal size, the whole universe shrinks to a rational, created scale. Galaxies may not be 40 light years across. Galaxies may not be galaxies-- or at least “island universes!” Stars maybe are not flying

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

away from us like scared rabbits at near the speed of light. Red shifts and Big Bangs might then necessarily retreat into a lonely grave. The time and starlight problem?— largely gone. Most astronomical textbooks and thousands of pages of calculated “knowledge” would have to go, for the most part, into the scrap heap.

Now please, please, don't run out and say or teach that all these things are or are not so. This could cause enormous damage to God's cause if this is done prematurely, or in the wrong way. It could bring reproach upon faith-based science. On these things we simply don't know for sure yet. We are only testing them at this point. Let's marshal our evidence first. Please!----. But do ask the questions!

Meanwhile, be more tentative about what you hear out there and question everything. Don't buy so quickly what is said. Remember, they don't buy of us. Be an “agnostic” of secular science to the degree the opposite side claims to be agnostic or atheistic of a Creator God. But in this author's mind, the evidence that is contrary to popular science keeps mounting to the point where it cannot continue to be honestly ignored. There has to be a correct answer to these questions. This author chooses to side with the claims of the God of the heavens and not the claims of accepted science in the area of universal astrophysics, for one, where bold claims are made about places and objects where no scientist has really ever been or has been able to investigate or measure up close.

However, in superior fashion, let Christians be “real” scientists, cautious and considerate, not jumping to extreme, assumed conclusions from which they may have to retreat embarrassed. Let the wise Christian question everything, and look hard at the factual evidence, not the theoretical evidence. The real evidence is to be found in the biblical record, the rocks striated by global catastrophes, rocks containing microscopic radio halos, the heavens measured by a ruler that we can read and hold in our own hands and have it all backed up by a solid faith structure.

My premise is that truth is more likely to found from the real Creator of the Heavens, and not from the false creators driven incessantly forward by mad conclusions and dreamed up notions. With God's revelations we have privileged information. We can safely assume upon it.

## *Appendix B*

Staying nearer the biblical perspectives and conclusions, though they are not very popular today, will leave the Christian in a much safer position I believe in the end. Even the present world will make even better sense to him. He may be laughed at now, but he won't be later.

The famous general and war hero of the American Revolution, Richard Montgomery, is known to have been a noble and brave soldier. Headed toward the battle of Saratoga, he was challenged in a conversational exchange with his wife, (Janet Livingston) a ravishingly beautiful dame, on whether he would, in the heat of the crisis, always hold his place in the battle line or whether he would flee in fear. In response he immediately replied to the love of his life--famous words-- similar to these:

"You shall never have cause to blush for your Montgomery."

History records that Montgomery's wife never did have to blush for the exploits of this notable war hero who died bravely in the Battle of Quebec. So will it be for the noble Christian in pursuit of the truth. By sticking to the sacred standards of faith, though they don't always agree with the world's view of things, will still leave the believer in a more commendable position in the end. They won't have to be ashamed for their beliefs when the real end crisis comes. God won't leave them embarrassed.

Unfortunately, on the converse, those who have disdained and rejected the faith of Christ will be super-embarrassed at the end; so much so that they will call for the rocks and the mountains to fall on them and "hide them from the face of Him that sits upon the throne." But the true follower of God will not have to blush, at least in the final end-game, for his trust and belief in the Most High Creator God. He will say, "Lo! This is our God. We have waited for Him, and He will save us." The honest Christian investigator has operated on much sounder and genuine information---not just some alternate bias, as even some Christians purport. He has not operated on theory alone but on the basis of truth, the Word of Truth.

Look for and seek for the truth. Jesus said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." (John 14:6) The Bible says of the Creator, "Thy word is truth." Take the safest route then to the truth. Know first the Creator. Then you will know the truth about what He has created.

## Appendix B

### Horizon Refraction

It is the opinion of current science that when one looks at the horizon from this earth's surface that the observer is not really seeing the true position of objects found at a distance. The reason given for this is that due to the refractive qualities of light passing through our lower atmosphere there is a significant shift of perspective. This is charged to a number of things, but particularly it is thought to be related to barometric pressure and to temperature. These supposedly cause the rays of the sun and the moon, for instance, to appear above the horizon, even when the sun or moon is below the horizon, because the atmosphere of this earth apparently "bends" the light rays around the curvature of the earth.

