

The Scientific Illusion

Solange Strong Hertz

A wealth of scientific arguments have been marshaled by creationists against evolution and other myths fabricated by modern science. Although science, a discipline based on natural reason, can be manipulated to propagate error, it's good to be reassured that it lends itself even more easily to the support of the truth. Our Catholic faith tells us that because the truth is one, true science and true religion can never contradict each other, but where is real science today?

At no time in human history has error been allowed to spread so freely, and why not? It incurs neither censure nor punishment for leading minds astray, for two simple reasons: one, that scientific research no longer acknowledges any authority beyond itself and two, it admits no evidence that isn't provided by its own senses. Only data gleaned here and now from the material universe which can be seen, heard, touched and measured is admissible. The vast body of eternal, invisible premises which underlie and pervade the whole of created reality is therefore excluded on principle and not allowed to contribute any relevant information, to the great detriment of science itself. For instance, how can biology hope to ascertain the extent of the role played by the invisible soul in the growth and vital processes of living organisms if the soul is postulated *a priori* as non-existent?

Whoever dares to refute false scientific dogmas is therefore reduced to fighting on purely material grounds, and sad to say, this foreshortened terrain is where nearly all the fighting is being done. For the last 300 years creationists have been content to defend the truth by skirmishing according to the arbitrary rules of warfare laid down by science on its own authority without ever questioning them, let alone directly addressing what lies at the core of the disagreement. Inasmuch as both sides have pretty much tacitly agreed to ignore the mass of unseen evidence which actually forms the most important part of human knowledge and limit themselves to sense data in their debates, is it any wonder that a whole new artificial reality existing only in man's mind is being mistaken for the world God actually created?

Science declared its independence of the Church long before the state did so. Indeed the political separation of Church and state we have today could never have been engineered unless the way had been prepared for it by a previous separation of science from theology. It was science, and not the state, which first repudiated the Church as Teacher of all nations and divinely appointed custodian of the truth in this world, who alone possesses the moral authority to keep both science and state in their proper places. The rift broke out into the open when Galileo Galilei first publicly proposed that the earth revolved around the sun, rather than the other way round.

Until then the whole world, both Christian and pagan, believed that our earth was the center of the universe and that the entire cosmos revolved around it, because *geocentricity is a truth of the natural order revealed by God from Adamic times*. Inasmuch as it's impossible to see what's actually going on in outer space without standing outside the universe, this truth is a proper object of revelation. God had to reveal that He had set His earth at the center of the universe because, although, like Aristotle, we might be led to deduce this from simple observation, we could never be certain of it for lack of conclusive empirical proof, given the

fact that we have no stable point of reference outside ourselves by which to judge relative motion between us and other heavenly bodies.

In its elucidation of the Creed in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, the Catholic Church teaches officially, “The earth also God commanded to stand in the midst of the world, rooted in its own foundation.” Although geocentrism can’t be proved experimentally, it can be proved theologically, for the earth was not created primarily to be man’s home, but to provide the ground for the Incarnation, the central event of history whereby God would become man and reign as Christ the King at the very center of His Creation. First revealed to Adam and then transmitted to his descendants as part of primordial tradition, the centrality of the earth is clear from the account of Creation in the book of *Genesis* and affirmed or implied in thousands of passages throughout the *Bible*, which always refers to the sun, and never to the earth, as in motion.

For instance, the Psalmist speaks of the sun “as a bridegroom coming out of his bride-chamber,” who “hath rejoiced as a giant to run the way: His going out is from the end of heaven, and his circuit even to the end thereof” (*Ps. 18:6-7*). The Preacher **says**, “The sun riseth and goeth down, and returneth to his place: and there rising again, maketh his round by the south and turneth again to the north” (*Eccles. 1:5-6*). And of course there is the famous story about how Joshua on one occasion was divinely empowered to make both the sun and the moon stand still in order to prolong the day of battle “till the people revenged themselves of their enemies” (*Josh. 10: 12-13*). Scripture also tells us how the prophet Isaias made the sun go backwards “ten lines by the degrees” on the sundial of Achaz “by which it was gone down” (*Is. 38:8*). In the New Testament our Lord himself says His heavenly Father “makes his sun to rise on the good and the evil” (*Matt. 5:45*). No passage can be found anywhere in Scripture which depicts the sun at rest.

