

Re: Universes, was Re: Venus– why not a good planet to view?

## Re: Universes, was Re: Venus– why not a good planet to view?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2007–05/msg00703.html>

---

- *From:* oriel36 <kelleher.gerald@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 17 May 2007 04:02:34 –0700
- 

On May 16, 10:20 pm, Bullseye <b...@xxxxxx> wrote:

On 16 May 2007 13:28:45 –0700, oriel36 <kelleher.ger...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

You are among those who have lost their intuitive intelligence to recognise that creation is a fountain and not a cistern. All faith relies on the ability to appreciate the Eternal in temporal existence and most of all that love is the center of all things and not transitory ideas. The pre-Christian answer in Job amounts to beholding the vastness of creation once the shallow surface artifices are stripped away, the limitations are exceeded and we find ourselves participators in creation rather than commentators.

<http://www.usccb.org/nab/bible/job/job38.htm>

These anti-Christian and anti-intuitive creatures, using a mixture of astrology and photography close the Universe in a celestial sphere bubble and would rob others of the experiences which the great Western astronomers fought so hard to realise. The empirical or 'scientific method' agenda was always going to be anti-faith insofar as it tries to assemble facts to conform with what it sees but that sight has proven unreliable as I have shown again and again.

The author of Job knew the constellations – "Have you fitted a curb to the Pleiades, or loosened the bonds of Orion?" but he fits it into the swirling dynamic of creation and the joys as well as the

Re: Universes, was Re: Venus– why not a good planet to view?

pitilessness, carelessness, strengths, weaknesses, abilities that are often found in the form of man. There is no pretension in creation and it does not suffer a civilisation to survive that attempts to construct creation out of its component parts, insofar as the foundations for constructing visions of the universe are based on the incorrect relationship between the axial and orbital cycles, you can imagine that what exists now are conceptual monsters. Copernicus, a Christian, was well aware of this –

" although they have extracted from them the apparent motions, with numerical agreement, nevertheless . . . . They are just like someone including in a picture hands, feet, head, and other limbs from different places, well painted indeed, but not modeled from the same body, and not in the least matching each other, so that a monster would be produced from them rather than a man. Thus in the process of their demonstrations, which they call their system, they are found either to have missed out something essential, or to have brought in something inappropriate and wholly irrelevant, which would not have happened to them if they had followed proper principles. For if the hypotheses which they assumed had not been fallacies, everything which follows from them could be independently verified." De revolutionibus, 1543

Many ideologies have appeared that never made room for what Dante knew – " The Love which moves the sun and the other stars." notwithstanding that this is at the core of all Christian beliefs and especially in the life of Christ.

What do you want proven Bullseye ?, you can go out yourself and discover that love is central to existence, that you are an astronomer because the motions of the Earth make your existence possible, that there is no special knowledge required to appreciate nature but just a respectful regard for physical considerations. The works of the great astronomers are found in this direction but the works of men who have turned our heritage into a celestial sphere cistern can only live off a pseudo–authority where investigation is no longer a facet of existence but a cruel tyrant built on self congratulation and pretension.

If the doors of perception were cleansed everything would appear to man as it is: Infinite. —William Blake

## Re: Universes, was Re: Venus– why not a good planet to view?

Please come back and post when you are not on crack.– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

These fools here believe that being 'religious' is a byword for ignorance and they have no reason to believe otherwise judging by your response.

If all you can manage is a great bearded gentlemen in the sky then good for you, it is acceptable as a religious belief for those who direct their energies to more basic human endeavors but for those who ascend to astronomical affairs and how existence is a direct result of the cyclical motions of the Earth and the structure into which those motions occur, the same intuitive intelligence which loves Christian faith is employed in trying to discern accurate astronomical working principles based on physical considerations. In short, you cannot be an astronomer and be anti-Christian or indeed any faith where the Eternal and temporal mesh.

The only enemy Christianity has in mediocrity and these astrologers here have reduced the vibrant astronomical discipline of Copernicus, Kepler and Huygens to an exercise in magnification all imposed on an astrological framework. Should you doubt that the great Christians preferred a non believer to a mediocre one then be under no doubt –

" I know what you have done, and that you are neither cold nor hot (as a church). I could wish that you were either cold or hot! but since you are lukewarm and neither hot nor cold, I intend to spit you out of my mouth! While you say, 'I am rich, I have prospered, and there is nothing that I need', you have no eyes to see that you are wretched, pitiable, poverty-stricken, blind and naked (in God's sight). My advice to you is to buy from me that gold which is purified in the furnace so that you may be rich, and white garments to wear so that you may hide the shame of your nakedness, and salve to put on your eyes to make you see. All those whom I love I correct and discipline" Johanne Revelation

So, stop your whining to these numbskulls who have no feel for astronomy never mind matters of faith.

Re: Universes, was Re: Venus– why not a good planet to view?