According to conventional astronomical teaching the amount of refraction varies according to the declination of the object in the sky. Straight above the observer the object is subject only to very minor refraction, one arc minute or less. But the more the object descends to the horizon the amount of refraction marginally increases according to some very complicated mathematical laws of variable refraction. By the time it reaches the horizon one is left with as much as 34 arc minutes (over half a degree) of refraction for the given object. (The apparent diameter of the sun itself is about 34 arc minutes) The popular saying is: "When the bottom tip of the sun reaches the natural horizon, it has already gone down."

## *Appendix B*

While anyone can observe that atmospheric disturbances can affect the view of an object, both in color and clarity, (in other words, stars twinkle, the sun can look “squashed,” etc.) it seems a dubious matter to accept in wholesale fashion that what one is seeing is not really there! Especially is this troubling when one can use a scientific instrument or a transit, establish a straight line into space or at the horizon and fix on the object---and be told that this said line bends to the object---for it certainly is not ascertainable at short distances.

First we must explore why a correction for atmospheric refraction has been considered necessary in scientific circles. Of course, the actual reason necessitating a correction is seldom mentioned or explored by encyclopedias and astronomical works. It is simply told us that this “is the way it is.” Then follow complicated mathematical formulas for calculating it. This author has puzzled over this matter some time.

The best of his knowledge at this point as to why this teaching prevails can be summarized as follows:

I believe the reason comes about because actual observation of objects such as the sun and moon shows them to be positioned in ways that do not fit what one naturally expects in the circumstances. Therefore the actual position of these objects receives an astronomical adjustment to accommodate the theory of the astronomer.<sup>91</sup>

To further elaborate it seems to be the assumption of those who create astronomical software, that when the top half of the sun is still visible above the perfect natural horizon on one side of the earth that the bottom half is equally visible from the same

---

<sup>91</sup> Please read, Observation #2, in Appendix A. It explains in part why the calculations seem to demand adjustment. This is maybe at least 50% of the error. The other 50% seems to be pure fiction, that arbitrarily places the sun on the horizon when it is actually below it.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

position 180 degrees on the other side of the earth. Now while such a scenario will represent the general overall movements of the heavens consistently to the observer for *most* of the day, I am coming to believe that it does not represent accurately what happens in true perspective.

But because the sun, or stars appear relative to both horizons in the "wrong" place, this circumstance has been charged to horizontal refraction. In order to return the objects to a so called correct position, one where the object is centered on the natural horizon, an adjustment is thought necessary. But this conventional determination may reach fatal demise when certain factors are taken into consideration.

What is forgotten in the fray to make the sun and stars be reckoned at such great distances, is that when objects are closer to us they will actually shift their perspective position when looked at from two separated but corresponding points. This can be easily demonstrated by putting one index finger straight out about a foot from one's nose, and then the other finger as far out as one can reach. Close one eye and the outer finger shifts position. Close the other and it moves to the opposite side.

It is my contention that this is exactly what is happening to some astronomical objects on our own natural horizons. It is not refraction, at least to the accepted degree, but rather a shift of perspective. This shift can only occur because the sun is indeed close enough to us that it shifts its apparent position on the horizon when viewed from opposite sides of the earth at the same moment in time.

Therefore when the sun appears about 28.5 arc minutes above the horizon, then it indeed is 28.5 arc minutes above the horizon.<sup>92</sup> To place the sun precisely on the natural horizon (in this balanced

---

<sup>92</sup> In the case of the sun, it is perhaps actually displaced by but a few seconds of light time but this is of no consequence if measurements are taken consistently.

## *Appendix B*

circumstance) as typical astronomical programs do, violates the true perspective.



The safest astronomical programs to use for such calculations, I believe, are the ones that adjust by default for horizon refraction. Therefore the so called “non-refracted” position marks, I suspect, the real position of the object. From this more reliable measurements can be taken.


Provided are pictures that roughly demonstrate the curvature of the earth. By simply placing a round protractor on the picture it is easily ascertainable to determine that the natural horizon is close to one astronomical degree below the astronomical horizon. Of course, the observer cannot see sky below the astronomical horizon, though maybe one or two arc minutes. But the fact remains that the horizon curves or falls away slightly from the observer.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS



When one observes the setting sun, direct sunlight is cast at the observer's feet, though not as powerful, of course, as the sun's rays at its zenith. This is explained by the intervening atmospheric conditions being much longer (horizontal perspective) and providing a filtering effect. But up unto the moment that the last tip of the sun is observed, significant shadows and rays are detectible. Thus light is reaching the observer and illuminating the landscape in front of the observer. Science officially tells us this direct effect is happening due to atmospheric refraction. The sun while it appears to be setting has already gone down completely. Is there anything wrong here? I think so.

