

Geocentrism or Heliocentrism
Which is it?
What difference does it make?
The Heliocentric Hoax

James V. Forsee

Sept 1998

Truth forever on the scaffold.
Wrong forever on the throne.
James Russell Lowell

About four hundred years ago a great debate challenged the Catholic world and it has still not recovered from the crushing blow of heliocentrism. Aside from the intrigues of the Judeo-Masonic Conspiracy, Nicholaus Copernicus (1473-1543), Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), and Albert Einstein (1879-1955) are three of the most prominent architects of this New Age hoax.

Copernicus, who taught the theory that the earth both rotates on its axis once a day and revolves around the sun once a year, rejuvenated this ancient Babylonian myth call heliocentrism. This re-hashing of the error of Aristarchus(1) was actually nurtured by astrology for generations, and most scholars acknowledge that those who embraced this deception after the death of Christ were Bible-hating pagans. During the Life of Copernicus this novelty was sustained via the network of Freemasonry. This satanic craft, shrouded in symbolic sophistry, has as its main objective the destruction of Christ's Church (Truth).

The renowned Catholic historian, William Thomas Walsh, in his bibliography, *Philip II*, examines an unfinished article from that period entitled *The New Atlantis*. This work, by the revolutionist Francis Bacon, was a veiled description of the Freemason machinery as it operated in Europe around the 1500's and is claimed by modern Masons to be their own. Bacon's piece acknowledges that subversive "members of the order control medicine, science, astrology . . ." (2) Even today, according to the revisionist historian Ralph Epperson, Masonry claims the sun as their symbol!

It was not, however, until Galileo, that heliocentrism was used to subvert the Roman Catholic world view (geocentrism). Solange Hertz, a contemporary Catholic historian, reveals that Galileo, usually in need of money, "was easily inspired and financed by the group of revolutionary spirits who clustered about Cosimo de Medici II in Florence." (3) Perhaps because of their influence, Galileo lied to the Church and College of Cardinals and resumed teaching the theory **as a fact**. He, "the wrangler", had a tendency to mock his opponents and to overstate his case. (4) God's Providence, it seems, arranged a Saint and Doctor of the Church, Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, S.J., the Master of Controversial Questions, to refute the Galileo heresy. Despite Bellarmine's impeccable refutation, the lack of viable proofs submitted by Galileo, and the failure of modern science to verify heliocentrism, Galileo has become the "light" and "Father of Modern Science", while the Church, our Mother, appears "dark" and defunct.

Modern science texts to this day, dominated by secular humanists, state that Galileo proved the Copernican sun-centred theory. The fact is, he proved nothing. Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), who sought to formulate the known facts about the universe into a uniform conception of nature in his *Cosmos* (5 Vols, 1845-1862), said quite candidly: "I have already known for a long time that we have no proof for the system of Copernicus . . .but I do not dare to be the first one to attack it."

Bernard Cohen in *Birth of a New Physics*, 1960, concurs: "There is no planetary observation by which we on earth can prove the earth is moving in an orbit around the sun."

Before previewing and/or summarizing some of the well-known scientific experiments and their conclusions regarding heliocentrism vs. geocentrism, one must be aware of the Catholic Church's position concerning science. One, too, must understand the philosophical and psychological implications inherent in the dethronement of man from the centre of the universe. And one must not be so naive as to think that such subtleties are not systematically employed by Satan and his agents in the ultimate plan to destroy the Catholic Church.

This Church teaches that there is no contradiction between science and religion, and that faith is higher than science, and in fact, that theology is the Queen of the Sciences. Nevertheless, because of the machinations of the Evil One, this cancerous heresy, heliocentrism, succeeded in displacing man from the centre of the universe, where Jesus Christ came to redeem man. But more importantly, it appeared to have discredited Holy Scripture.

Indeed, the far-reaching consequences of this cannot be underestimated. A contemporary Catholic scholar, Paula Haigh, in a letter to *The Remnant* (May 12, 1989) speaks her observations most emphatically: "Galileo's case was decisive in the course of history, and the Church, in her condemnation of the Copernican system, was guided by the Holy Spirit (in spite of all the politics involved) and spoke infallibly for our future guidance." Walter van der Kamp (1913-1998), founder and past director of the Tychonian Society, affirms: "For the Galileo affair and its aftermath, as all historians of whatever aspect of human action and thought, acknowledge that it has wrought a change in our attitude towards the world, not equaled by anything since Our Lord walked among us."⁽⁵⁾ To an incalculable degree, man was spiritually wrenched from his Creator, God.

