

-----Quick Notes-----

Bible-related

Relationships

"When you're accustomed to privilege, equality feels like oppression."

The overarching principle Jesus taught (e.g. Mat. 20:20-28) is that Christians are not to have authority over each other. 1 Peter 5:3 tells us not to "lord over". Eph. 5:21 tells us to submit to each other, which is impossible if "submit" means to an authority. And since "God is no respecter of persons" (Rom. 2:11) and judges by the heart rather than the flesh (1 Sam. 16:7), we see that there cannot be any hierarchy between Christians, including/ especially between Christian spouses (Gal. 3:28). It should raise great concern when anyone teaches division by flesh in the Body of Christ, as if that Body has many heads (ref. 1 Cor. 12).

Scripture does not teach that wives should consider husbands to be their Lord, as that would be idolatry, since there is only one Lord and Master. Rather, in Christ there is no privilege, entitlement, or hierarchy among the saved. Spouses are partners who should complement each other the way the left and right hands do. We have one Lord and Master, and marriage is no exception.

Husbands are to notice how Christ loved the church: by self-sacrifice and by stooping down to the oppressed to lift them up. In ancient cultures women were socially and economically disadvantaged. Today this is not the case in most western countries, so the command to love and support applies equally to men and women. We should focus on how to be good Christians instead of "real" men or women.

Serpent Seed

This is the teaching that when God set hostility between the seed of Eve and the seed of the serpent (Gen. 3:13), he was predicting that her son Cain, who was the first murderer (Gen. 4:8), would begin the genetic line of Satan among humans. This is based on the presumption that Eve eating the forbidden fruit was a euphemism for committing adultery with the serpent, the offspring being Cain. It arose from kabbalistic teachings and gave rise to unbiblical movements such as Christian Identity, the Kenites, Kinism, and British Israelism. This belief boils down to there being one superior race of pure humans, and another of hybrid human/satan genetics. Anyone who disagrees with the group's theology is simply labeled "seed of Satan" and dismissed as unsaveable.

This teaching is easily debunked by Gen. 4:1, which states plainly that Adam was the father of Cain. We might also point out that Adam ate the forbidden fruit as well, yet no one claims this means he committed an immoral act with the serpent. And if every instance of eating fruit or being beguiled is taken this way, it quickly becomes obvious that this meaning is preposterous. A similar contextual problem faces this theory in the New Testament whenever the phrase "children of the devil" is seen (e.g. 1 John 3:12). It is an argument from silence, it imposes external religious texts on the Bible, and it makes lies out of the Bible's clear statements about God loving the whole world and not wanting any to perish (John 3:16, 2 Peter 3:9). More can be found at [Berean Bible Church](#).

Theosophy

According to sources such as [Encyclopaedia Britannica](#), Theosophy is the name of a Gnostic/Neoplatonic belief system going back to [Mani](#), a 3rd century self-proclaimed prophet or sage. Later branches include Freemasonry and the New Age movement, with emphasis on meditation, enlightenment, and consciousness. One of the more influential theosophists was Helena Blavatsky, who practiced occultism and helped to

introduce the teachings to the western world.

Sadly, ignorance of this religion allows it easy infiltration into Christian churches. For example, the name Saint Germain is mistaken for a great Christian of the past instead of the mystical and charismatic "adept" and alchemist he actually was. Ironically, some who extol the alleged virtues of these theosophists claim at the same time to oppose and denounce Freemasonry.

Religions masquerading as scientific or healthy have had similar success in infiltrating Christian communities, via Hindu practices such as yoga or transcendental meditation, or renamed variants such as the [prayer labyrinth](#), centering prayer, and The Silence.

Hebrew Roots

Christians are not at all obligated to the law of Moses or the priesthood of Levi they are based upon. Rather, we are under the law of Christ and priesthood of Melchizedek, which is simply to love God and people.