At the same time, Scripture categorically affirms the immovable position of the earth at the center of whatever solar, lunar, ‘astral or other peregrinations may be taking place around it. *Psalm 92* states flatly that God “hath established the world which shall not be moved,” and *Psalm 95* tells us He has “corrected the world, which shall not be moved.” *Psalm 103* says God has “founded the earth upon its own bases; it shall not be moved forever and ever.” In *1 Paralipomenon* can be read the dictum, “He hath founded the earth immovable” (*16:30*), and the book of *Job* says that God by His power “stretched out the north over the empty space and hangeth the earth upon nothing” (*26:7*).

Such quotations could be multiplied at length. We must note in passing, however, that Scripture does not bind us to any particular system describing the paths taken by the stars and planets as they move through space around the earth. We are free to espouse the Aristotelian, the Ptolemaic, the Tychoonian, or any other arrangements or modifications of the many geocentric hypotheses which have been devised over the centuries. It doesn’t matter whether they are concentrically or eccentrically organized, moving elliptically or according to epicycles, provided they seem to explain the observable movements and the earth remains at their center.



Inasmuch as in Galileo’s day the natural sciences were still considered part of philosophy, the handmaid of theology, it’s not surprising that the first opponents of

heliocentricity were polemicists who based their argumentation entirely on Scripture. Like all the Fathers of the Church, orthodox theologians believed that the *Bible* was inerrant in its every detail, and that where it described the workings of material creation it was in fact teaching real science, and not indulging in mere poetic metaphor or symbolism. Cardinal St. Robert Bellarmine's rigorous defense of the divine revelation of the earth's position was therefore only to be expected from a saint who would become a canonized Doctor of the Church.

In a memorable letter dated April 12, 1615 which in his capacity as Master of Controversies, he wrote to the friar Paolo Foscarini, a Carmelite provincial who supported Galileo, St. Robert said,

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 center of the heavens and only revolves around itself (i.e., turns on its axis) without traveling 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 holy faith and rendering the Holy Scriptures false.

He goes on to remind Fr. Foscarini that the Council of Trent

...prohibited expounding the Scriptures 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 Joshua, you would find that all agree in explaining literally 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 center 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 commentaries. 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.

St. Robert winds up his letter by allowing that

...if there were a true demonstration that the sun was in the center of the universe and the 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 had been demonstrated. But I do not believe that there is any such demonstration; none has been shown to me.

And it's sober fact that in this year 2003 A.D., the world is still waiting for this conclusive demonstration on the part of human science.



In itself Galileo's theory was far from new. The Greeks had toyed with it centuries before, and Copernicus and Kepler had formulated it as a mathematical theory which had

become familiar to most of the educated minds of their day, but until Galileo came along, no one dared seriously pretend that it reflected reality. At most it could be said to describe the universe as it might appear to an observer standing on the sun, who was making calculations from there. As Cardinal Bellarmine made clear in his letter, heliocentrism had always been permitted as a method of making astronomical calculations. Galileo would therefore have incurred no censure had he continued to teach heliocentrism merely as a mathematical model by which the course of the planets can easily be described and eclipses predicted. When he began maintaining that it actually conveyed reality, however, he impugned the veracity of Scripture, and that's what got him into trouble with the Magisterium.

As he explained in a letter to his friend Don Castelli, he was persuaded that Scripture used imagery adapted to the weak intelligence of the vulgar which was never meant to be taken literally by the educated. In 1614 he published a letter he had written to the Grand Duchess Christina of Lorraine, wherein he argued that the *Bible* only intended to convey those supernatural truths necessary for salvation and had no interest in natural phenomena. As the saying goes, the *Bible* doesn't tell us how the heavens go, but only how to go there. Because according to him scientific certainty was attainable by the natural sciences on their own without the help of revelation, he believed the obvious sense of Scripture must give way before scientific evidence, to the contrary. In other words, he maintained that because the *Bible's* competence extended only to spiritual matters, it could, and in fact does contain many errors in the natural order and was not to be trusted in the scientific world of hard facts.

