

Spherical Earth Hoax

Bryed Billerbeck

October 11, 2023

Table of Contents

- Why Is This Important?
- Executive Summary
- The Biblical Perspective
 - A Quick Quiz
 - So, What Do The Bible and God, Really Say About The Earth?
- What does “fake” science say? (Assumptions, Axioms, Postulates & Theorems necessary to prop up the spherical earth hoax)
- By The “Fake” Numbers
 - Acceleration
 - Mount Shasta
 - Mount Whitney
 - Castle Peak & the Sawtooth Mountains
 - Sutter Buttes
 - Lake Tahoe
- Mount Whitney, Chemtrails & Flat Cloud Horizons
- The Moon is It’s Own Light
- Asteroids
- San Rafael Bridge Video
- The Oceans & My Swimming Pool
- Other Stimulating Questions
- Questions & Answers
- About The Author

Why Is This Important?

Just One of Many Ways We Are Being Blinded and Separated From God

Proverbs 25:2 “It is the **glory of** God to conceal a matter, But
the **glory of kings** is to search out a matter.

Why Is This Important?

2 Corinthians 4:3-4 Amplified Bible ³But even if our gospel is [in some sense] hidden [behind a veil], it is hidden [only] to those who are perishing; ⁴among them the god of this world [Satan] has blinded the minds of the unbelieving to prevent them from seeing the illuminating light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.

We must know the real enemy, Satan and his methods or we will perish. It's not the Democrats, or Republicans, other races, religions, rich or poor, etc. It's Satan and his. He/they create and fuel all those divisions. If Satan and his can fool us with things like a spherical earth, directly in conflict with God's Word, Satan and his can deceive us with anything and everything, and he has, does and will continue to do so if we don't overcome him. He uses witchcraft, sorcery, spells, apparitions, lies & deceptions (fake science), divisions, and on and on. We don't know how to defend ourselves against these things. Worse yet, we're oblivious to, and therefore subject to, all of it. Just like Satan likes it. The truth sets us free!

John 8:32

And **you will** know the **truth**, and the **truth will set you free** [from the penalty of sin]."

The definition of sin is: "Separation from God". Anything that separates us from God, not just the bad things we do but, idols, lies, deceptions, people, etc. All the weapons Satan uses against us while we're oblivious to them.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uwUd5S8g2rc> This is why they want you to think the earth is a sphere.

Executive Summary

Biblical and Natural Contradictions and Disproofs of a Spherical Earth

Executive Summary of Spherical Earth Disproofs

1. The bible tells us the “earth circle” is not measureable, it is domed with water above the dome and on the earth with sky, not space in-between. Sun, moon & stars are w/in the dome, sun & moon are individual lights that orbit earth, not a light and a reflector. Earth has an immovable, pillared foundation.
2. We don’t zoom about space a gazillion miles per hour around the sun or rotate on axis. The entire fake planetary system model is based on a minimum of 30 independent, unobservable, unprovable and in some cases laughable assumptions, Axioms, Postulates, Theorems and a lot of circular reasoning, **necessary to create the fake world so many chose to live on.**
3. Mount Shasta, Lake Tahoe, Mount Whitney, Sawtooth Mountains, Sutter Buttes, Chemtrails & the San Rafael Bridge video and Moon light are all contrary to life on a fake sphere.
4. Fake Moon & Earth rotations & orbit imaginary, related forces are not enough to create the tides we see or keep the oceans in place so, something else does oh yeah, God’s boundaries.
5. Actual polar star rotations at the equator don’t fit spherical hoax model.

The Biblical Perspective

A Few Key Verses

A Quick Quiz

Literal or Metaphorical

Is The Bible Figurative/Metaphorical or Literal?

- The Bible is Figurative/Metaphorical only. Yes No
- The Bible should be taken Literally always. Yes No
- The Bible should be taken Literally sometimes and Figuratively others. Yes No
- The Bible should be taken simultaneously Literally and Figuratively. Yes No

Let's Decide Which Parts Are Literal or Figurative

L F

- Creation (or Evolution)
- Garden of Eden
- God's Covenants
- Tower of Babel
- Noah's Ark & the Flood
- Sodom and Gomorrah
- Jonah & the Whale
- Moses, Pharaoh, Plagues, Red Sea
- David & Goliath, the Line of David

L F

- Prophets
- Virgin birth
- Jesus
- Jesus' Miracles
- Jesus is God (Trinity)
- Satan & Demons
- Eternal life
- Last days & judgement
- Saved by Grace through Faith

Is God's Word Figurative/Metaphorical or Literal?

- God's Word should be taken Figuratively/Metaphorically only. Yes No
- God's Word should be taken Literally always. Yes No
- God's Word can be taken Literally sometimes and Figuratively others. Yes No
- God's Word should be taken simultaneously Literally and Figuratively. Yes No

Is God Figurative/Metaphorical or Literal?

- God should be taken Figuratively/Metaphorically only.
- God should be taken Literally always.
- God can be taken Literally sometimes and Figuratively others.
- God should be taken simultaneously Literally and Figuratively.

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

So, Who Decides Figurative/Metaphorical or Literal?

- How convenient, we can decide when to take the Bible, God's Word or God, literally, figuratively or metaphorically. That makes life so much easier. We basically then get to define God, His Word and our own flavor of Christianity or Faith. Hmm, that doesn't seem right to me. Probably because it isn't.
- God has so vastly many more facets than we do. When He gave us His Word, Himself, He gave us His multifaceted and amazing self. There are at least two facets in His Word I'm aware of, Logos and Rhema. Logos is the written Word while Rhema is the Holy Spirit inspired Word. The written Word is alive, He tells us that as it is literally Him, and never changing while Rhema too is Him, alive yet, it seems to change. That's why when you read a scripture a 2nd, 3rd, 4th time, you will think, that's new, so cool, how did I miss that before? It's because you may not have been ready for all facets of it before or, the Holy Spirit is just showing you a new or different facet of it now.

Important Things About God's Word to Consider

John 1:1-3 Amplified Bible 1 In the beginning [before all time] was the Word (^aChrist), and the Word was with God, and ^b**the Word was God Himself.** 2 He was [continually existing] in the beginning [co-eternally] with God.

Hebrews 4:12 Amplified Bible 12 For **the Word of God is living** and active and full of power [making it operative, energizing, and effective]. It is sharper than any two-edged ^asword, penetrating as far as the division of the ^bsoul and spirit [the completeness of a person], and of both joints and marrow [the deepest parts of our nature], exposing and judging the very thoughts and intentions of the heart.

So, What Do The Bible and God, Say About The Earth?