Mat. 5:17	Jesus fulfilled law
John 1:17	law from Moses, grace & truth from Jesus Christ
John 6:28-29	the work God requires is to believe in the One he sent
Acts 15:10-11	salvation only by faith, not the burden of the law
Rom. 3:19-31	what law says is to those under it; its purpose is to expose sin, not justify anyone
Rom. 3:27,31, 4:1-5	The law we uphold is the law of faith

Rom. 4:1-5,13-25	righteousness by faith/promise, not works of the law
Rom. 6:14-15	not under law but under grace, not a license to sin
Rom. 7:1-6	we died to the law and now belong to Jesus
Rom. 8:2-3	'law of sin and death' is THE law of Moses
Rom. 8:15,23	Christians adopted by God through faith in Jesus
Rom. 14:5-6	sacred days are a matter of personal conviction, not law
Rom. 14:10-17	kingdom not about food/drink but justice, peace
Rom. 14:19-22	don't judge personal convictions, but be considerate
Rom. 14:23	whatever is not from faith is sin
1 Cor. 9:20-21	not under the law of Moses but of Christ
1 Cor. 15:56	sting of death is sin, power of sin is THE law
2 Cor. 5:10	Bema of Christ to give/take Christians rewards
Gal. 2:9	Paul accepted by Peter, James, and John
Gal. 2:14	Paul rebuked Peter for making Gentiles observe Judaism

Gal. 2:21	righteousness by grace not law, or Jesus died for nothing
Gal. 3:19-29	law was temporary guide, didn't negate the Promise
Gal. 4:5	Christians adopted by God through faith in Jesus
Gal. 4:8-11	no need to observe sacred days, months, years
Gal. 4:21-23	heirs of promise, not law
Gal. 5:1-12	justification by law = fallen away from grace
Gal. 5:14	we have the blessings of Abraham (not Jacob/Israel)
Gal. 6:2	we are under the Law of Christ, love and compassion
Eph. 2:8-10	saved by grace, not works which are for rewards
Phil. 3:9	not our own righteousness but only in Jesus through faith
Col. 2:8	Christ, not philosophy and tradition
Col. 2:16	no judging about food, drink, festivals, moons, or sabbaths
Heb. 7:12-13	a change of priesthood requires a change of law
Heb. 8:13	the old law was fading away
Heb. 10:1	law is only shadow, not reality

Rev. 2:9, 3:9	those who say they're Jews but aren't
Eph. 2:13-18	Jesus brought peace in his flesh
Jer. 31:35-37	Israel will never cease to be a nation while the luminaries remain
Mat. 10:5-6, John 10:16, Gal. 3:28, Mat. 15:24, and Eph. 2:11-13	define Jew, Gentile, and Church

Mark 7:19 says 'cleaning all foods', but elimination does not clean food. Gal. 4:4 says Jesus was born under the law. But Jesus could not have been born under the PENALTY OF the law. They claim we're only under the law if we break it, and Jesus didn't break it. But if it's held over you in case you break it, you're still UNDER it. It's disingenuous to substitute 'faithfulness to the law' for 'faith' (equivocation fallacy) to claim that salvation by faith means obeying the law. Saving faith is always in the risen Jesus and his righteousness.

The key to **forgiveness** is the apparent (but not actual) clash between justice and mercy. If sin against others isn't punished, the victims are not being shown love. There can be no love without justice, no justice without a standard, and no standard without consequences. In Luke 17:3 Jesus said that sin must be rebuked and that forgiveness should only be given to the repentant. In Rev. 6:10 the martyrs in heaven ask God to avenge their blood, and they are not rebuked. In fact, most of Revelation is about God paying back the wicked for their sin, because justice is finally being done and the victims compensated. Many people have said that God is evil for not stopping sin and violence, but they complain when God finally acts. The so-called "vengeful God" is the just and holy God who defends victims.

Why is it anyone's business whether people whose faith they

don't share are following their sacred text? "Christians don't obey my cherry-picked verses, so all Christians are hypocrites."

Piso Family Conspiracy: Read [On the Roman Piso Theory](#)

It's pointless to debate [the Mandela Effect](#), since the evidence you'd need to prove it can change. It's the same problem as debating free will; if we didn't have it, we couldn't debate it. See also the video [TruthFinders - 29: Mandela Effect and the Bible](#).