When Galileo began expounding these views not only in the learned Latin of the universities, but in the vernacular before the general public, the ecclesiastical authorities were moved to act. In 1616, the Congregation of the Index under Cardinal Bellarmine, acting in the name of the reigning Pontiff Paul V, formally condemned two propositions. Without actually naming Galileo as their promoter, the Congregation pinpointed as errors:

1. The sun is the center of the world and completely immovable by local motion.
2. The earth is not the center of the world, not immovable, but moves according to the whole of itself and also with a diurnal motion.

The second proposition regarding motion on the part of the earth was judged to be merely "erroneous in the faith," but the first one, regarding the centrality of the sun, was unanimously declared "formally heretical" and "philosophically foolish and absurd... inasmuch as it expressly contradicts the teaching of many texts of Holy Scripture, both according to their literal meaning and according to the common explanation and interpretation of the Holy Fathers and learned theologians." The words "formally heretical" would mean that such a proposition is not merely erroneous, but directly contrary to a doctrine of the faith.

Continuing nonetheless to teach his error in the face of this solemn denunciation, during the pontificate of Urban VIII in 1633 Galileo was tried in person before the *Inquisition* and convicted – not of faulty science – but of heresy. He was silenced and sentenced to house arrest. "All books which affirm the motion of the earth" were put on the *Index*, and in 1664, a generation after Galileo's death, Pope Alexander VII issued the bull *Speculatores Domus Israel* which he affixed to a new *Index* condemning all books in any way teaching heliocentrism, commanding and enjoining by his Apostolic Authority "all persons everywhere to yield to this *Index* a constant and complete obedience."

The importance of this document cannot be minimized, for it included and reaffirmed not

only the previous condemnations, but “all the relevant decrees up to the present time, that have been issued since the Index of our predecessor Clement.” The creationist scholar Paula Haigh rightly concludes from this that “The evidence for papal infallibility in the Galileo case rests, then, upon the Bull of Alexander VII in 1664.” She discerns a twofold basis for its authority: “1) The decrees of the *Index* and the *Inquisition* which were based on the truth of the Church’s tradition, especially as in this case it rested upon the unanimity of the Fathers and the constant position of the Church; and 2) the infallibility of the Pope speaking in his own official capacity as Head of the Church and therefore *ex cathedra*, even though not defining any new dogma but simply affirming tradition.”

Miss Haigh goes on to say, “The ^{modern} theologians have never addressed the problem posed by this Bull of Alexander VII. If they had, they would need to admit its direct papal authority and search for some subsequent document by a subsequent pope that formally and specifically abrogated, i.e., nullified the 1664 Bull. But no such document has ever been found or produced. The case seems to me to be exactly parallel with that of the Bull *Quo Primum* by Pope St. Pius V by which he established the Mass of the Roman Rite in perpetuity.”¹

In an effort to marshal arguments against the doctrine of papal infallibility, which was being hotly debated and about to be defined at the First Vatican Council in 1870, an English Catholic priest by the name of Fr. William Roberts compiled a work entitled *The Pontifical Decrees against the Earth’s Movement*. Fr. Roberts, who mistakenly believed that heliocentrism had been proved, made a painstaking study of the old decrees against heliocentrism, bringing them forward to prove his contention that popes in the past had in fact fallen into error when speaking *ex cathedra*, and that papal infallibility was therefore nothing more than a pious belief on the part of Catholics. He offered documentary proof that heliocentrism had been irreformably condemned *ex cathedra* as contrary to faith – as continued to be held without question throughout the Catholic world for a long time thereafter. If his proofs are correct, it follows that heliocentrism remains proscribed today and may not be knowingly and willfully entertained or promoted by any Catholic without endangering his salvation.