20th century man may think that it is of no importance whatever whether the sun or the earth was proved to be the centre of the universe. But it was then and it is now. History has verified this. To understand it, one must seek to study history on its own terms, and in the context of that era. Before the Galileo heresy the Christian, as opposed to the progressive modern man, was not only geocentric, but theocentric (God-centred). Before the "earth-movers" arrived on the scene, Western Civilization had an orderly world-view; everything had its place. First of all, man believed in God, the Creator of Heaven and earth, and in Holy Mother the Church. He also believed that God sent His only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, to the centre of the universe, the motionless earth, in order to redeem man. And, contrary to his worldly 20th century counterpart, man yearned for Heaven where God reigned. The only means of enjoying the Beatific Vision was through Christ's Church.

All bespoke unity. Man knew the importance of the Church and necessity of belonging to Her. He may have belonged to a certain manor, a certain town, a certain guild, and so on, but the chain of command was virtually unbroken. If he were a vassal, he would be answerable to his lord, and in turn the lord would be answerable to the king, the king answerable to the Pope (primarily in moral

matters), and all of these answerable to God. In short, man knew where he stood. All was orderly, all was secure. Man believed and he belonged.

Then, with the new world view, came doubt, the enemy of faith. As the famous English poet, John Donne, so aptly bemoaned: "And new philosophy calls all in doubt." **Man, now displaced from the centre of the universe, not only sustained a loss of dignity, purpose, and direction, but also he was most tragically and psychologically divorced from God, the all-unifying Creator.** This is precisely why this controversy is crucial.

The foremost human authority on this issue is, of course, St. Robert Bellarmine, who knew the perilous consequences of Galileo's heresy. The following letter of April 12, 1613 was written to an involved party, Fr. Paolo Foscarini, and it decisively and prophetically cautions the 16th century world about the dangers of heliocentrism. Lest one might believe it is quoted out of context, and also to dispel any doubt, Bellarmine's entire letter will be cited. The following should indicate why Pope Clement VIII rejoiced that "the Church of God had not his equal in learning." (6) Bellarmine to Foscarini:

I have gladly read the letter in Italian and the treatise which Your Reverence sent me, and I thank you for both. And I confess that both are filled with ingenuity and learning, and since you ask for my opinion, I will give it to you very briefly, as you have little time for reading and I for writing.

First. I say that it seems to me that Your Reverence and Galileo did prudently to content yourself with speaking hypothetically, and not absolutely, as I have always believed that Copernicus spoke. For to say that, assuming the earth moves and the sun stands still, all the appearances are saved better than with eccentrics and epicycles, is to speak well; there is no danger in this, and it is sufficient for mathematicians. But to want to affirm that the sun really is fixed in the centre of the heavens and only revolves around itself (turns upon its axis) without travelling from east to west, and that the earth is situated in the third sphere and revolves with great speed around the sun, is a very dangerous thing, not only by irritating all the philosophers and scholastic theologians, but also by injuring our holy faith and rendering the Holy Scripture false. For Your Reverence has demonstrated many ways of explaining Holy Scripture, but you have not applied them in particular, and without a doubt you would have found it most difficult if you had attempted to explain all the passages which you yourself have cited.

Second. I say that, as you know, the Council (of Trent) prohibits expounding the Scripture contrary to the common agreement of the holy Fathers. And if Your Reverence would read not only the Fathers but also the commentaries of modern writers on Genesis, Psalms, Ecclesiastes and Josue, you would find that all agree in explaining literally (ad litteram) that the sun is in the heavens and moves swiftly around the earth, and that the earth is far from the heavens and stands immobile in the centre of the universe. Now consider whether in all prudence the Church could encourage giving to Scripture a sense contrary to the holy Fathers and all the Latin and Greek commentators. Nor may it be answered that this is not a matter of faith, for if it is not a matter of faith from the point of view of the subject matter, it is on the part of the ones who have spoken. It would be just as heretical to deny that Abraham had two sons and Jacob twelve, as it would be to deny the virgin birth of Christ, for both are declared by the Holy Ghost through the mouths of the prophets and apostles.