Much

Isaiah 8:12

“You are not to say, ‘It is a conspiracy!’ In regard to all that this people call a conspiracy, and you are not to fear what they fear nor be in dread of it.”

Yes, that is a real verse. God knew they'd be calling His truth conspiracy.

Psalm 64:2

“Hide me from the secret counsel *and* conspiracy of the ungodly, from the scheming of those who do wrong,”

The Biblical Perspective

Genesis 1:16-17 16 God made the **two great lights** - the greater light (the sun) to rule the day, and the lesser light (the moon) to rule the night; He made the [galaxies of] stars also [that is, all the amazing wonders in the heavens]. 17 God placed them in the expanse of the heavens to provide light upon the earth,

Two great lights, not a great light and a great reflector. ☺

The Biblical Perspective

Psalm 19:4.5-6 Amplified Bible

4.5 In them *and* in the heavens He has made a tent for the sun,⁵ which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber; It rejoices as a strong man to run his course.⁶ **The sun's rising is from one end of the heavens, and makes its circuit to the other end of them;** and there is nothing hidden from its heat.

It's sun rise, not earth rise. The sun is on a circuit or path, not the earth. ☺

The Biblical Perspective

Genesis 1 The Creation Amplified Bible

1 In the beginning God (*Elohim*) *created* [by forming from nothing] the heavens and the earth. **2** **The earth was** *formless and void or a waste and emptiness, and darkness was upon the face of the deep [primeval ocean that covered the unformed earth]*. The Spirit of God was moving (hovering, brooding) over the face of the waters. **3** And God said, *“Let there be light”*; and there was light. **4** God saw that the light was good (pleasing, useful) *and He affirmed and sustained it; and God separated the light [distinguishing it] from the darkness.* **5** And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was *evening and there was morning, one day.* **6** And God said, *“Let there be an **expanse** [of the sky] in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters [below the expanse] from the waters [above the expanse].”* **7** And God made the expanse [of sky] and separated the waters which were under the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse; and it was so [just as He commanded]. **8** God called the expanse [of sky] **heaven**. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day. **9** Then God said, *“Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place [of standing, pooling together], and let the dry land appear”*; and it was so. **10** God called the dry land **earth**, and the gathering of the waters He called **seas**; and God saw that this was good (pleasing, useful) *and He affirmed and sustained it.* **11** So God said, *“Let the earth sprout [tender] **vegetation**, **plants** yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit according to (limited to, consistent with) their kind, whose seed is in them upon the earth”*; and it was so. **12** The earth sprouted *and* abundantly produced vegetation, plants yielding seed according to their kind, and trees bearing fruit with seed in them, according to their kind; and God saw that it was good *and He affirmed and sustained it.* **13** And there was evening and there was morning, a third day. **14** Then God said, *“Let there be light-bearers (sun, moon, stars) in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be *useful* for signs (tokens) [of God’s provident care], and for marking seasons, days, and years; **15** and let them be *useful* as lights in the expanse of the heavens to provide light on the earth”*; and it was so, [just as He commanded]. **16** God made the two great lights—the greater light (the sun) to rule the day, and the lesser light (the moon) to rule the night; *He made the [galaxies of] stars also [that is, all the amazing wonders in the heavens].* **17** God placed them in the expanse of the heavens to provide light upon the earth, **18** to rule over the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good *and He affirmed and sustained it.* **19** And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day.

Genesis 1 Analysis

Okay, let's take these one or a couple at a time. Verse 2, earth formless and void, only water on the surface. God just pulls out the canvas. Verse 6 - 10, God creates an expanse? Then He makes two different kinds of water in this expanse, heaven's water and earth's water then He gathers the Earth's water into one place so land could appear. So, the expanse. To me that seems like a shape or a container for everything, room to work. Thoughts? Then He says the heavens are water, not a vacuum. Thoughts? Verses 14 -16, Enter sun, moon & stars. The sun and moon are lights, separate day and night, govern the seasons, days and years. Key thing here is He calls both the sun and moon lights. It doesn't say the moon reflects the sun's light. It is its own light! That tells me the phases are light settings if you will and have nothing to do with the shape of the earth, sun or orbits and rotations. Thoughts? Finally, verse 16 – 17 God placed the sun, moon and STARS in heaven, within the expanse (or envelope), in the sky, not beyond the firmament, the waters of heaven or in imaginary space. Thoughts? Amos 9:6 kinda makes is sound like the expanse is domed, fully contained and we can't go beyond it.

Okay so what right? Don't argue you can't take those verses literally or I'll have Eric slap you and take away your license to be a Believer. ☺ The what is, instead of supporting Satan's BS and attacking those of like faith disproving Satan's BS like the guys in your videos do, you should be using these verses and the others I've sent you to prove the holes in Satan's BS. Defend your faith! Like you would against Satan's evolution lie verses creationism or his abortion lies! The spherical earth lie is worse as even Believers in Christ believe it. **Let your faith become your sight!** If you reverse your approach in this way, The Lord will remove the spiritual veils and show you the truth. It will become so obvious. That doesn't mean it will be easy. You will be attacked mercilessly by all who Satan employs, even friends, believers and pastors. Trust me, I know. But, if you continue in Him, you through Him will persevere. And you will be so much closer to Him. Your faith will become an even more firm foundation in more ways than those you thought you were already standing on. Please try this Dean, go on this journey this way with me and others like me. You will not regret it. Turn your thinking around, pray and go back through what I've sent you and what I'm about to show you. And even if you don't come around, try to enjoy the journey. I have. If all this wasn't meant for you, it will be a great proof for others down the road. Thanks for all you've already done on this and thanks in advance for any future work you decide to do. You are definitely sharpening my sword and strengthening my faith.

The Biblical Perspective (Dome w/ Floodgates)

Amos 9:6 It is He who builds His upper chambers in the heavens And has established His **vaulted dome** (the **firmament** of heaven) over the earth, He who calls to the waters of the sea and pours them out on the face of the earth—
The LORD is His name.

Genesis 7:11 In the six hundredth year **of** Noah's life, on the seventeenth day **of** the second month, on that same day all the fountains **of** the great deep burst open, and the windows *and floodgates of the heavens* were opened.

How does one dome a sphere?

A Reasonable Representation



This is a reasonable representation of the firmament, the earth “disc”, and the sun, moon and stars within the firmament. I don’t think though the representation of positions of the sun and moon are correct and the foundation is not shown. Everyone should read the Book of Enoch for a correct understanding of the actual earth, moon, sun and star mechanics and dynamics. Absolutely amazing. Enoch witnessed them directly. No one else has.