As we know, Galileo abjured in order to avoid excommunication, and to this day the Church has not lifted its condemnation of his heretical theory, which remains as unproven as ever. As a matter of fact, attempts to prove it, like the well known Michelson-Morley experiments mounted back in 1887, have a way of backfiring and sometimes actually lending support to a static earth. Strangely enough, however, probably because Galileo allowed people to believe that he had actually observed heliocentrism through his newly invented telescope and he had supposedly “proved” it mathematically, his heresy soon raged out of control despite all the Church’s condemnations. After some initial indignation at the novel theory, the Protestant

¹ Paula Haigh's views may be read in her papers “Galileo's Heresy,” “Galileo's Empiricism and Beyond,” and “Was It/ Is It Infallible?” available from F & M Kramer, 1020 Raleigh Dr – # 2303, Carrollton TX 75007-7928 or origins@ev1.net Miss Haigh’s papers can also be found on the Internet: <http://user2.ev1.net/~origins/>

denominations, ever eager to prove Rome wrong, were the first to give way to the rising tide of scientism, with Calvinists in the lead and Lutherans bringing up the rear.

Spreading like wildfire through the universities of Europe, heliocentrism gradually gained acceptance among the teaching organs of the Church. Rome stood firm for a long time, but eventually two weak Popes gave way under the mounting pressure from the liberated academia. In 1757 Benedict XIV opened the floodgates by permitting the false theory to be taught as theory in schools, and in 1822 Pius VII, bowing to “the general opinion of modern astronomers,” began gradually removing books on heliocentrism from the *Index*. When Gregory XVI finally removed them all in 1835, the sequel was not hard to predict. Galileo’s views on biblical exegesis became the norm, and the *Bible* no longer figured as a scientific authority. The Holy Ghost had to make way for the dictatorial new scholarship.

Incredible as it may seem, like Fr. Roberts and the general public, highly educated dignitaries in the Catholic hierarchy ended up believing, on pure hearsay and without a shred of proof, that heliocentrism had actually been proved. Cardinal Manning, one of the famous converts from Anglicanism brought into the Church by the Oxford movement, is a fairly representative case. In his popular book *The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, written in the 1870’s, he writes in perfect good faith,

From the moment that the motion of the earth was established as a scientific truth, the Church has accepted it. And why? Because the Church has no revelation of physical science. No revelation whatever is made of astronomy. The *Book of Joshua* uses the language of sense and not the language of science in saying that the sun stood still. Therefore faith and theology are in no way implicated and in no way in conflict.²

Doesn’t this sound familiar? The good Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster didn’t hesitate to throw the entire weight of his office behind heliocentrism, despite a total absence of documented proof that the Magisterium of the Church has ever accepted heliocentrism, let alone that heliocentrism has been proven scientifically. Leo XIII’s *Providentissimus Deus*, promulgated in 1893, staunchly defended the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, but did nothing to remedy the situation because it allowed considerable leeway to accommodated meanings and interpretations. With science permitted to go its own way unchecked and to wield so unprecedented an influence over the minds of Christians, it’s no wonder that less than a half century later G. K. Chesterton would see no reason why a Catholic could not accept the equally unproven theory of theistic evolution, now openly preached by the new conciliar religion.

St. Pius X had tried to stem the tide in 1907 by issuing the decree *Lamentabili sane* and the encyclical *Pascendi* against the rising tide of Modernist errors. He allowed scientism no quarter, categorically condemning the notions that “the interpretation of the sacred books ... is subject to the more accurate judgment and correction of the exegetes,” and that “Divine inspiration does not extend to all of Scripture, so that it renders its parts, each and every one, free from error.” He also condemned the growing opinion that, “Since the deposit of Faith contains only revealed truths, the Church has no right to pass judgment on the assertions of the human sciences,” although the truth of the matter is that Scripture in fact contains many truths which can be known by reason alone or even by simple observation, and it is inerrant in all.

² Burns Oates, Tenth Edition, p. 370.