Third. I say that if there were a true demonstration that the sun was in the centre of the universe and earth in the third sphere, and that the sun did not travel around the earth but the earth circled the sun, then it would be necessary to proceed with great caution in explaining the passages of Scripture which seemed contrary, and we would rather have to say that we did not understand them than to say that

something was false which has been demonstrated. But I do not believe that there is any such demonstration; none has been shown to me. It is not the same thing to show that the appearances are saved by assuming that the sun is at the centre and the earth is in the heavens. I believe that the first demonstration might exist, but I have grave doubts about the second, and in a case of doubt, one may not depart from the Scriptures as explained by the holy Fathers. I add that the words "the sun also riseth and the sun goeth down, and hasteneth to the place where he ariseth, etc" were those of Solomon, who not only spoke by divine inspiration but was a man wise above all others and most learned in human sciences and in the knowledge of all created things, and his wisdom was from God. Thus it is not too likely that he would affirm something which was contrary to a truth either already demonstrated, or likely to be demonstrated. And if you tell me that Solomon spoke only according to appearances, and that it seems to us that the sun goes around when actually it is the earth which moves, as it seems to one on a ship that the beach moves away, he knows that he is in error and corrects it, seeing clearly that the ship moves and not the beach. But with regard to the error, since he clearly experiences that the earth stands still and that his eye is not deceived when it judges that the moon and stars move. And that is enough for the present.

I salute Your Reverend and ask God to grant you every happiness.

Are not the words of this great Church doctor and saint eloquent, insightful, profound? Is there any Catholic among us who can find a flaw in it?

Since, as previously stated, theology is true science (God's science), then only through theological sources can one be absolutely sure of answers. Also, scientifically speaking, how can anyone go outside the universe to observe what is actually happening? Since this is impossible, God has provided us with an unerring source of truth. The Holy Scriptures, certainly a primary source, are absolutely geocentric. There are a number of passages to support the earth-centred reality. Refer, for example, to Genesis and the Psalms. Note **Psalms 18:5-6, 92:1, 95:10**; also, **Ecclesiastes 1:4-6** and Josue's long day (**Josue 10**). Believe the truth revealed in perpetuity, when you read **Psalm 103**, which anticipates Copernicus, Galileo and Einstein, and all the other innovators: the earth..."shall not be moved **forever and ever**". (emphasis added)

Many writers, scientists, and pseudo-theologians have spilt much ink trying to accommodate unverifiable, modern science (heliocentrism and evolution, in particular) with the Bible. Despite their mental gymnastics, their forced allegorical interpretations, their flaws in logic, and so on, not one has presented a viable argument. Belief in their reasoning not only requires blind faith, but leads one to conclude that God is a poor grammarian at best or a liar at worst. **Some exegetes try to pass off all the inconsistencies by calling the language of the Scriptures poetic, figurative, or phenomenological; meaning that God in some cases did not really mean what He said.** Aside from the inspired Word of God, we have the Doctors of the Church, the Magisterium and the Decrees(7), all geocentric. Today, after four hundred years, the official teaching of the Catholic Church is still geocentric: The earth is the centre of the universe, and it has no motion.

Even secular authorities, though unknown to most, give the Church credence. For example, two hundred years ago, well after the Galileo affair, in a Nov 22, 1885 letter to St. George Mivart, **the English scientist Thomas Huxley wrote: "I gave some attention to the case of Galileo when I was in Italy, and I arrived at the conclusion that the Pope and the College of Cardinals had rather the best of it."**

Science's sun-centred theory, on the other hand, did not fare as well. Ironically, the scientific experiments, observations, data, and proofs, to purportedly have verified heliocentrism and thus to have discredited the Holy Catholic Church

and Scripture, regardless of these efforts have verified geocentrism as well. One wishing to explore man's efforts to prove God wrong should investigate the following: the supposed revolution of the earth around the sun can be studied by Bradley's experiment, the parallax of stars, the annual loop of Pluto, the intensification of meteors after midnight, annual Doppler shifts of stars, and so on. The supposed rotation (spinning) can be studied by reviewing the earth's oblateness, the wind patterns, the force of projectiles and spacecraft, force of air falling bodies, the direct observation from the moon, the Coriolis effect, and so on. **The Foucault pendulum has been proven to be a fabrication which proves nothing.**(8)

Is the earth actually moving or are the heavenly bodies doing the moving? Or to use the nebulous phrase of science: "Is there some unexplained phenomenon to consider?" Study them all. Cold reason should cause you to acknowledge that no conclusive proofs exist to prove Galileo's theory. Even our most powerful instruments conclusively prove movement only --- but movement of what?