[Was the Gospel preached throughout the world in the first century?](#)

The Rapture is an event where Jesus will descend from heaven with the shout of the archangel and the trumpet of God. Dead Christians will rise, and then living Christians will be snatched away into the clouds with them at the same time, to meet Jesus in the air. None of the contexts say it happens only after the Antichrist rises to power, or severe disasters, etc.

John 11:25-26	the righteous dead contrasted with the righteous living
John 14:1-3	the analogy of bride and groom at the last supper
1 Cor. 15:50-53	trumpet, shout, dead Christians raised, living transformed
1 Thes. 4:13-18	same as above
1 Thes. 5:1-11	Day of the Lord contrasted with the Departure
2 Thes. 2:1-12	church holds back Beast, the Great Lie
Rev. 3:10	church kept out of time & place of testing

Rebukes

Love does not mean enabling sin; sin must be exposed, confronted, and resisted. Otherwise, we show no love or respect for God or innocent victims. 'Do not judge' (Mat. 7:1) is balanced by 'Stop judging by mere appearances, but instead judge correctly' (John 7:24). 'Love keeps no record of wrongs' (1 Cor. 13:5) is balanced by 'We all must appear before Christ in court so that each person can be paid back for the things that were done while in the body, whether they were good or bad.' (2 Cor. 5:10).

John 7:24	judge rightly, not by appearances
Rom. 1:24-27,32	same-sex relations are shameful
Rom. 6:17-18	mark and avoid false teachers
1 Cor. 5:1-13	church proud of sexual sin but must expel habitual sinner
1 Cor. 6:9-11	living in sin is what the unsaved do
1 Cor. 6:18-20	sexual sin worse than others
Gal. 1:6-9	a curse on those teaching a false gospel
2 Peter 2:1-3,18-20	teaching lustful desires, depravity
Eph. 5:3	among you must be no hint of sexual depravity
Eph. 5:6-13	expose works of darkness, do not partner with them
2 Thes. 3:6	avoid fellow believer who is idle
2 Thes. 3:14-15	expel those defying the teachings, but

1 Tim. 1:3-4	rebuke those teaching heresy or obsessing over myths
1 Tim. 1:19-20	name and expel subverters of the faith
1 Tim. 4:1	departing from faith, teachings of demons
1 Tim. 5:20	openly rebuke those living in sin
1 Tim. 6:20-21	avoid false knowledge
2 Tim. 3:16	scripture useful for teaching and rebuke
2 Tim. 4:2-4	reprove, rebuke those with itching ears
Titus 1:9-16	sharply rebuke false teachers, dividers, esp. judaizers
Titus 3:10	after 2 warnings, have nothing to do with divisive people
1 John 4:1-3	test the spirits
2 John 1:7-11	do not associate with false teachers
Jude 1:4	perverting grace of God into sensuality and deny Jesus
Rev. 21:8	fate of cowards, murderers, perverts, etc.

Salvation is an offer of adoption that you accept by trusting the Jesus who rose from the dead. You can't earn it or work to keep it; you can only live in humble gratitude for it. Jesus is the only way to be adopted by God as our Father.

We are Christ's ambassadors, so God makes his appeal through us: Be reconciled to God. This is the Good News! Christ died for our sins according to prophecy, then he was buried, and then he was raised on the third day according to prophecy. When we heard the word of this saving Good News, we believed and were sealed with the promised Holy Spirit. At that moment we were

guaranteed eternal life.

Because of that, we live in humble gratitude, since this isn't a license to sin. At salvation we were cleaned up, set apart, and cleared of all charges, not by performing good deeds or obeying the law of Moses, but by faith alone. We were saved only by the grace of God. It wouldn't be a gift if you had to earn it or had to work to keep it. Instead, you live to please God out of love.