The Biblical Perspective (Not Measureable Circle)

[Jeremiah 31:37](#) (*The God laid foundation is not measureable yet, we have measurements?*) Thus says the LORD, “**If the heavens above can be measured and the foundations of the earth searched out below, then I will also cast off and abandon all the descendants of Israel for all that they have done,**” says the LORD.

[Isaiah 40:22](#) (*God says it's a circle not a sphere*) It is He who sits above **the circle of the earth**, and its inhabitants are like grasshoppers; [It is He] who stretches out the heavens like a veil and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in.

So, we have measurements and, we're still here. Hmm.

The Biblical Perspective (A Firm Foundation)

Psalm 104:5 (*The God laid foundation is not movable, we're not zipping around in space*) He established the earth on its **foundations**, So that **it will not be moved forever and ever**.

Isaiah 51:16 I have put My words in your mouth and have covered you with the shadow of My hand, to establish the [renewed] heavens and lay the **foundations** of the [renewed] earth, and to say to Zion (Jerusalem), ‘You are My people.’”

2 Samuel 22:16 “The channels of the sea appeared, The **foundations** of the world were uncovered at the rebuke of the LORD, at the blast of the breath of His nostrils.

Proverbs 8:29 When He set for the sea its boundary So that the waters would not transgress [the boundaries set by] His command, When He marked out the **foundations** of the earth—

Psalm 18:15 (*The God laid foundation has been and will again be laid bare*) Then the stream beds of the waters appeared, and the **foundations** of the world were laid bare at Your rebuke, O LORD, at the blast of the breath of Your nostrils.

Isaiah 24:18 Then it will be that he who flees at the sound of terror will fall into the pit, and he who comes up out of the pit will be caught in the snare; For the windows of heaven are opened, and the **foundations** of the earth tremble.

Psalm 96:10 Indeed, the world is firmly *and* securely established, it shall not be moved;

A Firm Foundation (Continued)

Job 38:4-6 (*There is a God laid foundation*) “Where were you when I laid the **foundation** of the earth? Tell Me, if you know *and* have understanding.⁵ “Who determined the measurements [of the earth], if you know? Or who stretched the [measuring] line on it? ⁶ “On what were its foundations fastened? Or who laid its cornerstone ---

Isaiah 51:13 That you have forgotten the LORD your Maker, Who stretched out the heavens And laid the **foundations** of the earth, That you continually tremble with fear all day long because of the rage of the oppressor, as he takes aim to destroy? And where is the rage of the oppressor?

The Biblical Perspective (Sun, Not Earth Moves)

1. [2 Samuel 23:4](#) Is like the morning light *when the sun rises*, A morning without clouds, *When the fresh grass springs out of the earth Through sunshine after rain.*’

2. [Ecclesiastes 1:5](#) Also, the **sun rises** and the **sun sets**; **and hurries** to the place where it **rises** again.

3. [Isaiah 13:10](#) For the stars of heaven and their constellations will not flash with their light; The **sun** will be dark when it **rises**, And **the moon will not shed its light**.

4. [Nahum 3:17](#) Your guardsmen are like the swarming locusts. Your marshals are like the hordes of grasshoppers settling in the stone walls on a cold day. When the **sun rises**, they fly away, And no one knows the place where they are.

5. [James 1:11](#) For the **sun rises** with a scorching wind and withers the grass; its flower falls off and its beauty fades away; so too will the rich man, in the midst of his pursuits, fade away.

6. [Matthew 5:45](#) so that you may [show yourselves to] be the children of your Father who is in heaven; for He makes His **sun rise** on those who are evil and on those who are good, and makes the rain fall on the righteous [those who are morally upright] and the unrighteous [the unrepentant, those who oppose Him].

7. [Mark 16:2](#) Very early on the first day of the week, they came to the tomb when the **sun** had **risen**.

8. [Job 26:8-10](#) “He wraps the waters in His clouds [which otherwise would spill on earth all at once], And the cloud does not burst under them. “He covers the face of the ^b**full moon** and spreads His cloud over it. “He has inscribed a circular limit (the horizon) on the face of the waters at the boundary between light and darkness.

Biblical Earth Characteristics Summary Analysis

- Job – God laid out the earth to specific measurements.
- Psalms – It has a firm foundation and it doesn't move. (In fake space)
- Jeremiah – The heavens and earth are not measureable by man so, how do we then have measurements? (Oh yeah, fake science)
- Isaiah – Earth is a circle, not a sphere and it has a covering or tent over it. Genesis tells us it's called the firmament and it's a dome.
- Isaiah – God is really proud of the earth's foundation, He goes on and on about it.
- Proverbs – God set the boundaries for the waters.

What Does “Fake” Science Say

A ChatGPT Query of “Planetary Science” w/ Commentary

The Assumptions Used To Create “Fake” Spherical Earth System And Call It Scientific Fact. Wait What?

So I employed ChatGPT, a free AI program that operates on a 2022 or so snapshot of the (Google) internet. Why highlight that it's Google? Well, as the coming story rolls out, you'll see the biblical and flat earth perspectives don't match Google's agenda and narrative so, most opinions, facts and data counter to the Google narrative are censored, removed or they just won't provide them so, you have to be careful when you use an AI program operating on okay, I'll say it, in a deep state system on deep state data. Garbage in, garbage out. So in this analysis I had to disguise my questions so that Google didn't know what I was doing and bring in data from outside, non-deep state search engines like DuckduckGo. I'll explain more as we go. The coming slides show you all the assumptions, postulates, axioms and theorems, all unproven or provable, the Deep State had to use to create their planetary system theory and then with circular reasoning, “say” it was true or, consensus science, so they could then teach it as fact. Consensus science? 9 out of 10 doctors were paid to tell you smoking was okay in the 40s and 50s. Similarly between 2020 and 2024, many doctors were paid to tell you Covid19 was real and vaccines were safe and effective. Hmm, sounds fishy. It is. How's consensus science working for you? So, let's dive in.

Axioms, Postulates and Theorems

Axioms:

An axiom is a statement or proposition that is regarded as **self-evidently true without any need for proof**. (vey convenient) In the context of mathematics and logic, axioms serve as fundamental starting points from which other statements are logically derived. Axioms are essential for constructing mathematical theories and logical systems, providing the foundational principles upon which the entire framework is built. Axioms are **considered to be universally valid** and are **not subject to further analysis or proof** within a particular system. (again, very convenient) They are assumed to be true and are used as the basis for establishing the validity of other theorems and propositions. (when caught, circular reason your way out) Axioms are often used synonymously with postulates, especially in the context of geometry. For example, Euclid's axioms, also known as postulates, form the basis of Euclidean geometry. These axioms include statements such as the existence of a straight line between any two points and the ability to extend a finite straight line continuously. These principles serve as the starting points for constructing the entire geometric system. Axioms play a critical role in shaping the logical structure of various fields of study, providing the necessary framework for formulating hypotheses, theories, and models. While axioms are assumed to be true within a specific logical system, they can differ across different systems or theories, reflecting the diverse perspectives and assumptions inherent in various branches of mathematics, logic, and philosophy.