## Appendix B



### 31 Million Miles from Planet Earth

**Video Credit:** Donald J. Lindler, Sigma Space Corporation, [GSFC](#), [Univ. Maryland](#), [EPOCH/DIXI Science Teams](#)

**APOD Explanation:** On July 4th, 2005, the Deep Impact spacecraft directed a probe to impact the [nucleus of Comet Tempel 1](#). Still cruising through the solar system, earlier this year [the robotic spacecraft](#) looked back to record a series of [images of its home world](#) 31 million miles (50 million kilometers) away. In a sequence from top left to bottom right, these four frames from [the video show](#) a rotating Earth. They combine visible and near-infrared image data with enough resolution and contrast to see clouds, oceans, and continents. They also follow a remarkable transit of Earth by its large, natural [satellite, the Moon](#). The Moon's orbital motion carries it across the field of view from left to right.

**Sept. 3, 2008, Astronomy Picture of the Day**

While atmospheric disturbances do inhibit visibility and does warp and flicker the objects in view, it is hard to establish that the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

center of a given object totally displaces itself, and that even the land itself changes position by half a degree, which is even more than the apparent diameter of the sun itself! Stars twinkle, yes. But it strains belief that they shift all over the place like this!

There is not the slightest evidence as one examines photographs of the earth from space that sunlight “bends” over the polar tips through the agency of the earth’s atmosphere. Unlike the earth the moon has no real atmosphere, yet the light seems to behave similarly when considering both the earth and the moon. If the land and sea is indeed bathed with light because of over half a degree of atmospheric refraction, there should appear slivers of light illuminating the landforms (esp. at the poles) at a point past the edge of the shadow or umbra, for a distance of maybe hundreds of miles. It does not appear that this is the case at all.




**Sept. 4, 1998, Astro. Pic. of day**

**Nozomi: Earth and Moon (Previous page)**

## Appendix B

Credit: [Nozomi MIC Team, ISAS](#)  
Courtesy [Anthony Toigo](#)

**APOD Explanation:** Japan launched its first mission to orbit Mars, [Nozomi \(Hope\)](#), on July 3rd from the [Kagoshima Space Center](#) on [the island of Kyushu](#). [Nozomi's goal](#) is to explore the Martian atmosphere and magnetic field as well as regions of the planet's surface and moons. [Formerly known as Planet B](#), the spacecraft will use highly [elliptical orbits](#) with successive Earth/Moon flybys to help slingshot itself along its ultimate trajectory [toward Mars](#), arriving at the red planet in October 1999. [This stunning picture](#) of the crescent Earth-Moon system was taken by Nozomi's onboard camera on July 18 from a point in space about 100,000 miles from the Earth and 320,000 miles from the Moon. Vibrant and bright, the reflective [clouds and oceans of Earth](#) contrast strongly with the dark, somber tones of [the lunar surface](#).



## **THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS**

### **Conclusion:**

Therefore, it is my general opinion that the sun is much closer to us than is traditionally taught. It actually “appears” closer to the natural eye. In addition, it seems incongruous, from a creationist’s viewpoint as to why God would create such a disproportionate, gigantic sun to warm the earth and the solar system, and then have to place it at such an incredible distance. It is inefficient, consumptive, and over-built. It just isn’t necessary to make it this large.

Secondly, the idea of major horizontal refraction seems to be most likely another “scientific” myth. Things are for the most part where they appear they are. While some warping and bending do occur because of atmospheric disturbance, the centers of the objects are not displaced any significant distances. What you see is largely what you get!

# Appendix C

## Distance to the Stars, and Other Considerations

The distance to the stars may also be roughly ascertainable using similar methods as were applied to the sun measured off the earth's horizon. This author is still experimenting, for sure, on this matter. We cannot be ready to make any claims with absolute confidence on this endeavor, so it would be appreciated that the reader please award the author some latitude for the time being to explore the heavens some more. The heavens are enormous, by any estimation, and until a thorough investigation is carried out we must be conservative in our claims.

