

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/msg00704.html>

- *From:* Bullseye <bulls@xxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 17 May 2007 11:24:46 GMT
-

On 17 May 2007 04:02:34 –0700, oriel36 <kelleher.gerald@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

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

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

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

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