Axioms, Postulates and Theorems

Postulates:

A postulate is a statement or proposition that is **accepted as true without proof**, (again, very convenient) serving as a starting point for deducing and proving other statements within a particular system or framework, typically in the fields of mathematics, logic, and geometry. Postulates are also known as axioms, and they establish the fundamental assumptions upon which a specific theory or branch of knowledge is built. Postulates are crucial in establishing the basic rules and assumptions that underlie a particular system of thought or field of study. They provide a framework for developing logical arguments and mathematical proofs within that system, **guiding the process** (others might say manipulating) of building a coherent and internally consistent body of knowledge. (some might say narrative or hoax) While postulates are assumed to be true within a specific context, **they can sometimes be revised or replaced** (again, very convenient, a bit like a get out of jail free card or ace of trump) in alternative systems of thought or with the development of new theories or concepts. The careful selection and formulation of postulates are essential for constructing sound and robust theories and frameworks in mathematics, logic, and other disciplines.

Axioms, Postulates and Theorems

Theorems:

In mathematics and logic, a theorem is a statement that has **been proven on the basis of previously established statements**, (you caught that right, established statements, not proven facts. Subtle, very subtle and of course convenient) such as other theorems and axioms, and is typically identified as an important result within a specific branch of mathematics. The process of proving a theorem involves logical reasoning and the application of mathematical concepts and principles. A theorem is distinct from a definition, which simply assigns a meaning to a term, and from an axiom, which is a statement that is accepted without proof as a starting point for deducing and proving other statements. Theorems are the building blocks of mathematical knowledge and play a crucial role in the development of mathematical theories and the advancement of mathematical understanding. A well-formulated theorem is generally precise and unambiguous, providing **clear conditions under which it holds true**. (I sure don't remember that part from school) The proof of a theorem is a demonstration, often using logical arguments and mathematical techniques, that the theorem is valid under the given conditions. The process of proving theorems is a fundamental aspect of mathematical research and serves to establish the validity of mathematical statements and the relationships between various mathematical concepts. Theorems have far-reaching implications in various branches of mathematics, as they form the basis for the development of mathematical structures, theories, and applications. They contribute to the formulation of mathematical models used in various scientific disciplines and play a vital role in solving complex mathematical problems and advancing our understanding of the natural world.

Quick Summary

- To establish fake, biblically unmeasurable planetary masses, 8 assumptions, 1 Postulate, 1 Axiom and 3 Theorems were necessary. All unprovable or observable.
- To establish fake, planetary rotations, 6 assumptions, 2 Axioms and 8 Theorems were necessary. All unprovable or observable.
- To establish fake, planetary orbits, 3 assumptions, 2 Axioms and 4 Theorems were necessary. All unprovable or observable.

In total, there are a minimum of 30 independent, unprovable assumptions, Axioms, Postulates and Theorems necessary to create the fake world some chose to live on.

Planetary Mass Calc Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems...

Query: List all the assumptions, postulates, axioms and mathematical theorems the calculations of the earth, sun and moon **masses** are based on.

ChatGPT

The calculations of the masses of the Earth, Sun, and Moon involve a combination of observational data, **theoretical models**, and mathematical principles from various fields of physics, mechanics, and celestial dynamics. While providing an exhaustive list of all the **assumptions, postulates, axioms, and theorems** involved is not feasible in this format, I can mention some of the key elements that are typically used in these calculations:

Assumptions:

1. Spherical symmetry: The celestial bodies are often assumed to be approximately spherical to simplify calculations.
2. Uniform distribution of mass: The mass distribution of the celestial bodies is considered relatively uniform over the scales relevant to the calculations.
3. Gravitational interactions: The gravitational forces between the Earth, Sun, and Moon are **assumed** to follow Newton's law of universal gravitation. This law states that every particle attracts every other particle in the universe with a force that is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between their centers. The formula is given by $F = G * (m_1 * m_2) / r^2$, where F is the gravitational force, G is the gravitational constant, m_1 and m_2 are the masses of the two objects, and r is the distance between their centers.
4. Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion: These laws describe the motion of planets and other objects in the solar system. They include:
 - a. The law of orbits: All planets move in elliptical orbits, with the Sun at one of the focal points.
 - b. The law of areas: A line that connects a planet to the Sun sweeps out equal areas in equal times.
 - c. The law of periods: The square of the orbital period of a planet is directly proportional to the cube of the semi-major axis of its orbit.
5. Equations of motion: These equations, derived **from Newton's second law** of motion, are used to describe the dynamics of the celestial bodies. They take into account the gravitational forces between the bodies and the resulting accelerations.
6. Equations for orbital dynamics: These equations describe the motion of celestial bodies in orbit around each other and involve concepts such as centripetal force, angular momentum, and orbital energy.
7. Equations related to the perturbations of celestial bodies: Various perturbations, such as those caused by other celestial bodies or relativistic effects, can be taken into account through specific mathematical models and equations.
8. Mass determination techniques: These include methods such as analyzing the orbits of natural and artificial satellites, gravitational interactions between celestial bodies, and other observational data from space missions and ground-based observations.

Planetary Mass Calc Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems...

Query: List all the assumptions, postulates, axioms and mathematical theorems the calculations of the earth, sun and moon **masses** are based on.

ChatGPT (Continued)

Calculations involving the masses of celestial bodies are complex and involve a combination of **theoretical models**, empirical data, and advanced mathematical techniques. The specific assumptions and theorems used may vary depending on the specific context and the precision required for the calculations.

Postulates and Axioms:

1. Newton's laws of motion: These fundamental principles of classical mechanics form the basis for understanding the dynamics of the celestial bodies and their interactions.
2. Axioms of celestial mechanics: These axioms establish the basic assumptions and principles governing the motions of celestial objects, including the conservation of energy and momentum.

Mathematical theorems:

1. Newton's law of universal gravitation: This theorem describes the gravitational force between two objects and is fundamental to understanding the gravitational interactions between celestial bodies.
2. Gauss's law for gravity: This theorem is used in the calculation of the gravitational fields and potential of massive bodies.
3. Theorems of orbital dynamics: These theorems describe the motion of celestial bodies in orbit and include concepts such as angular momentum, orbital energy, and the equations of motion for celestial mechanics.