On May 13, 1917, feastday of St. Robert Bellarmine, even as the First World War was raging, our Lady began a series of apparitions at Fatima, Portugal which culminated in a stupendous solar prodigy surpassing the ones performed in ancient times by Joshua for the Israelites and the prophet Isaias for King Ezechias. It was witnessed by over 70,000 people, before whose very eyes she demonstrated the sun's subservient position to the earth by sending it zigzagging through the heavens to earth and back again in a riot of color like an incandescent yo-yo on a string, causing total panic among the viewers. But not even a miracle of this magnitude could shake what was by then an entrenched belief that the sun was the stable center of the universe. The time had come, predicted by St. Paul to St. Timothy, when men "will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own desires... will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears: And will turn away indeed their hearing from the truth... to fables" (2 Tim. 4:4).

In 1943 Pius XII's encyclical on Scripture *Divino afflante Spiritu*, said to have been written by the modernist Jesuit Cardinal Bea, would characterize "the Holy Fathers, the Doctors of the Church and the renowned interpreters of past ages" as "sometimes less instructed in profane learning and in the knowledge of languages than the Scripture scholars of our time." This provided an authoritative preface to the dictum which would issue a generation later from the Second Vatican Council's "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," deploring "certain habits of mind, sometimes found too among Christians, *which do not sufficiently attend to the rightful independence of science*. The arguments and controversies which they spark lead many minds to conclude that faith and science are mutually opposed." Now, no Catholic will maintain that there is any opposition between faith and true science, but faith exposes false science immediately on contact, being absolutely incompatible with error of any kind, and where that is the case, science should submit to correction.

In 1979 John Paul II requested the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, in conjunction with the Vatican Secretariat for Non-Believers, to re-examine Galileo's case and "in frank recognition of wrongs wherever they originate, to dispel the mistrust that this affair still arouses in many minds, preventing fruitful concord between science and faith, between the Church and the world." The groundwork had been laid by a liberal French Dominican, Fr. Dominic Dubarle, an atomic scientist and Pugwash conferee, who first broached the idea to Pope John XXIII when the latter was papal Nuncio in Paris. Paul VI steadfastly refused the overture, but John Paul II proved more receptive. A Commission for this heady work was duly named, chaired by Archbishop Paul Poupard of the Secretariat.

Among its members figured the American Fr. William Wallace, a former electrical engineer, physicist and Commander in the U.S. Navy, who had become a professor of history and philosophy at Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Lecturing in March 1982 at King's College in Wilkes-Barre, he informed his listeners,

The total content of revelation was not available for authoritative definition with the death of the last Apostle. Only through slow and painstaking scientific investigation were the literary genres of the *Bible* uncovered and the rules for its interpretation ascertained. The example is simple, but it illustrates well the true complementarity of science and religion, of reason and belief. Were such rules known to Rome in 1615 and 1633, Galileo would have been spared the indignity to which he was finally subjected. But had he not suffered that indignity, had he not been motivated by that passionate desire for truth that brought it about, Scriptural studies would never have achieved the status they enjoy

today.

Indeed not! In the light of the surprising news that the total content of revelation was not available for authoritative definition until now, the outcome of Galileo's re-trial was easily predictable, as foreseen by Walter van der Kamp, Protestant editor of the geocentrist *Bulletin of the Tychonian Society*. In the December 1981 issue he wrote,

Straws in the wind and the Vatican's tactical retreats from 1822 onwards presage a conciliatory course and a compromise whereby the give is on Rome's side and the take on the side of Scientism. For unless the Catholic Church surrenders the claim, hushed up but never yet openly and completely abandoned, that the Earth according to Holy Writ is the unmoved center of the observable Universe, and hence IS that center – is there anyone who thinks that secular science will sign a peace treaty? ...In about a hundred years the Roman Church has reached the position that it took the large mainline Protestant denominations 300 years to reach... Galileo will be canonized, and St. Robert Bellarmine quietly sacked.

When John Paul II did in fact rehabilitate Galileo in the course of his address before the Pontifical Academy of Sciences on Halloween 1992, the American media were unanimous in handing down their own infallible judgments. While on the west coast the *Los Angeles Times* headlined, "Earth Moves for Vatican in Galileo Case – Vatican Admits Error in 17th Century Case," on the east coast the same article by William Montalbano was carried by the *Washington Post* under the caption "Vatican Says Galileo Right after All – 3 Centuries Later, Pope Admits Error."