John 3:16	salvation only by faith in Jesus
John 14:6	Jesus only way, truth, life, path to Father
Rom. 3:28	justified by faith apart from works of the law
Rom. 4:4-5	wages are for works, faith is not work, credited as righteousness
Rom. 6:1-4	grace not a license to sin
1 Cor. 6:10-11	washed, sanctified, justified in name of Lord Jesus Christ
1 Cor. 10:32	Jews, Gentiles, Christians
1 Cor. 15:3-4	Gospel is that Jesus died and rose
2 Cor. 1:21-22	Spirit is deposit guarantee of our inheritance
2 Cor. 5:20	be reconciled to God
Eph. 1:13-14	given Spirit at salvation, deposit guaranteeing inheritance
Eph. 2:8-10	saved by grace through faith, not works which follow

All this happens the moment we're saved, so all of it would have to be undone to make us unsaved:

Romans 3:28, 4:5, 24, 5:1, 9, Gal. 3:24, Phil. 3:9	declared righteous
Romans 8:14-17, Galatians 3:7, 26	become children of God
Galatians 3:27	clothed with Christ
1 Cor. 6:19-20	belong to Christ, not ourselves
Galatians 3:29-4:7	heirs according to the promise
Galatians 5:24	the flesh was crucified
Eph. 1:7	redemption through Jesus' blood, forgiveness of our sins
Eph. 1:11	became God's own possession
2 Cor. 1:22, Eph. 1:13-14	sealed with the Holy Spirit who guarantees our inheritance
Eph. 2:5	made alive with Christ
Eph. 2:6	raised up and seated with Christ in heaven
Romans 5:1, Eph. 2:13	brought near to God, have peace with God
Eph. 2:19	citizens of God's household
Eph. 4:30	sealed for the day of redemption

Col. 2:13	made alive and forgiven
Col. 3:3	died but life now hidden with Christ in God
2 Thes. 3:3	protected from the evil one
Romans 6:23, 1 Timothy 1:16, Titus 3:7, 1 John 2:25, 5:12-13	given eternal life
Titus 2:14	set free and purified
Titus 3:5, 1 Peter 1:3,23	born again
1 Peter 1:4	given an imperishable reservation in heaven
1 Peter 1:18	ransomed
1 Cor. 10:13, Jude 1:24	kept from falling
1 Cor. 3:16	are God's temple
Romans 3:24, 1 Cor. 6:11	washed, sanctified, justified
2 Cor. 5:17	are a new creation

Without salvation

Mat. 25:41,46	eternal life or punishment for sheep and goats
Rev. 20:15	lake of fire
Luke 16:22-24,31	rich man in torment
John 3:36	God's wrath remains on whoever rejects the Son

Rom. 2:6-8	God will repay everyone; the evil will have wrath
Heb. 6:1-2	eternal judgment
Jude 1:7	those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire

Re. “**you are all gods**” in Ps. 82:6 the 'gods' were human leaders who would die like anyone else. In John 10:34 Jesus uses this as a legal loophole to counter the charge of blasphemy See also [this commentary](#) under verse 34.

[Skeptic Project debunking Zeitgeist](#)

Science & Philosophy

Science has come to mean a specific academic discipline which employs the scientific method to examine and try to comprehend the natural world. **Philosophy** attempts to explain and give meaning to various observations, from the presumption of how truth can be determined (epistemology). But is science truly naturalistic? How do we define what is natural/physical? To be physical, a substance or entity must meet one of these criteria: Chemical Formula/Structure, Charge, Matter, Momentum, Spin, Electron-volts, Calories, or Joules. And [peer review is gatekeeping](#). Also, [Einstein plagiarised others](#): 'All this was maintained by Poincare and others long before the time of Einstein, and one does injustice to truth in ascribing the discovery to him.' -- Charles Nordmann (Einstein's paper 'Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Koerper' in Annalen der Physik.)

- 'Nietzsche is Dead' ~God
- **Ontological Primitives**: Ontology is the study of being, and primitive means first or early. So the OP are the first

beings, the First Causes, and we have two choices: Nature, the material realm, and Supernature, the immaterial realm. But Nature is ruled out, since nature suffers increasing entropy, so Supernature is required.