The calculations of the masses of the Earth, Sun, and Moon involve a combination of these principles and concepts, along with specific mathematical techniques and observational data to derive accurate estimates of their masses and interactions.

Planetary Rotation Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems...

Query: List all the assumptions, postulates, axioms and mathematical theorems the calculations of the earth and moon **rotations** about their axis are based on.

ChatGPT

The calculations of the Earth and Moon rotations about their axes involve a combination of assumptions, postulates, axioms, and mathematical principles from the fields of physics and celestial mechanics. While providing an exhaustive list is not feasible in this format, I can mention some of the fundamental elements typically used in these calculations:

Assumptions:

1. Spherical symmetry: The Earth and Moon are often assumed to be approximately spherical to simplify calculations.
2. Stability of the rotational axis: The rotational axes of the Earth and Moon are considered relatively stable over the timescales of interest.
3. Negligible atmospheric effects: The effects of the atmosphere on the orbits are often considered negligible.
4. Two-body problem: In many cases, the orbits are simplified by assuming that only two bodies are involved, neglecting the influences of other celestial bodies.
5. Conservation of angular momentum: It is often assumed that the angular momentum of the system is conserved.
6. Uniform distribution of mass: The mass distribution of the Earth and Moon is assumed to be relatively uniform over the scales relevant to the calculations.

Postulates and axioms:

1. Axioms of rotational dynamics: These axioms establish the fundamental principles governing the rotational motion of solid bodies, including the conservation of angular momentum and the laws of motion.
2. Axioms of celestial mechanics: These axioms form the basis for understanding the motion of celestial bodies, including the principles of conservation of energy and momentum.

Mathematical theorems:

1. Euler's rotation theorem: This theorem describes the movement of a rigid body about a fixed point and is essential for understanding the rotation of the Earth and Moon about their axes.
2. Theorems of rotational dynamics: These theorems describe the rotational motion of solid bodies, including concepts such as torque, angular acceleration, and the moment of inertia.
3. **Newton's Law** of Universal Gravitation: This law describes the gravitational force between two objects with masses and the distance between their centers. It is crucial in understanding the gravitational interactions between the Earth, Sun, and Moon.
4. Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion: These laws, as mentioned previously, describe the motion of planets and other celestial bodies. They are crucial for understanding the patterns and dynamics of the orbits of celestial bodies.
5. Conservation of Energy: The principle of conservation of energy is applied to the celestial system to understand how energy is exchanged and conserved within the system.
6. Conservation of Angular Momentum: This principle is applied to the system to understand the conservation of angular momentum in the orbits of the celestial bodies.
7. Gauss's Theorema Egregium: This theorem is used to understand the intrinsic curvature of a surface (like the Earth's surface) embedded in a higher-dimensional space.
8. Lagrange's planetary equations: These equations are used to describe the motion of a small body orbiting a central body under the influence of their mutual gravitational attraction.

These assumptions, theorems, and laws, among others, form the foundation for the mathematical models used to describe the complex orbits of the Earth, Sun, and Moon. Advanced analytical and numerical techniques are employed in conjunction with these principles to accurately model and predict the motions and interactions of these celestial bodies.

Planetary Orbit Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems, etc.

Query: List all the assumptions, axioms, postulates and mathematical theorems that are used to prove the earth orbits the sun as opposed to the sun and moon **orbiting** the earth.

ChatGPT

The understanding that the Earth orbits the Sun, as opposed to the Sun and Moon orbiting the Earth, is a fundamental concept in modern astronomy and physics. (9 out of 10 paid for scientists agree. I call bullshit. See how they do this?) This conclusion is derived from a combination of observations, experiments, and mathematical models. And yet: Below are some of the key assumptions, principles, and mathematical theorems that support the heliocentric model, where the Earth orbits the Sun:

Assumptions:

1. Uniformitarian principle: Assumes that the same natural laws and processes that operate in the present also operated in the past and will continue to operate in the future.
2. Geometrical observations: Observations of the positions of celestial bodies and their movements relative to each other, recorded over centuries, provide the basis for understanding the heliocentric model.
3. Absence of detectable stellar parallax: The absence of significant stellar parallax in the observations implies that either the Earth is stationary or the stars are much farther away than the scale of the Earth's orbit, supporting the heliocentric model.

Postulates and axioms:

1. Axioms of celestial mechanics: These axioms establish the basic assumptions and principles governing the motions of celestial objects, including the laws of planetary motion proposed by Johannes Kepler.
2. Axioms of orbital dynamics: These axioms form the basis for understanding the dynamics of objects in orbit, including the principles of conservation of energy and angular momentum.

Mathematical theorems:

1. Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion: These laws describe the motion of planets and other celestial bodies and were formulated based on careful observations, providing strong support for the heliocentric model.
2. Newton's Laws of Motion: These fundamental laws of physics govern the motion of celestial bodies and provide a theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of the solar system, including the Earth's motion around the Sun.
3. Foucault pendulum experiment: This experiment demonstrated the rotation of the Earth on its axis, providing evidence that the Earth is not stationary and supporting the heliocentric model.
4. Stellar aberration: The phenomenon of stellar aberration, discovered by James Bradley, is a consequence of the Earth's motion around the Sun and provides strong evidence for the Earth's orbital motion.

These assumptions, postulates, axioms, and theorems collectively support the understanding that the Earth orbits the Sun, providing a fundamental basis for the heliocentric model of the solar system.

Simplification and Analysis

For simplicity, let's consolidate the assumptions, axioms, postulates and theorems common to the fake spherical system and it's mass, orbit and rotation calculations, circular reasoning. (slight of hand):

Assumptions:

- Uniformitarian principle: Assumes that the same natural laws and processes that operate in the present also operated in the past and will continue to operate in the future.
- Geometrical observations: Observations of the positions of celestial bodies and their movements relative to each other, recorded over centuries, provide the basis for understanding the heliocentric model.
- Absence of detectable stellar parallax: The absence of significant stellar parallax in the observations implies that either the Earth is stationary or the stars are much farther away than the scale of the Earth's orbit, supporting the heliocentric model.

Postulates and axioms:

- Axioms of celestial mechanics: These axioms establish the basic assumptions and principles governing the motions of celestial objects, including the laws of planetary motion proposed by Johannes Kepler.
- Axioms of orbital dynamics: These axioms form the basis for understanding the dynamics of objects in orbit, including the principles of conservation of energy and angular momentum.