The journalist declared triumphantly, "The Roman Catholic Church has admitted to erring these past 359 years in formally condemning Galileo Galilei for entertaining scientific truths it long denounced as against-the-Scriptures heresy." He informed the public that the Papal Commission had finally concluded

...that Galileo's clerical judges acted in good faith but rejected his theories because they were `incapable of dissociating faith from an age-old cosmology - the biblical vision of the earth as the center of the universe... Unable to comprehend a non-literal reading of Scripture, according to the commission, the judges feared that if Galileo's ideas were taught, they would undermine Catholic tradition at a time when it was under attack by Protestant reformers...

With the hindsight we now enjoy, we can see that this is exactly what happened, for with the Galileo affair, the Great Apostasy prophesied in Scripture began in earnest, and by now it's in full swing.

A *Reuters* account quoted John Paul II as admitting, "The geocentric representation of the world was commonly admitted in the culture of the time as fully agreeing with the teaching of the *Bible*, of which certain expressions, taken literally, seemed to affirm geocentrism." Confirming the common verdict on the diocesan level, the *Arlington Catholic Herald* read,

Pope John Paul II formally acknowledged that the church erred when it condemned 17th century astronomer Galileo Galilei for maintaining that the earth revolved around the sun... The Pope noted that Galileo rejected the Church's suggestion that he present the Copernican system as a hypothesis, instead of demonstrated truth. No one at that time had laid out `irrefutable proof' of the Copernican model, the pontiff said.

Alas, the article neglects to mention that this irrefutable proof has yet to be supplied by anyone, and that even atheist scientists are beginning to abandon heliocentrism, along with

Newtonian physics and other unproven fairy tales for grownups which ushered in the universal decline of the Faith.

As we know, with very few exceptions, Galileo's false theory is universally accepted today as true and proven, and even the Pope refers to the one unique body which stands at the core of God's creation as "planet earth." The story in *Joshua* is relegated to pedagogical fiction, and where once the errors of science were corrected by the light of Scripture, the alleged errors of Scripture are now corrected by the latest findings of science. In other words, as final arbiter of what is true or false in the natural order – the only order which exists for scientists – *science has replaced divine revelation as the ultimate source of truth.*



Because God created the material universe as an immense parable fraught with supernatural meaning, there exists, whether we like it or not, an intimate relation between faith and science. As the Psalmist sang, "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of his hands" (*18:1*). Not only do the heavens relay to us by their immensity, beauty and order the perfections and power of their Creator, but apparently the history of the world can be read there in the signs of the Zodiac marking the path traveled by the sun in the course of the year. The original significance of these twelve signs, or constellations, each with three subsidiary ones, is now being rediscovered by Christian scholars as it was first known to Adam and the ancients, before the interpretation of the Zodiac had been perverted by satanically inspired astrologers.

Put in proper order, beginning not with Aries as now deployed, but with Virgo, the sign under which our Lady was born, and ending with Leo rather than with Pisces, the Zodiac foretold in the stars the story of the Incarnation, the Redemption and the world to come long before the *Bible* was written. Virgo is of course the Blessed Virgin, and Leo is Jesus Christ, the Lion of Judah, universal Lord of Creation. (This, incidentally, provides the answer to the mystery of the Sphinx which, having the head of a woman and the body and tail of a lion is simply a compendium in stone of the ancient Zodiac.) Capricorn, the sign under which our Lord and Savior was born, is quite properly the Goat, a sacrificial animal offered for the remission of sins under the old law. Its back legs, however, terminate in the tail of a fish, signifying that its death produces life. In the accurate chronological order Capricorn is the fifth of the twelve signs, occurring appropriately at the beginning of the age of the Son in world history.

God explicitly refers to the Zodiac when He asks Job out of the whirlwind, "Have you fitted a curb to the Pleiades, or loosened the bonds of Orion? Can you bring forth the Mazzaroth in their season, or guide the Bear with its train?" (*Job 38:31-32*) The Creator allowed Adam to name the animals, but the naming of the stars He reserved to himself as He set them in their appointed places. The Psalmist speaks of God as the one "Who telleth the number of the stars and calleth them by name" (*Ps. 146:4*), and the prophet Isaias says, "Lift up your eyes on high and see who bath created these things: who bringeth out their host by number and calleth them all by their names" (*40:26*). The story which the Zodiac unfolds in the course of the year lies in the meanings of these names given by God to each of the stars in its forty-eight constellations when He set them in order in the beginning, making of them, as the

Psalmist says, “faithful witnesses in heaven” (*Ps. 88:38*) of His plan for the world. Many of these original names have been deduced from their common forms found in ancient languages.