- No effect is greater than its cause; so the cause of everything from energy to empathy must be a powerful sentient being. This is the **First Cause**. It's philosophically absurd and physically impossible for the world to have created itself.
- Statements by Richard Lewontin (evolutionary biologist) PhD Zoology, Alexander Agassiz Research Professor at Harvard University (Lewontin, Richard: "Testing the Theory of Natural Selection"; Nature, March 24 1972; p.181):
 - **Evolution** is the blind belief that frogs actually turn into princes, and you don't even have to kiss the frogs. To select is to take a subset of what already exists, so 'natural selection' is the opposite of evolution. Blind processes can't look forward or anticipate; the change in environment comes before the reaction to it. Animals can't adapt to survive, since they already survived in order to adapt.
 - "Darwin's theory of evolution by NATURAL SELECTION in particular is HOPELESSLY METAPHYSICAL, according to the rules of etiquette laid down in the Logic of Scientific Inquiry and widely believed in by practicing scientists who bother to think about the problem. The first rule for any scientific hypothesis ought to be that it is at least possible to conceive of an observation that would contradict the theory. For what good is a theory that is guaranteed by its internal logical structure to agree with all conceivable observations, irrespective of the real structure of the world?"
 - "If scientists are going to use logically unbeatable theories about the world, they might as well give up natural science and take up religion. Yet is that not exactly the situation with regard to Darwinism? The theory of evolution by natural selection states that changes in the inherited characters of species occur,

giving rise to differentiation in space and time, because different genetical types leave different numbers of offspring in different environments...”

- “SUCH A THEORY CAN NEVER BE FALSIFIED, for it asserts that some environmental difference created the conditions for natural selection of a new character. It is existentially quantified so that the failure to find the environmental factor proves nothing, except that one has not looked hard enough. Can one really imagine observations about nature that would disprove natural selection as a cause of the difference in bill size? The theory of natural selection is then revealed as metaphysical rather than scientific. Natural selection explains nothing because it explains everything.”
- “Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism.”
- “It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated.”
- “Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door. The eminent Kant scholar Lewis Beck used to say that anyone who could believe in God could believe in anything. To appeal to an omnipotent deity is to allow that at any moment the regularities of nature may be ruptured, that miracles

may happen.”

The **fruit fly experiment** only produced defective fruit flies, not even house flies, horse flies, or dragon flies

Evolution is the belief that frogs turn into princes, and you don't even need to kiss the frogs.

Which came first, the **laws of physics** or the matter they act upon? 🤔

Nothing in the Bible states or implies that earth is a ball that spins and orbits a star. **Isaiah 40:22** says **circle (not ball)** of earth, stretched heavens like canopy over a tent; **Isaiah 22:18** says "He will roll you into a **ball** and throw you", showing that Isaiah had a word for "ball" but didn't use it to describe earth. Also, "hangs the earth on nothing" (**Job 26:7**) doesn't imply "a ball spinning on its axis while orbiting a star shooting through a vast vacuum". We could also mention Joshua's long day (**Joshua 10:13-14**), and if it really meant earth stopped spinning, everything on the surface would have flown off at a tangent.

In the context of debating earth shape, it's well understood that "flat" is the opposite of "spherical". It does NOT mean featureless or without topography.

cosmology <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cosmology>

inertial = following the laws of motion; **non-inertial** = appearing to violate the laws of motion
To observe coriolis, **YOU** have to be **IN** the **NON-INERTIAL** ref. frame.

The **sun and moon** both move in similar ways overhead, but we're told one orbits us and we orbit the other. 🤔

How is it that at the equinox, the sun rises at 90° and sets at 270° no matter where you are on earth?

It stretches credulity to think that light from a star a gazillion lightyears away is never deflected on its way here.

electrostatics <https://byjus.com/physics/electrostatics/>
shadows <https://youtu.be/QWdQ4zs9dG0>

Sim theory: A simulation requires something "real" that's being simulated. Nobody who proposes that our reality is a simulation ever explains the reality issue. Also, if we're IN a simulation, we also ARE a simulation, so this is our reality anyway. Thus it's pointless and meaningless to call our realm a simulation.

re. **boiling water** in an oven <https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/557812/why-doesnt-water-boil-in-the-oven> : It actually does boil, it just doesn't LOOK like it's boiling because of the slow rate of heat increase. The heat transfer rate in the oven is much slower because it's by convection. **Evaporation** occurs below boiling point and only at the surface of the liquid.