Mathematical theorems:

- Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion: These laws describe the motion of planets and other celestial bodies and were formulated based on careful observations, providing strong support for the heliocentric model. **“It's the poor score keeper who doesn't always win the game.” They created the data, measurements and math to support their theory.**
- Newton's Laws of Motion: These fundamental laws of physics govern the motion of celestial bodies and provide a theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of the solar system, including the Earth's motion around the Sun. **Again, good score keeper.**
- Foucault pendulum experiment: This experiment demonstrated the rotation of the Earth on its axis, providing evidence that the Earth is not stationary and supporting the heliocentric model. **You get the same effect with sun & moon revolving around earth.**
- Stellar aberration: The phenomenon of stellar aberration, discovered by James Bradley, is a consequence of the Earth's motion around the Sun and provides strong evidence for the Earth's orbital motion.

These assumptions, postulates, axioms, and theorems collectively support the understanding that the moon orbits the Earth which rotates about it's axis and orbits the Sun, providing a fundamental basis for the heliocentric model of the solar system.

Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems 1 by 1

Alrighty then, that's a lot of assumptions, theorems, axioms and postulates, most of which have not been or are not provable, that are necessary to support this hoax. Below I will use a combination of biblical examples and experimental contradictions to crack the hoax foundation and hopefully weaken your allegiance to it.

Let's begin with the Uniformitarian Principle. Seriously, there is such a thing. Sounds a whole lot like a gender identity issue so clearly it's directly from Satan but, I digress. Reminder: Uniformitarian principle: Assumes that the same natural laws and processes that operate in the present also operated in the past and will continue to operate in the future. Okay, so this Satanic principle directly conflicts with several biblical topics and their own narratives on evolution. There was an all earth encompassing flood which God said via a rainbow covenant would never happen again. That's different. Satan took that symbol for his LGBTQXYZ Trans movement but again I digress. There were giants on the earth not just in the bible (Nephilim), but in archeology. Massive humans, much larger than Goliath. Think 20 feet tall. Change 2. Dinosaurs, huh, change 3. Ancient giant trees, with bases as large as mountains. Think of that mountain in that Richard Dryfus movie Contact I think it was, that's a petrified tree stump, not a mountain they're all magically drawn to. There are several others like it around the world. I have pictures. That's 4. Let's not forget their global warming hoax and different oxygen, nitrogen etc. mixes in the atmosphere they claim over the eons. That's 5. Finally for now, the constellations. They're changing regularly as they are a story God has given us of our past and things to come. They are part of His prophecies. That's 5 and the main reason it is so important for Satan to keep us in the dark with this whole spherical earth planetary orbit mess to distract us from what God is telling us in the heavens. That's 6, myth busted.

Spherical Symmetry & Uniform Mass Distribution. Seriously? Everest is on one side of the fake sphere and the Grand Canyon on the other. There are trenches in the ocean we don't even know where the bottoms are yet. Their fake space photos of the earth make it look pear shaped. Which the heck is it? It's pear shaped in those photos because they didn't have Photoshop back in the day so it was a pretty weak hack or kluge back then. Go look at that photo closely. It's always the same. Why only one? Didn't we fake go to space and the moon more than once? Why is there no fake rotation motion blur in that photo? Think how long that exposure had to be with a film based camera and what a mess that photo should be. And how did they transmit that without MPEG or JPEG compression, through the Van Allen radiation belt?

Foucault Pendulum Experiment. Like gravity, there is no way to actually prove the pendulum's motion can only be caused or explained by earth's rotation or gravity, or is a derivative of all the bogus motions of planets, sun, moon and stars. What if God just decided gravity would be a cool thing kinda like a photon or electron, etc. ?

Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems 1 by 1 Continued

Next lets tackle Stellar Parallax and Aberration. Reminder: Absence of detectable stellar parallax: The absence of significant stellar parallax in the observations implies that either the Earth is stationary or the stars are much farther away than the scale of the Earth's orbit, supporting the heliocentric model. In case you're not familiar with parallax: Stellar parallax is an astronomical phenomenon that refers to the apparent shift in the position of a nearby star relative to more distant stars, when observed from two different points. This effect occurs due to the motion of the observer, typically the Earth, as it orbits the Sun. The basic concept of stellar parallax is analogous to the way objects appear to shift when viewed from slightly different positions. If you hold your finger in front of your face and close one eye and then the other, you'll notice the apparent shift of your finger against the background. This is due to the different perspectives provided by each eye. Similarly, as the Earth orbits the Sun, stars appear to shift their positions relative to more distant stars over the course of a year. Stellar parallax provides astronomers with a fundamental method for measuring the distances to nearby stars. By observing the shift in position of a star over a period of six months, scientists can calculate the angle of parallax, which is inversely proportional to the distance to the star. This method allows astronomers to determine the distance to relatively close stars, which would be challenging to measure using other techniques. The measurement of stellar parallax is a crucial component in the study of the structure and scale of the universe. It has been an essential tool in establishing the fundamental framework of modern astronomy, including the development of the heliocentric model and the determination of the scale of the solar system and beyond.) The stars are moving, not the earth! See 4. Above in the Uniformitarian principle. I can't even write that without laughing.

Conservation of Angular Momentum and Negligible External Torques. Friction is always present everywhere so there will always be a torque on a moving object, always. Not in space you say? How convenient for them. They couldn't make their BS model work if there were atmosphere and friction in space so, they just declared a vacuum in space, yeah that's it, a vacuum, that would do it. We got this. So wrong. How convenient yet again, the space morons, NASA, the only ones that have fake been there, tell us "Illuminati Honor", there is no atmosphere in space, it's a vacuum. There's a firmament between heaven and earth. We can't go through it in these bodies unless God opens them to us. Enoch and Elijah are the only ones to go and return in these bodies.

Assumptions, Axioms, Theorems 1 by 1 Continued

Okay, that's enough for now. I could go on but, if you really look at all those unprovable assumptions, axioms, theorems, etc. and are really honest about it, you'd have to agree there is a whole lot of convenient hand waving hocus pocus or ignoring of the man behind the curtain going on in there. You also have to admit, the circular reasoning. Each assumption, axiom, theorem etc. heaped on top of another while at the same time used in the model of the other. Pretty flimsy base if there is a base at all. Do you see how they've convinced us that a theory at best, is fact? They do that constantly. Back in the 50s and 60s, they paid enough doctors off so they could say 9 out of 10 doctors agree, smoking is good for you. How true was that? There are dozens of similar examples in between that and the Covid Vaccine (bioweapon). You can buy 9 out of 10 opinions any time you need. And oh, by the way, you can then destroy the 1 out of 10 with lies, threats, extortion, blackmail, expulsion, etc. It never ends. We all have to remain critical thinkers.