At present, though, what this author seems to be finding is not compatible at all with the traditional paradigms we moderns have commonly accepted as fact. So again, no claims are made here without further investigation to explain the anomalies that he seems to be finding. All conclusions are very tentative on this matter. Because of his own established biases, even this author is still finding the evidence hard to believe. Some of it simply does not make sense yet. So far it is consistent, though, to what we have discovered so far in this book. Honesty must reign supreme in the end, though.

At this juncture, many of the stars themselves seem to range at the same general distance (and beyond) from us as our nearby sun. Also, it appears that astronomy programs are simply rotating the map of the heavens rather than representing exactly what happens due to perspective. Some field work is in order. But it appears that in general the chief stars are scattered across the dome of the heavens at a distance just beyond the sun by maybe half a million miles on the average. The planets themselves seem to be closer or even close to equal to the

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

general range of the sun.

When calculating, only a small angular distance is required to separate the stars at a significant distance beyond the sun. Yet still the calculations average amazing close. Not too much can be determined exactly without significant, broader, and accurate observation, but the circumstance seems consistent that many of the visible stars are reasonably close to a similar distance from earth, many between 1 and 2 million miles. Otherwise they would measure much differently when viewed geometrically than they do.

Below are some general experimental measurements of “shift” against the horizon taken recently.<sup>93</sup> Also given are some approximate distance figures in miles:

<b>Celestial Object</b>	<b>Shift vs. the horizon</b>	<b>Distance/miles</b>
Aldebaran	14' 05"	972,020
Altair	14' 34" (e.g. .2436)	939,966
Betelgeuse	14' 41"	931,899
Menkalinan	10' 31"	1,303,065
Capella	10' 18"	1,328,884
Pollux	12' 59"	1,055,722
Dubhe	6' 59"	1,959,416
Arcturus	14' 07"	969,548
Vega	11' 32"	1,186,460
Canopus	8' 58"	1,526,043
Sirius (Canis Maj.)	13' 60"	977,310
<b>Sun</b>	14' 28"	<b>976,369</b>
<i>Jupiter</i>	13' 46"	994,487
<i>Venus</i>	14' 06" (phase: .98)	970,365
<i>Mercury</i>	14' 36"	937,261
<i>Saturn</i>	14' 27"	946,992
<i>Mars</i>	14' 34"	962,176

---

<sup>93</sup> Great emphasis must be placed on the word approximate. But even here the numbers are so radically different than the extreme figures given by astronomy for these objects, representing contrasting differences from hundreds of light years as opposed to only a million or two miles.

## Appendix C

Usually the general average places them only a few arc minutes in perspective beyond the *distance* of the sun.<sup>94</sup> It appears indeed as if the heavens are a large domed canopy or tent, under which the sun and certain of the planets progress through their respective movements or orbits. (Cf. to Psalm 19!)

At least a few major circumstances seem to be suggested so far:

1. First is that the major planets seem to range in the general vicinity of the sun's orbit or the distance of its orbit or position. This exonerates the suggestion made earlier in the book that the sun and the planets may travel a similar highway, but use different lanes.
2. Second, stars such as Betelgeuse, Sirius, and others would be much, much closer than popularly reported. Canopus, supposedly 312 light years away from us, measures only 1.5 million miles. The disparate difference between these two distances is so radical that it is almost inconceivable that these figures could belong to the same universe!
3. Another interesting circumstance is that in the case of Capella, given here a shift value of only 10' 18," when tested 6 months aside gave a value of 10' 17". For an earth that is supposedly traveling according to Copernican theory 186 million miles from its first location yet here rather seems to reside at exactly the same distance six months later is startling information. If indeed it is really as close to us as the figures above show, it would argue for the fact that earth and stars are more likely largely rooted to one general spot rather than streaking all over in the universe or shooting about in our local system. The idea is very counter culture to say the least.

It is also of interest, that the motions of Venus and Mercury, planets that seem to hang around the sun according to the prevailing theories of motion and verifiable observation, measure very close to the sun in distance in consideration of their phases. This seems to argue that our

---

<sup>94</sup> Further, some anomalies already appear, at least if Kepler and Copernicus were really correct in their understanding of the movements of the spheres. These distances were taken at a particular moment in time 2-10-13 from 180 deg. West, or on the Antemeridian. It must be assumed that the distance to these objects relatively varies, depending on the position of the sun, or the earth, and other planets throughout the year.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

system of measurement is at least somewhat consistent with itself, though the size and distance conclusions are radically different from popular science in total scale. (But, again, there are some disturbing anomalies that must yet be investigated!)