This is a big subject, lying far beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that when the Psalmist said that “the heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of his hands,” he can be taken literally. “Day to day uttereth speech, and night to night showeth knowledge. There are no speeches nor languages where their voices are not heard. Their sound bath gone forth into all the earth: and their words unto the ends :of the world” (*Ps.18:1-5*). This means that the Gospel was first preached not by the Apostles, to whom the liturgy justly applies these words, but by the heavens.³

Tampering with man’s view of the physical universe is therefore not inconsequential, because inevitably it alters his view of God and spiritual reality. Built hierarchically on inequality as principle, with man – not to mention God-made-Man – standing exactly midway between the macrocosm and the microcosm, the largest and the smallest bodies in the chain of being, the universe was expressly constructed by God to draw the minds and hearts of men to Himself as apex, center and end of all things. As St. Paul said, no one contemplating the order and majesty of nature has any excuse for doubting God’s existence or not being aware of His attributes, “for the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made: his eternal power also and divinity” (*Rom. 1:20*).

Incapable of attacking the faith directly, Satan and his think tanks inspired their tool Galileo to reverse the order of the universe in men’s minds, persuading them that with the sun at the center, the earth had no special importance, being merely one of the planets revolving around it in one of any number of similar galaxies. Suddenly, with no longer any up or down, the heavens taught a completely different story and the way was open to speculation on an infinitely expanding, centerless universe, ending who knows where and to what purpose. And as our Lord told Nicodemus, “If I have spoken to you earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe if I shall speak to you heavenly things?” (*John 3:12*). When science declared its independence from the faith which till then had preserved it from serious error, scientists “professing themselves to be wise,” as St. Paul says, “became fools” (*Rom. 1: 22*) who by tailoring the faith to their reasoning, ended by abandoning it altogether.

Building on Galileo’s error, reality was left even farther behind after the Freemason-chemist Isaac Newton began constructing a whole new universe based on a mathematical system existing largely in the human mind, where matter literally moved itself by so-called “laws of gravity,” which in due time were generally accepted as true with no more proof behind them than Galileo’s heliocentrism. The next step was the theory of evolution, which led men to believe that matter actually generates life. The heresiarch Teilhard de Chardin, who asked, “Is evolution a theory, a system or a hypothesis?” answered his own question by affirming, “It is much more. It is a general postulate to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must henceforth bow and which they must satisfy in order to be thinkable and true. Evolution is a light which illuminates all facts, a trajectory which all lines of thought must follow.”

Back in 1907 Pope St. Pius X had already pinpointed evolution as the “principal

³ For more on this subject, see *La Voix de Dieu dans les Etoiles*, translated, from the book by Kenneth C. Fleming; J. A Seiss, *The Gospel in the Stars* (1884); E. W. Bullinger, *The Witness of the Stars*; or Frances Rolleston's classic work *Mazzaroth* (1863).

doctrine” of the Modernists, noting in *Pascendi* that “to the laws of evolution everything is subject under penalty of death – dogma, Church, worship, the Books we revere as sacred, even faith itself.”(26) Einstein’s theory of relativity is likewise believed without proof, for with revelation disregarded, the new atheistic science arrogates faith to itself alone, whose false dogmas must be “believed” on its own unsubstantiated word. After incurring so much worldly ridicule for its condemnation of Galileo, the Church backed away from any and all pronouncements on purely scientific matters. Not only has there been no official condemnation of evolution and other falsehoods, but the Second Vatican Council actually encouraged the faithful to “blend modern science and its theories and the understanding of the most recent discoveries with Christian morality and doctrine,” so that “their religious practice and morality can keep pace with their scientific knowledge and with an ever-advancing technology.”⁴

The secular press reported an address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences delivered by John Paul II on October 22, 1996, wherein he declared that “new knowledge leads to recognition of the theory of evolution as more than a hypothesis. It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of knowledge.”⁵ *L’Osservatore Romano* for October 30 rendered these words as, “New knowledge has led to the recognition of more than one hypothesis in the theory of evolution,” but whichever is the correct version, it is the common acceptance of evolution which injected the idea of “change” into the proceedings of the late revolutionary Council, thereby serving to undermine the very notion of Catholic Tradition.