Perhaps the most notable experiments are "Airy's failure" and the Michelson-Morley experiment. These two are a 'must' for any serious study of this intriguing subject. The Astronomer Royal of England, George Biddel Airy (1801-1892), in 1871 performed a star-gazing experiment which came to be known as "Airy's failure". The simple solution to all the problems raised in this experiment was that the earth is at rest, immobile, in absolute space.(9) God and His agents, the angels, hold it there. But the crushing blow to heliocentrism was the Michelson-Morley experiment, and all those who tried to imitate or perfect it. Their classical experiment of 1887 was another effort designed to vindicate Galileo. But it also backfired. They bounced a beam of light off two mirrors in perpendicular directions and reflected the light back to their source. The lights returned simultaneously, regardless of location, season, elevation or orientation of instruments. The expected result was that the beam of light running parallel to the "supposed" path of the orbiting earth would return more quickly.

For those desiring detailed, scientific information on experiments that favor geocentrism, research the Fresnell drag experiments and Arago's experiment (Livingston). Study the Trouton-Noble experiment, the induction effect (des Coudres), the test for rotation of polarized light (Strutt), the Ahranov-Bohm effect (Erlichson), and the phase shift of electrons in a superconductor (Jacklevic).

Satan, allied with the modern conspirators, needed a new strategy to snuff out the remnant of the Catholic world view, in order that their diabolical agenda take its place. In the late 1800's to the early 1900's experiments actually ran contrary to modern science, and the conspirators needed somehow to keep the earth moving. Enter Albert Einstein. Besides tirelessly and diligently working for the Communist cause and aiding the Soviets by supplying them with our atomic secrets, he had a most unique position in the *Novus Ordo Seclorum* (New World Order). An apparent objective of all his intellectual efforts was to destroy, as completely as possible, all confidence that our human race might have in our accumulated knowledge from prior generations about the physical nature of our universe. Indeed, how could the average layman refute Einstein's abstractions? It is beyond the scope of this study to do so, but this champion of the cause was always suspiciously elusive when asked about the inconsistencies of his famous theories. "It is well known that Einstein at different times and occasions, for understandably different reasons, gave different answers to questions about the occurrences that had prompted him to his views on motion, rest and space-time."(10)

In *De Labore Solis* Walter van der Kamp exposes Einstein's fallacies quite handily. For those wanting to explore this more thoroughly, you are referred to pp39-51 of that remarkable work. Einstein's theories do not disprove geocentrism.

At the end of a letter in the *Bulletin of the Tychoonian Society*, No. 54, Charles Long, Ph.D. of Minnesota, cogently explains the lack of definitives:

. . . Einstein is the fellow who went on to compose the General Theory of Relativity. The basis of this theory is that all motion is relative! Einstein wrote his equations describing how the Universe works. If the Earth spins and the stars are at rest – the equations explain all observations. But if the Earth is at rest and stars whirl – the equations still explain all observations. They must, for the theory begins with the assumption that all motion is relative. You can't say positively that anything is at rest. Take your choice – the equations of General Relativity come out the same. Einstein put Mach's (Principle) into mathematical form and what emerged is surely one of the ultimate creations of the human mind.

Like Galileo, Newton the alchemist, and many others who support godless science, Einstein proved nothing. Even the atheistic philosopher, Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), correctly asserts: "Whether the earth rotates once a day from West to East as Copernicus taught, or the heavens revolve once a day from East to West, as his predecessors believed, the observable phenomena will be exactly the same. **That shows a defect in Newtonian dynamics, since an empirical science ought not to contain a metaphysical assumption which can never be proved or disproved by observation.**"(11) (emphasis added)

These occult-influenced scientists have trespassed into the sacred realm of **metaphysics**, that lofty philosophy which seeks to methodically explain ultimate realities. And this crime, in the 16th century, immediately set off alarms heard in the Church, especially by those scholastically sensitive and educated. Having no competence to function in a metaphysical consideration, science's failure could be predicted from the start; its effort to prove geocentrism wrong failed.