Of course, we cannot make any great conclusions from all of this in that more work needs to be done to verify and measure this whole idea more accurately. But a few stars and planets are here addressed, anyway, for curiosity and interest. At least a question is made of this whole circumstance. It is good to question, and it is good to test popular theory that some of us have begun to believe has rather grossly separated itself from the truth.

### Moon Defect



“Moon defect” is the term describing not the phase of the moon, but rather the angle at which the midline between the darkened side of the moon and the illuminated side of the moon presents itself. One can visually observe this phenomenon sometimes when the sun is setting, yet a half moon is also visible above. It sometime appears to the observer that the phase angle does not match the obvious angle to the sun.

This is a curious circumstance when analyzed. For instance, on the date and time noted in a previous experiment the moon presents an approximate angle that would appear to be normal until one does the math.

## *Appendix C*

Now, of course, the moon because of its movements and patterns relative to the earth's and sun's movements can show all kinds of angles and presentations. The planes and orbits of the heavenly bodies in some ways is very complicated. But the defect itself, WHEN THE MOON IS EXACTLY 50% PHASED, provides a unique circumstance. By perspective there are limits to how much defect could possibly appear---- at even the most extreme angle---- when the moon in its position parks virtually beside us.

The question must be asked how much the angle would be when measured at a time that the sun itself is straight out from a horizontal equatorial horizon line in the east (as it is). With the moon obliquely 240,000 miles from different points on the earth there will naturally be a slightly different angle presented. But how much would it be?

Here is the mathematical reality: Even if the half moon (equidistant from the sun as is the earth at this juncture) is at the most extreme position north and south of an equatorial position, it cannot shift as much as 5 or more degrees if the sun is 93 million miles away. Not at all, really. Mathematically, the shift of perspective or phase angle would hardly change at all in that case.

In fact, if the sun is at that distance, it calculates that the most extreme shift possible if the moon is 240,000 miles from us is .146 of one degree! Think about this. That is one hundred forty six thousandths of one degree!! It can hardly be measured. Yet the angle in this instance is much more and its position is not directly adjacent but mildly oblique. Calculations produce the same relative distance to the sun of about a million miles when all things are taken into consideration. The angle itself demands that the sun be in close proximity to the moon, relatively speaking.

We do acknowledge that the moon is not exactly on the same plane of the ecliptic and that it varies. But this difference can be measured (using the ecliptic grid, etc.) and amounts to roughly 4.3 degrees difference in the case under discussion. Yet the moon can present much larger differences in the defect than this. It demands that the sun is much closer to us than the traditional 93M in order to account for the larger angles that appear.

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

## Libration of the Moon

Another matter of importance in this discussion is the libration effect of the moon. Observation of the moon reveals that the moon's face presents an oscillating pattern that from side to side illuminates a small amount of the moon's surface not always seen. This varies up to 6 or 7 degrees, because of the elliptical orbit of the moon, for the moon varies in its distance from us in a range of about 22,000 miles. Principally the libration is the illusion that occurs when it is seen from a location on earth that changes in perspective as the earth rotates.

The reader needs to observe that if the sun is 93M miles away the difference between how the light strikes the sun vs. the earth could only vary .146 of one degree when everything else is the same. Yet in the space of only 22,000 miles, the light of the sun on the moon's surface will vary two or three, up to a 6-7 degrees and more! How can this occur if the sun is at the traditionally prescribed distance? But it makes perfect sense in our revised astronomical model.

## Heat Transfer over Great Distances

While this author has not done much research into this area, it is certainly a consideration that should be looked into more. It is an area that in itself makes the proscribed distance to our sun suspect.

As hot as and as large as the sun is supposedly; how could we feel its intense radiation as much as we do from 93,000,000 miles away? It would be like trying to feel heat from a very hot campfire a thousand feet away. I can't *directly* feel our blazing fire in the fireplace from my seat on the sofa ten feet away! It takes several hours to even heat up the house.