When God gave Adam and Eve “dominion over the fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air and the beasts and the whole earth and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth,” (*Gen. 1:26*), He said nothing about the heavens, which He reserved to Himself and His angels. As we have seen, He even named the stars personally, and so far the actual design of the movements of the celestial spheres remain a secret known only to Himself and His angelic ministers. Inasmuch as the best we can do is guess at them from what we can observe within very limited perspectives, how can we hope to learn anything about what really goes on in the universe if we presume to ignore what God has actually revealed to us about it? Trying to disprove evolution without first disproving the heliocentric falsehood which preceded it is like trying to fight abortion without fighting the practice of contraception on which abortion is based.

It is because heliocentrism destroyed the credibility of Holy Scripture that the biblical accounts of the world’s origins and future destiny are now rejected even by Catholic churchmen as fanciful stories invented by semi-evolved peoples, whereas the fantasies concocted by modern scientists are received as indisputable tenets to be universally believed

⁴ *Gaudium et Spes*, 62

⁵ *New York Times*, in John Tagliabue's "Pope Bolsters Church's Support for View of Evolution," 10/25/96. *L'Osservatore Romano* for 10/30/96 reads, "New knowledge has led to the recognition of more than one hypothesis in the theory of evolution."

until they are discarded or superseded. Small matter that evolution remains as unproven as the heliocentrism which ushered it in and flies directly in the face of God's revelation that matter has no power whatever to produce anything of itself. As our Lord said, "It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh profits nothing" (*John 6:64*). The faith furthermore teaches that God created the world and every living creature out of nothing "according to their kinds" (*Gen. 1:25*) in the beginning, and not by a long process. Far from expanding to limitless new horizons and producing ever new species, we in fact have God's word for it that heaven and earth as we know them "shall pass away" (*Matt. 24:35*), being "reserved for fire unto the day of judgment" (*2 Pet. 3:7*).

In other words, two faiths are now confronting each other, the one held by those who believe in God and the other by those who believe in science, for science in our day has elevated itself to the status of a whole new religion, whose dogmas need not be proved empirically to be believed, but accepted on its word alone. This means that to defeat false science Creationists must be something more than mere scientists. Instead of meekly restricting themselves to the artificial terminology invented by the enemy and abiding by its arbitrary dictates, they must also be apostles of the one true Catholic Faith, boldly using the metaphysical, yet wholly scientific language of this Holy Faith, outside of which there is no salvation for science or anything else.

The Word of God must be re-admitted as the incontrovertible, bedrock evidence it really is, in the natural as well as the supernatural order. And why not? God's Word is truth itself, the only actuality of which we can be absolutely certain in this world. It outweighs all natural evidence and supersedes all natural reasoning. Lying above and beyond every experimental datum, it automatically invalidates whatever contradicts it. Reassuring as it may be to discover physical evidence to support revelation, in the final analysis true faith demands that what God has revealed must be believed on His word alone, which can never deceive, even if all supporting evidence were lacking or contrary.

As St. Basil said, "Let us prefer the simplicity of faith to the demonstrations of reason." After all, like material creation itself, the end of natural science does not lie in this world. Borne aloft by the gift of Knowledge conferred by the Holy Ghost, scientists must look to the Transfiguration of all things in Christ-God if they are really to explain anything. That is the only direction in which the universe can be expanding from the here and now into limitless eternity, and it's their duty to provide the tangible evidence for what is actually going on!



Reprinted from a **Feb 2003** issue of

The Remnant

21170 W Linwood Dr NE

Wyoming MN 55092