But to continue . . . **the very name 'Einstein' (saviour of heliocentrism) is 'sacred' and synonymous with 'genius', thanks to the conspiratorial propaganda so thoroughly disseminated.** And in addition to his fallacies as detailed in *De Labore Solis*, not to mention the common fallacy among writers who confuse Newton's relativity with Einstein's, the latter's fantasy cannot be reconciled with the Sagnac effect. This experiment reveals that the speed of light is not the same in every direction, while the theory of relativity relates that it is the same in every direction.

More generally, Solange Hertz accurately acknowledges that science has moved from the "visible" and "observable" to the "hypothetical" and "purely mathematical".(12) As a result, this abstruseness makes it all the more difficult to analyze Einstein's true purpose. Adding more light, Jewish Dr. Erich Fromm, a United Nations cohort, in his *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*, boasted that ". . . Freud, Einstein and Marx were architects of the modern age." Notice he avoids the more controversial phrase, "New World Order". More specifically, it is known that Karl Marx is said to have stated that he was indebted to Copernicus for preparing the world for Marxism (New World Order).(13) Most illuminating.

And there is the "quasar distribution problem." In 1976 a heliocentrist of sorts, Y. P. Varshni, analyzed the spectra of three hundred eighty-five quasars (the farthest known stars from earth). One hundred fifty-two of them fell into fifty-seven groupings, all of which had the same red-shift. This red-shift hypothesis is not debated among astronomers. To quote Varshni, who arrives at the paradoxical conclusions:

". . . the Earth is indeed the centre of the Universe. The arrangement of quasars on certain spherical shells is only with respect to the Earth. These shells would disappear if viewed from another galaxy or quasar. This means that the cosmological principle will have to go. Also it implies that a coordinate system fixed to the Earth will be a preferred frame of reference in the Universe. Consequently, both

the Special and General Theory of Relativity must be abandoned for cosmological purposes.(14)

Exit, Einstein.

In short, modern textbooks lie when they claim proof for heliocentrism. After four hundred years it 'appears' that God is right. Have we not now 'evolved' full circle to the **pre-16th** century world view? St. Robert Bellarmine saw no proof, nor does Van der Kamp, who said: "Numerous experiments have confirmed its (geocentrism's) stability; none have dislodged it."

Before concluding the scientific section of this study, consider for a moment the supposed antiquity of the earth, ranging into the billions of years, the evolution and descent of man from lower life forms, the abstract theory of relativity, the expanding universe, 'black holes', life on other planets --- the entire panoply of organized myth. Each of these theories, masquerading as truth, has its origin in the Father of Lies.

The supposed implied existence of life forms on far-away planets are a natural offshoot of heliocentrism. This myth, too, is heretical and dates to at least the time of St. Boniface in the 8th century. These supposed beings (precursors of *homo sapiens*) in an expanding, vast (nay, limitless) universe, according to the contemporary view in astronomy (which is 'acentric' --- no centre), would not be descendants of Adam and hence could not be ransomed by the suffering and death of Christ on the Cross. The entire incarnation is in jeopardy.

Suppressing the truth has been the primary means for the success of so many of Lucifer's deceptions.(15)

From the beginning this old serpent was rightly named Lucifer, 'the Light-Bearer', for he is the source of the 'false light' which the Blessed Virgin later told us at La Salette would soon "illuminate the world", causing "extraordinary wonders every place because the true faith will be extinguished." Furthermore, he and his agents have gone under various names: Gnostics, Cabbalists, Rosicrucians, Freemasons, Illuminati, Communists, New Age Movement, and other theosophical societies. More specifically, even the luciferian Albert Pike, Illustrious Grandmaster of American Freemasonry during the Civil War period, said: "At the bottom of magic . . . was science.(16)

Notice that Pike uses past tense (*was*). Truth in general is reversed:

God signifies Satan and Satan – God. Good is evil. Virtue is vice and vice is virtue. Light is darkness and darkness, light. Revelation is obscurantism and obscurantism is revelation. Religion is superstition and superstition, religion.(17)

Similarly, modern pseudo-science, controlled by Judeo-Masonry, mixes fact with fantasy, hypothesis with reality, and false proofs with exacting calculation. This magical sleight of hand can easily present itself harmful to those not firmly grounded in the Truth.