"If ten people are in a room, and nine agree on how to interpret and respond to a situation, the tenth man must disagree. His duty is to find the best possible argument for why the decision of the group is flawed."

By The “Fake” Numbers

Using Math, Science & Observation to Disprove Satanic Math, Science (or Lack Thereof), Lies, Deceptions and Illusions

Breaking Their Fake Model w/ Acceleration

Equation for acceleration of fake sphere around sun:


$$a=r/v^2 \quad a \approx 5.93 \times 10^3 \text{ m/s}^2$$

Where:

a is the centripetal acceleration.

v is the orbital speed of the Earth around the Sun.

r is the radius of Earth's orbit, approximately equal to the average distance from Earth to the Sun (1 astronomical unit, $AU \approx 1.496 \times 10^{11}$ meters).



Equation for acceleration of fake sphere about its fake axis:

$$a=r\omega^2 \quad a \approx 0.034 \text{ m/s}^2$$

Where:

a is the centripetal acceleration.

r is the distance from the axis of rotation (radius of rotation).




ω (omega) is the angular velocity of Earth's rotation.

This picture shows that at night, my centripetal acceleration about the earth's fake axis would be toward the sun while during the day it would be away from the sun. At night then my acceleration toward the sun should be $0.00593 + 0.034 + 9.8 = 9.84 \text{ m/s}$ while during the day it would be $0.034 - 0.00593 + 9.8 = 9.828 \text{ m/s}$. $(9.84 - 9.828)/9.8 = 0.0012$ or 0.12%. So, during the day a 200lb individual should weigh 0.24lbs less than at night.

Forces related to the moon are $1/200^{\text{th}}$ of those about the sun so, have been left out for simplicity. The moon does not cause tides.

Breaking Their Fake Model w/ Acceleration

Since there are many weight variables for a human during a day, my cat Spartacus was kind enough to lend me a couple of his kitty litter boxes for this experiment. So, 80lbs of kitty litter should weigh 0.1lbs or 1.6oz less at high noon than it would at midnight. What I saw was an identical weight at noon and midnight. I also checked at 6pm and 6am to be thorough. Hmm. So, all precision scientific measurements should consider this? They don't.



Consensus Science, Best Opinions Money Can Buy


Consensus Medicine



Consensus Medicine (for slow learners)




Consensus Planetary Lies



"If ten people are in a room, and nine agree on how to interpret and respond to a situation, the tenth man must disagree. His duty is to find the best possible argument for why the decision of the group is flawed."

NASA is Hebrew for Deceived

So why NASA and not ASC, American Space Center or CSE, Center for Space Exploration or USSC, USCSE, etc. ? NASA is not an administration and has little to do with Aeronautics, remember, they're in fake space. Hmm.



Remember in the 60s when they told us the earth was “slightly pear” shaped because their paper Mache model warped right before they had to film and air their fake mission? How'd we get back to a regular sphere anyway?

Isaiah 8:12 “You are not to say, ‘It is a conspiracy!’ In regard to all that this people call a conspiracy, and you are not to fear what they fear nor be in dread of it.”

SELECT VERSE OLIVE TREE ENHANCED STRONG'S DICTIONARY

נָשָׁא

STRONG'S NUMBER:**h5377**

Dictionary Definition


h5377. נָשָׁא *nâšâ'*; a primitive root; to lead astray, i.e. (mentally) to delude, or (morally) to seduce: — beguile, deceive, x greatly, x utterly.

AV (16) - deceive 12, greatly 1, beguiled me 1, seize 1, utterly 1;

1. to beguile, deceive
 - (Niphal) to be beguiled
 - (Hiphil) to beguile, deceive
 - (Qal) utterly (infinitif)

SEARCH FOR
[h5377נָשָׁא](#)


NASA Fakery Exposed



What's wrong with this picture?

That's the continental United States in the top right quadrant. The way I reoriented the photo shows that NASA's continental United States covers exactly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the circumference of the fake sphere, except it doesn't. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the fake sphere's fake circumference is 6,220 miles while the continental United States is only 3,000ish miles coast to coast. Oops. NASA really needs to get better with their fake numbers, models and Photoshop.

More Basic Concepts & Equations



The fake, biblically immeasurable sphere, is 24,880 miles in fake circumference and has a 3,960 mile fake radius. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the fake circumference would then be 6,220 miles.

What this means is if I walk 6,220 miles in a straight line on the surface of the earth between points A and B, I will have dropped or climbed 3,960 miles depending on which direction I was traveling.


That means for every mile I travel along the surface of the fake sphere, I either drop or rise $3,960/6,220$ or 0.64 miles. Right? So, the fake sphere average slope is 0.64 miles.

So, if I walk 10 miles along the surface, I drop or rise 6.4 miles over that distance or, if I walk 100 miles I drop or rise 64 miles. Right?

Vanishing Point Eye Resolution Equation

For the flat earth, we need different math with, real numbers:

Minimum Resolution of a Typical Constricted Pupil = 0.02 Degrees



$$PH = x \sin(\theta)$$

$$x = PH / \tan(\theta)$$

$$D_{inv} = PH / (\tan(\theta_{inv}))$$

$$D_{inv} = x \cos(\theta)$$

PH = Peak Height

D_{inv} = Distance to Invisibility or, Loss of Resolution

This equation will be used to show how far away an object with proper contrast (snow capped mountain against a blue or brown background) would be viewable by the human eye on a perfectly clear day on the actual flat earth.

Equations Applied

Let's now apply our fake sphere and flat earth equations to an actual mountain on the earth, Mount Everest. Mount Everest is approximately 25,000 feet or, 5 miles high.

Using our fake sphere model, that would mean by the time we walked 5/0.64 or 7.8 miles from the base of Mount Everest, it would disappear from view. Hmm, we all know that's not the case.

Now let's apply our flat earth vanishing point equation ($D_{inv} = PH / (\tan(\Theta_{inv}))$) to Mount Everest.


$$\text{FE } D_{inv} = PH / (\tan(\Theta_{inv})) = PH / 0.000349 = 5 / 0.000349 = 14,326 \text{ miles}$$

PH = Peak Height

D_{inv} = Distance to Invisibility or, Loss of Resolution



Obviously with modern day smog, haze, etc., we are not able to see that far but, you get the idea, we easily see mountains 100s of miles away that we shouldn't be able to see at all on the fake sphere. With a telephoto lens or other optical aid, these distances could be easily achieved.