Gravity and Moving Earth

- We observe that objects fall/rise and that gases expand in all directions, but we don't know the cause. Whoever claims a cause (IV) must be able to manipulate it.
- Experiment: IV (controllable cause) causes DV (effect) under the condition of CV. Null if disproved.
- Gas is a state of matter that has no fixed shape and no fixed volume. Volume can't be known without a container. Gas is the Black Swan of the downward vector claim.
- Things move because nature seeks equilibrium. This is a fundamental law of nature, just like entropy. Fundamental laws are simply observed, not explained.
- If gravity is caused by matter bending spacetime, how can the immaterial (spacetime) be bent, and how does this put pressure on the material (matter)?
- If the ISS is being continually pulled "down" by gravity, why is it not accelerating, since gravity is an acceleration?

- And since the direction of gravity is toward earth's center, why are the astronots floating?
- They should be pinned to one side of the station, just as people are pinned to the walls of a spinning room at an amusement park.
- The perpetual extreme smiles on the astronots is a giant tell... I think they're on something, but it's not a space station.

Reference Frames

- **Inertial** means to behave according to the normal laws of motion; there is only one frame.
Non-inertial means to appear to violate normal laws of motion; there are two frames.
- Standard cosmology insists that [the Coriolis Effect](#) is the result of earth rotation, then uses [conservation of angular momentum](#) as an excuse for why it doesn't happen. The necessary antecedent of conservation of momentum is MOTION, the question being debated, which is an Affirming the Consequent fallacy.
- Video of star trails from a stationary drone proves star motion is not due to earth motion. In fact, the drone should slowly tilt opposite the direction of spin.
- [The Foucault Pendulum](#) is supposed to demonstrate alleged earth spin, but this spin curiously doesn't seem to affect any other large pendulums such as large construction cranes at rest. If anything, it would only mean earth spins like a disc rather than a ball. Couldn't earth rotation/drift be proved by putting a helium balloon in a room with no air movement? If it never moves horizontally then there is no drift, and there is not enough mass for conservation of momentum.
- The sun causes molecules to move/vibrate faster, causing friction/heat, and the higher you go the fewer molecules there are, so that's why it gets colder.
- No two rays from the surface of a sphere can be parallel.

The divergence between them increases with distance, so a very distant ball sun can never have parallel rays reach earth.

- All stars should move at different speeds across the sky if some are much farther away than others. It begs the question (also ad hoc explanation) to offer some excuse as to why this is not observed. Timelapse photography shows the whole sky moving as a unit, turning like a disc.
- It defies reason that light from stars billions of miles away reaches us without being deflected by anything. It would be impossible to triangulate a star's position.
- The moon is likely translucent; some light bounces off the surface, and some gets inside and makes the moon glow.
- How does any alleged satellite stay in orbit without booster fuel aboard to offset decay? Solar power alone can't serve as a booster source; you need fuel.
- Standard cosmology says that all the stars are flying apart from each other, but says it's stupid to believe they revolve around earth.
- Satellite balloons, [photo by NASA](#).

Light and Luminaries

- If the moon is translucent, how can it block the sun during a solar eclipse? Maybe the 'dark' side of the moon isn't translucent, or something other than the moon causes solar eclipses.
- [Stars and focus](#)
- [Light](#)
- [What is light?](#)
- [Bending light](#) (Light bends to the thickest part of a change of density, not necessarily up or down.)
- [Refraction of light](#)
- [sun paths & seasons](#)
- If we could always see beams of light we'd see nothing else. We only see when light hits an object. But then how can we see light **sources**, to the point where we could go blind if the light is intense enough? And how do prisms break

sunlight into its 'frequencies'? How does the photoelectric effect work?