At the equatorial latitudes the climate can at times be unbearably hot. Yet as you move toward the poles, a relative distance of only a few thousand miles, the mean temperatures will dip into the extreme sub-zero ranges. While the oblique angle at which the sun strikes the earth toward the poles is definitely a factor, as well as the local weather systems that interact with the various landforms, it still does not account for the variance of even hundreds of degrees in so short a

## *Appendix C*

distance comparatively.

It is hard enough to explain this difference even when considering the sun to be a million miles away. But to account for such radiation reaching earth as it does from 93,000,000 miles, from an object that only fills only 1/2 of an astronomical degree in apparent diameter to us, ranges between the seemingly impossible to even perhaps the absurd.

It makes the sun so unbelievably hot, that it makes one skeptical that such an object could be that hot for thousand of years that something catastrophic could not happen somehow to alter it. Is it even possible according to conventional physics for something to really get that hot?

### **Determinant: Summary**

There is simply too much evidence accumulating to reliably reckon the sun and perhaps some of the visible stars as being at the typical distances given us in the literature.

We have here in this book presented several major ways to measure the sun's distance. First, using the horizon method in the early chapters of the book. Second, we measured off the 50% phase of the moon. Next we noted the impossibility of a defected moon if the sun is at such an extreme distance. We also noted the libration effect of the moon which demonstrates light angles demanding shorter distances in our local system. We have compared the moon's geometrical relationship with the earth and calculated off of that. We have discussed briefly heat transfer over large distances. We have studied photographic evidence. We have looked at the unchanging configuration of the constellations throughout the year. And there are probably certain other considerations that one can argue or question as well.

Why, one might ask, are the scientific distances exaggerated so much? It is fast becoming the conclusion of this writer that cosmological distances are typically over-calculated because of at least two or three major reasons:

1. First, because the distance to the sun is used as the common standard, the use of its *exaggerated* distance skews further

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

calculations of other objects. Scientists are working from a faulty standard to begin with. Sun worship, too, seems to be a modern phenomenon.

2. Secondly, because the motions of the sun in relation to this earth may be different than conventionally thought, therefore parallax and like methods cause other measurements to be exponentially miscalculated as well.

3. Another reason would be the “evolutionary inflation” habit we referred to in chapter 4. Evolutionary mania totally governs scientific thought. Science is on a continual, obsessive binge on time and distance. Scientists seem to use these heavy figures to impress us with their supposed great knowledge, I guess. Everything is in the billions and trillions, everything is over calculated, everything is *light years, red shifts, and parsecs*. We are left to suppose the ultimate purpose for all of this must be to enable *time* and *chance* to perform their unlikely “miracle!”

The Biblical models, the creation models, and the like, seem to be much closer to reality than the machinations of typical science. To this author this is likely to be the conclusion of the whole matter. It should be no surprise that the Creator of the Heavens would be right about the things He has created. It is wise to listen to the Creator Himself, rather than quickly buy the flimsy theories and manufactured notions of the godless. In time the true picture of the cosmos shall be clear to everyone, regardless of what men *pretend* to know today. (Philippians 2:14)

# Appendix D

## Sample of Typical Heliocentric Viewpoint

(Note to the reader: This piece is given for interest or as an example only, and is provided as it is. It represents correspondence written to answer someone else's questions, (which we don't have here) but it still betrays the typical condescending attitudes and thinking of the worldly mind on the issues of the astronomical movements.)

*“Earth Spins?” ---From the Internet*

Nice question. Heliocentrism. First, let's get our terms right. A planet rotates on it's axis. A planet revolves around the Sun.

Regarding your url animation, what at first seems true does not match up with the actual orbital views as seen from Earth. First is the obvious question as to why the animator who posted the webpage only included Sun, Earth, and Mars. The intention is to simplify the animation for persons who are not educated with astronomy. But including only three orbs also hides the fact that the animation is not accurate. Not for ten orbs and not even for the three shown.

Studying the revolutions more closely, we see that Mars goes into retrograde once per year. This does not concur with fact. Mars actually retrogrades once every two years. On that basis alone the animation is proven false. In order for the proposed animation to function properly, Mercury would need to retrograde three times per year and Venus would need to retrograde every 18 months on average. Such animation on the url would not be workable.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

It on the surface appears to be a good trick. But when held up to critical proof it fails miserably.