Incidentally, aviation, naval and NASA's space navigational systems use geocentric calculations. This in itself is neither proof of geocentrism nor disproof of heliocentrism, since the mathematics of both systems are workable.

In conclusion, scientific, historic and theological proofs have been submitted. Our findings: geocentrism is the truth; we have God's Word on it. But despite the truth, falsity has reigned supreme. Satan has convinced mankind that God was wrong. Because of this, our New Age world-view is one of religious skepticism, disorder, and moral decay. The malignancy of heliocentrism (developed from sun worship) is as vicious as it is insipid, for it seeks to destroy the truth and the faith. As a result, today's *Novus Ordo Seclorum* is void, empty, expanding, relative, godless. St. Athanasius, St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Robert Bellarmine have been replaced by

20th century frauds. These subverters of the truth and faith are, in general, without values, without order, without absolutes. Consequently, many have been seduced from the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church --- and from God, "Who canst neither deceive nor be deceived."

The Catholic monk, Copernicus, felt a gnawing, remorse for what he had done: "I do not ask for the grace granted to Paul, neither do I demand the forgiveness of Peter, but I incessantly pray for the forgiveness which Thou on the wood of the Cross has granted to the murderer." **May we not rightly deduce from this that he realized the consequences of his pernicious theory?**¹⁸

Has not this subtle attack and onslaught been to the detriment of many souls? In the final analysis, **how can any truth-seeking person have faith in the modern truth-benders?** Have not the Church and Holy Scripture been correct from the beginning? Have not the supposed antiquated Church and morality been far more perceptive than the human intellect?

Is science divine, or is God? Has not this been the Devil's ruse? Has not the heliocentric heresy been a driving wedge in the attack on Christ's Church?

It is time for the faithful to come to the defense of the Church and Truth, every particle of it. Does not true science, the Church, Holy Scripture, and the Holy Faith all hang in the balance?

*Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide
In the strife of truth with falsehood
For the good or evil side*

James Russell Lowell
"The Present Crisis"

St. Robert Bellarmine, pray for us

Notes

1 Solange Hertz, *The Sides of the North*, Big Rock Papers, Leesburg VA, 1981, p4.

2 William Thomas Walsh, *Philip II*. TAN Books, Inc, Rockford IL, 1987, xvi.

3 Solange Hertz, *Recanting Galileo*, Big Rock Papers, Leesburg VA, 1983, p4

4 Anne W. Carroll, *Christ the King: Lord of History*, Trinity Communications, Manassas VA, 1986, p278

5 Walter van der Kamp, Tychonian Society of Canada, Bulletin, Dec 1981.

6 Sidney F. Smith, "Bellarmine, Robert", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed, II, 411-413

7 Rev. William W. Roberts, *The Pontifical Decrees Against the Doctrine of the Earth's Movement, and the Ultramontane Defence of Them*, Parker & Co., London, 1885.

8 Richard G. Elmendorf, *A Critical Investigation of the Foucault Pendulum*, Pittsburgh Creation Society, Bairford PA, USA, 1994

9 Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D., *With Every Wind of Doctrine*, Tychonian Society, Cleveland OH, 1984, p190.

10 Walter van der Kamp, *De Labore Solis*, Anchor Book & Printing Centre, BC Canada, 1988, p43.

11 D. W. Sciama, *The Unity of the Universe*, Doubleday, New York NY, 1961, p102.

12 Solange Hertz, *Recanting Galileo*, Big Rock Papers, Leesburg VA, 1983, Part 2, p1.

13 Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D., *With Every Wind of Doctrine*, Tychonian Society, Cleveland OH, 1984, p236.

14 *ibid*, p252.

15 Ivor Benson, *This Age of Conflict*, Noontide Press, Costa Mesa CA, 1987, p35.

16 Solange Hertz, *The Occult Franklin*, Big Rock Papers, Leesburg VA, 1976, pp1-2.

17 Maurice Pinay, *The Plot Against the Church*, Christian Book Club, Palmdale CA, pp559-562

18 Walter van der Kamp, *De Labore Solis*, Anchor Book & Printing Centre, BC Canada, 1988, p103

James V. Forsee | 11725 Hidden Creek | Prospect KY 40059 | USA