- The Rayleigh Criterion states that the resolution of any imaging process will be limited by diffraction, according to the wavelength of the wave used to image it. But nothing can 'be' a wave. Instead, a field or collection of molecules can wave collectively when disturbed. If light is made of quanta (photons), how does it have frequency/wavelength? How does EM radiation or light propagate at all, even through things like vacuum tubes?
- EM energy and light are not like water, which seeks the path of least resistance. Light refracts toward the thickest part of a change in density, because it changes speed. It goes toward the 'normal' line if density increases, and away if it decreases.
- If light has no speed, how do prisms split sunlight into various colors/frequencies? Both waves and particles have frequency, so speed proves neither over the other.
- The only refraction an almanac concerns itself with is from your eye to a star. It has nothing to do with distance from your eye to an object on earth.

The Earth

- There is no evidence that earth spins, since it experiences neither centripetal (center-seeking) nor centrifugal (center-leaving) force. An object held by a rope (-petal) and spun around (-fugal) exhibits both in balance. And earth has no curvature because [there are no right angles for navigation on a ball](#).
- Curve calculators beg the question by making the horizon the tangent point. The observer is at the tangent point and is not looking down, even slightly. The horizon is apparent, not actual. But if the horizon is earth curve, that means earth curve is not actual, and a not-actual place can't hide physical objects. It's quantum curvature: as soon as you try to see it, it goes flat.
- The GP of a luminary must be actual rather than merely

apparent, since it's at 90 deg. above that spot on earth, which means no or minimal distortion from the air. And if angles to the GP didn't work, neither would sextants. The sextant takes the known, observed GP of a star on a certain day and time, and uses trig to determine the length of the adjacent---i.e., the distance you are from that GP.

- Presuming earth is a ball with a known radius: 'Please, sir, I want some R!' ~Oliver Twisted

Gravity, Magnetism, and Force

- Gravity cannot keep gas from escaping into a vacuum. Magnetic fields can be created and manipulated, but not so with gravity. We observe aligned molecules to explain the property of a mass to be magnetic, but nothing to explain gravity. And magnetism can only contain plasmas, not gases.
- If gravity is the effect of objects bending spacetime, how would a gas giant ever form? What bends spacetime while the gas is uncompressed in a vacuum, since gas molecules expand in all directions?
- In physics, energy is the quantitative property that must be transferred to an object in order to heat or perform work on the object. Energy is not material, but we can use it, and it's difficult to distinguish from mass.
- According to [Physics Classroom](#), a **force** is a push or pull upon an object resulting from interaction between objects. Forces only exist as a result of an interaction. And since relative density involves interaction and force comes from interaction, relative density is a force. (Modus Ponens: where P is interaction and Q is force: $P \Rightarrow Q, P, Q$)
- From Kevin Parcell, Metaphysicist published in Galilean Electrodynamics: 'We have to begin by letting go of Newton's very old presumption that mass attracts mass.'
- Dictionary def. of **Cosmology**: A branch of METAPHYSICS (the branch of PHILOSOPHY about first principles) that deals with the origin, structure, and space-time relationships of the universe.

- According to [this source](#), "Newton's two crowning achievements (the Laws of Motion and the Laws of Gravitation), that had reigned supreme since published in the Principia in 1687, were toppled from the throne by Einstein."
- If mass is inertia (RESISTANCE to change of motion), and if gravity is mass ATTRACTING mass (CAUSE of motion), then gravity causing motion is self-contradictory. Invoking the 'push' of bent 'spacetime' begs the question.
- Velocity is the rate of change of position with respect to time, whereas acceleration is the rate of change of velocity. Velocity is meters per second, and acceleration is meters per second squared.
- Acceleration in a vector perpendicular to the horizontal plane is an OBSERVATION, not an EXPLANATION. The laws of physics are based on OBSERVATIONS; they don't, by observing, explain phenomena.