Lastly, an orbit such as was given to Mars in the animation is impossible in itself. If Mars had such an odd orbit around the Earth, it would need another orb to act as a barycenter. Such an orb would need to be the same mass as Mars and exist at Lagrange point 3. Not only does an orb the mass of Mars not exist, an orb at Lagrange point 3 would cause instability in the orbits of both planets (Mars and its invisible twin).

Sorry, but the hypothetical animation is faulty on several grounds. Later models had the planets revolving the Sun and then the Sun revolving the Earth but none of these models stood up to scientific proof either.

Until modern times, man did not know the difference between the Universe and the Solar System. They were thought to be one and the same so it was fairly easy to look up and assume everything revolved the Earth. A second factor was that man does not feel the Earth spinning.

The Roman Catholic Church desperately clung onto geocentrism in an effort to maintain political and hierarchy power over the public. Although the Church was adamant regarding Ptolemy's geocentric model, there were some in other countries who did bravely speak out against the geocentric model without fear of retribution from the Church.

In the geocentric model, Earth was at the center followed by the Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. It fooled even the greatest minds of the time such as Plato and Aristotle. Early heliocentric models did exist around the third century BC such as the one proposed by Aristarchus but they lacked sufficient mathematics to become widely accepted. Other models were proposed in the following centuries to attempt to explain retrograde motions of planets. Thus the epicycles or wheels within wheels whereby some of the planets circled the Sun but the Sun still circled the Earth. It seems to have been a hot topic of early times since writings arguing in support of a heliocentric model have been found in ancient Sanskrit, Indian Vedas (Yajnavalkya), and Arabic texts but the people lacked observation techniques such as telescopes. Many books were lost forever in the Alexandria library fires but one supporter of Aristarchus' heliocentric model was Seleucus of Seleucia, a Mesopotamian astronomer who lived a century after Aristarchus but supported the heliocentric model by studying tides. The Roman Martianus Capella (5th century A.D.) expressed the opinion that the planets Venus and Mercury did not go about the Earth but instead circled the Sun. Copernicus was influenced by Capella's work. In the 11th century, the Muslim Alhacen proposed the Earth's rotation on its axis in 'The Model of the Motions' and al-

## *Appendix D*

Biruni discussed the Indian astronomical theories of Aryabhata, Brahmagupta and Varahamihira in his 'Indica'. Al-Biruni agreed with the Earth's rotation about its own axis, Abu Said al-Sijzi, a contemporary of al-Biruni, suggested the possible movement of the Earth around the Sun, which Biruni did not reject. Qutb al-Din in his 'The Limit of Accomplishment Concerning Knowledge of the Heavens', also discussed whether heliocentrism was a possibility in the 13th century. Even in the 15th century, Bishop Nicole Oresme discussed the possibility that the Earth rotated on its axis, while Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in his 'Learned Ignorance' asked whether there was any reason to assert that the Sun (or any other point) was the center of the universe. Brave statements which were no doubt forcibly recanted to avoid excommunication.

When one studies the sky over long periods, anomalies are noticed. Some planets were observed to have retrograde motions. In the 2nd century, the great mathematician Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus) tried very hard to solve this problem. He succeeded enough to cause the Church to adopt his geocentric model and persecute anyone who disagreed. This because the geocentric model offered little conflict with the literal translation of the Bible. This model was enforced by the Church for over 1500 years until men finally stood up against the Church risking their lives and reputations. It was not until 1757AD that the Roman Catholic Church lifted the ban on speaking about a heliocentric model. And it was not until 1822 that the Church allowed books on the heliocentric model to be printed. By this time, so many discoveries were being made with telescopes that the Church could no longer hide the truth from the public.

In the meantime, the Church was kept busy torturing and killing anyone who spoke of the heliocentric model in Europe. Copernicus presented the first mathematical evidence of the heliocentric model in 1543AD. Copernicus spared his life by allowing the church to "edit" his books. He held onto his most famous work and published it one year before his death knowing that the Church could hold no leverage over him at that time in his life. The telescope was invented in 1609. In 1609, Kepler came up with a heliocentric model where planets had elliptical orbits. In 1610 Galileo, a student of Kepler (whom some have suggested was poisoned by Galileo), observed the phases of Venus like the phases of the Moon. This observation did not fit into the geocentric model. Galileo's life was spared by the Church after Galileo said he was only writing on what he observed and was not 'teaching' the heliocentric model. He was still tried and convicted of heresy and was sentenced to house arrest for the rest of his life and also was not allowed to publish any more of his writings. Another astronomer Giordano Bruno refused to bow down to the oppressive control of the Church. He refused to recant his belief in the heliocentric model. The brave man who was the first to exhibit personal integrity and wanted the public to know the truth was imprisoned, brutally tortured, and finally burned to death after 8 years of refusing to agree with the Roman Catholic Church.

## THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

Tycho Brahe attempted his own model where all planets except Earth revolved around the Sun while the Sun still circled the Earth. In 1687, Newton's laws of gravity finally explained how the Earth could spin and not lose its clouds or birds and the heliocentric model gained full acceptance. In 1838, Friedrich Bessel was the first to measure stellar parallax proving another flaw in the Ptolemy model.

It was not until stellar parallax was measurable in the 19th century that we knew stars were very far away.

You still find the geocentric model of the Universe being taught in strict literal Bible religions. This is unfortunate and is an example of what some religion faithfuls will go to in order to maintain authoritative power and control over their members. Similar to the groups who maintain that the Universe was created in 7 days and Earth is only 5,000 years old.

Okay, history class is over. How do we prove that the Earth is spinning?

The first person to propose that the Earth rotated on its axis once every 24 hours seems to have been a Greek named Heraclides Ponticus, also known as Herakleides, in the 4th century BC.

In 1679, Newton wrote a letter to Robert Hooke. In it, Newton proposed that an object dropped from a higher altitude would drift to the east more than an object dropped from a lower altitude. Hooke corrected Newton by stating that it should fall further to the southeast. Hooke performed the experiment but was unable to make a determination of the result. In 1791, Giovanni Guglielmini repeated the experiment. The results were conclusive but Guglielmini was not skilled enough in mathematics to measure or calculate the results properly. In 1802, Johann Benzenberg repeated the experiment. He documented the results whereupon astronomer and mathematician Carl Gauss was able to finally develop a workable theory. Later experiments confirmed Gauss' calculations.

In 1851, French physicist Leon Foucault conducted tests with pendulums. The swings of the pendulums deviated to the right. Providing dynamic evidence of Earth rotation.

The Coriolis Effect was demonstrated in World War I when the Germans discovered that cannons fired to the south needed to be aimed slightly to the left of the target as the cannonballs would drift to the right when fired.

Skyscraper constructors calculate the rotation of the Earth into their design plans. Army Sniper Specialists are trained to take into account Earth's rotation whenever shooting at distances over one mile.

## *Appendix D*

In 1949, scientists developed atomic clocks based upon the element cesium. The vibration of a cesium atom does not change over time. By comparing the atomic clock to Earth's rotation, it is found that the rotation of the Earth is slowing.

# Appendix E

## Passages Describing the “Tented” Heavens

Job 9:8 **Which alone spreadeth out the heavens**, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea. (All KJV)

Job 26:7 **He stretcheth out the north** over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing.

Job 37:18 **Hast thou with him spread out the sky**, which is strong, and as a molten looking glass?

Psalms 104:1,2 Bless the LORD, O my soul. O LORD my God, thou art very great; thou art clothed with honour and majesty. Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment: who **stretchest out the heavens like a curtain:**

(Psalm 104:5) *Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever.*

Isaiah 40:22 It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that **stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in:**

Isaiah 42:5 Thus saith God the LORD, **he that created the heavens, and stretched them out;** he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein:

## *Appendix E*

Isaiah 44:24 Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things; **that stretcheth forth the heavens alone**; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself;

Isaiah 45:12 I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, **have stretched out the heavens**, and all their host have I commanded.

Isaiah 48:13 Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call unto them, they stand up together.

Isaiah 51:13 And forgettest the LORD thy maker, that **hath stretched forth the heavens**, and laid the foundations of the earth; and hast feared continually every day because of the fury of the oppressor, as if he were ready to destroy? and where is the fury of the oppressor?

Jeremiah 10:12 He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and **hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion**.

Jeremiah 51:15 He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and **hath stretched out the heaven** by his understanding.

Zechariah 12:1 The burden of the word of the LORD for Israel, saith the LORD, **which stretcheth forth the heavens**, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.

# THE CREATOR OF THE HEAVENS

At this writing books may be obtained from the following sources or directly from the author:

[www.lulu.com/sbehrmann](http://www.lulu.com/sbehrmann)

[www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com)

*“Keep Looking Up!”*