Existence and Perception

Berkeley on [the philosophical issue of reality](#): Since different people may have different perceptions of the same sensible (able to be sensed) object, then this proves the independence of the object. When a bird crashes into a window, it happens precisely because the bird did **not** perceive of the window, and it's unlikely that any other life forms were perceiving it at that moment either. On the other hand, we can conceive of things that don't exist (imaginary), and no amount of wishing can turn them into sensible, independent objects.

So then the only question is whether independent objects only exist because God continually perceives all of existence. Yet when God created this realm he didn't merely conceive or perceive it, he **spoke** it. Col. 1:16-17 says that Jesus completed all of existence (finished but with continuing effect; see [this reference](#)), including the supernatural, which means that the supernatural exists as independently as the natural. Yet though Jesus is not continually, actively holding everything together, there is nothing

God cannot know, even temporarily.

Someone may object that we can't say things only exist because God perceives them. But if Berkeley is right, then God is required. However, the deepest philosophy can't hope to truly explain our realm, whether the natural or the supernatural. But we *can* say that the existence of God is not disproved by philosophy, and that the delayed-choice quantum eraser experiment tends to confirm Berkeley.

But are we interpreting the DCQE experiment accurately? [This article](#) says no; it doesn't prove the need for a 'knower' and has nothing to do with choices being recorded before they're made. A comment there:

The silliness in interpretations of the delayed choice experiment is particularly blatant if you tell [the classical version](#).

Alice and Bob are playing a game. Bob has a six-sided die, a two-sided coin, and a small empty box to put the coin in. He rolls the die, gets a result between 1 and 6, and places the coin in the box heads up if the result is even (otherwise tails up). He then writes down his die roll, and carefully hands the box to Alice.

Alice now has a choice. She may either a) just open the box or b) shake the box before opening it (randomizing the coin). She then writes down whether the coin was face up or face down, and also writes down whether or not she shook the box.

After repeating the above process many times, Alice and Bob compare notes. They notice something amazing: Alice's choice seems to have affected Bob's die rolls, even though Bob wrote down his results before Alice's choice. When Alice shook the box the distribution of die rolls was flat, but when she didn't the distribution was banded! (Conditioned on the un-shook coin being heads, the die roll was always even.)

Clearly there is some sort of retrocausal effect...

The mistake in reasoning being made in the DCQE experiment is exactly the same as the mistake in reasoning being made in that last paragraph. It's unnecessarily interpreting correlation as retrocausality.

But see [this def. of entanglement](#), where under 'wavefunction' we read, "Though this interpretation does mean that the quantum state of every particle in the universe affects the wavefunction of every other particle, it does so in a way that is only mathematical. There is really no sort of experiment which could ever — even in principle — discover the effect in one place showing up in another location."

Links

- my links <https://yrtree.me/@BibleAnalysis>
- **Enoch** vids <https://www.youtube.com/@LevelUp777/search?query=enoch>
- **Enoch** post <https://www.fether.net/?LS=FOU&LE=BofEnoch>
- meat debate <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=34TMzrbxz64>
- my thoughts on **light** <https://fether.net/Lessons/lightreading.html>
- my thoughts on **Biblical Cosmology** <https://www.bible.fether.net/TGNTnew/downloads/FTS/scibcosmo.pdf>
- rebuttal to **SAB** <https://web.archive.org/web/20220222010009/https://www.berenddeboer.net/sab/>
- science site http://www.commonssencescience.net/elementary_particles.html
- my **Deity of Christ** debate <https://www.youtube.com/live/vdYYLGIInqjo?feature=share>
- my **Deity of Christ** debate transcript <https://fether.net/downloads/DeityTranscript.html>

- Heb. 8:7-13 **God** made the old covenant.
- Heb. 9:15-17, 26-28 **Jesus** enacted the new covenant in his blood.
- This is a clear, valid, undeniable syllogism for the deity of Christ:
 - **P1** Only God's death could enact the New Covenant
 - **P2** Jesus' death enacted the New Covenant
 - ∴ Jesus is God
- Only God incarnate could take on our suffering (Isaiah 53) and sympathize with our weaknesses (2 Cor. 5:21, Heb. 4:14-16).