Flat Earth Proof via Local Peak Observations



These are all photos from the top of Mount Rose near Reno NV, via my cell phone. On the fake sphere, I should not be able to see any of these peaks from my viewing location.

Mount Whitney from Mount Rose



Flat Earth (FE) Vanishing Point Vs Fake Sphere (FS) Invisibility & Obstructed View (OV) Distances

From a sea level clear view w/ no other mountain obstruction, no clouds or haze:

No Anderson Peak Obstruction

Mountain	PH _(min) [ft]	FE (Vanish) [mi]	FS D _(inv) [mi]	Rose Dist	Obs View _[mi]
Whitney	14,520.0	7880	4.30	209	132
Rainier	14,411.0	7821	4.26	529	337
Shasta	14,179.0	7695	4.20	185	116
Castle Peak	11,827.0	6418	3.50	420	267
Hood	11,240.0	6100	3.33	390	248
Rose	10,776.0	5848	3.19	0	NA
Lassen	10,465.0	5679	3.10	115	71.6
Buttes	2,210.0	1199	0.65	110	68.4
747	130.0	71	0.04	10	4.4

OV distance is the distance (by the time our gaze would reach the peak) above the peak because we're forced to look over the fake earth curvature or view slope.

$$FE\ D_{inv} = PH / (\tan(\Theta_{inv})) = PH / 0.000349$$

$$FS\ D_{inv} = VS * PH = 3,960 / (24,880 / 4) * PH = 0.64 * PH$$


$$Obs\ View = VS * (Rose\ Dist. - FS\ D_{inv}) = 0.64 * (Rose\ Dist. - FS\ D_{inv})$$

$\Theta = 0.02$ degrees (minimum human eye resolution)

$\tan(\Theta) = 0.000349$

We will go through each of the examples in this table in detail in the coming slides.

Sad Truth Beyond Measure



*It's easier to fool
people than to
convince them
that they have
been fooled.*

-Mark Twain

Sadly, he was an Illuminati,
Satanist so, he knew.

Mount Shasta


From The Top of Mount Rose

Mount Shasta Facts

Mount Shasta, a stratovolcano located in Northern California, has an elevation of approximately 14,179 feet (4,322 meters) above sea level.

The distance from Mount Rose in Nevada to Mount Shasta in California is approximately 185 miles (225 kilometers) as the crow flies.



Mt Shasta From Mt Rose



So on my way to photo the fake sphere's predicted hump at Lake Tahoe I stopped to climb Mt Rose, an 10,785 foot peak near Incline. On the way down at about 10,735 feet I noticed Mount Shasta. I'd seen it several times before but this time it dawned on me that I probably shouldn't be able to see so much of the 14,179 foot peak behind other peaks due to the fake curvature of the fake spherical earth.

Mt Shasta From Mt Rose Confirmation



Dean's Photo




Bryed's Photo



Mt Rose to Mt Shasta Via Lassen As The Crow Flies



Rose, Shasta, Lassen By The Numbers






Blow Up From The Photo



Note: These numbers don't take into account the view slope from Mt Rose. Those calculations follow.

Mount Shasta Model


Peaks	Mt Rose (View Point)	Ridgeline	Mt Lassen	Ridgeline	Mt Shasta
Flat Earth View					
Height [FT]	10,735	9,235	10,457	9,235	14,179
Distance From Rose [Mi]	0	115	115	115	185
View Down Slope [FT/Mi]		13.0		13.0	
View Height @ Dist [mi]		1222			5857



In the Spherical Earth Model We should not see any of Shasta yet we see nearly 6,000 feet of it.

The mountains between Rose and Mount Shasta are between 9,000 and 9,300 ft. As the upper left model indicates, the Flat Earth (FE) view slope over the intermediate range will allow us to see about 5,857 feet of Mt Shasta, 185 miles away. It is tempting to think that we could use similar reasoning or concepts on the fake sphere and the lower left model but, that's not how the optics would work on the fake sphere. On the fake sphere, Shasta would be blocked from view by the fake hump between it and Rose. Even using the flat earth model shows, you wouldn't see Mt Shasta but, it's actually far worse. The next slides will show you really wouldn't see Mt Shasta, by a lot.

Concepts & Equations, Applied To Fake Sphere



In the case of Mt Shasta, viewed from Mt Rose:

$$VS = 0.64 \text{ or } 64\%$$

For Shasta @ **b**, from Rose @ **a**, **D** = 185 miles so:

It is tempting to think we should be able to see one peak from the other on the fake sphere because both are so tall however, we must consider how the View Slope from Mt Rose actually works. It is the constant View Slope of the fake sphere which is still 0.64, though, from point **c** rather than point **a**. So, the height of Mt Rose in viewing Mt Shasta on the fake sphere does affect the View Slope. It does so by effectively shortening the distance to the point of interest. In the case of Mt Rose at 10,735 feet, our viewing distance is shortened by $10,735/0.64 = 16,773$ ft or 3.18 mi (distance from **a** to **c**). So, the drop of Mt Shasta at 185 miles away would then be $0.64 \times (185 - 3.18) = 116$ mi. So, being on Mt Rose at about 2 miles height decreased the drop of Mt Shasta below our field of view by, 2 miles, from 118 miles to 116 miles or roughly, by the height of Mt Rose.

Further Analysis & Reflections

I know 116 miles below our view horizon seems absurd but, it's actually not. Consider that 185 miles is just under 3% of a quarter of the circumference of the fake sphere, $185/6,220 = 0.0297$. So, we'd expect the change in our view horizon to be in the same range. Let's check: $116/3,960 = 0.0293$ or, $\sim 3\%$. So clearly, these numbers are reasonable no matter how difficult to fathom. The Satanists should have chosen better numbers if they didn't want us to notice and figure this out. The reason it has been so difficult to see for so long is the witchcraft, sorcery, spells and veils involved. They literally have cast spells on so many and heaped lies on top of lies. They are truly a wicked lot.

Proverbs 25:2

"It is the **glory of** God to conceal a matter, But the **glory of kings** is to search out a matter."

John 8:32

And **you will** know the **truth**, and the **truth will set you free** [from the penalty of sin]."

The definition of sin is: "Separation from God". Anything that separates us from God, not just the bad things we do but, idols, lies, deceptions, people, etc. All the weapons Satan uses against us while we're oblivious to them.

Isaiah 8:12

"You are not to say, 'It is a conspiracy!' In regard to all that this people call a conspiracy, and you are not to fear what they fear nor be in dread of it."

Psalm 64:2

"Hide me from the secret counsel *and* conspiracy of the ungodly, from the scheming of those who do wrong."

Parting Shot





This is Mount Shasta from the last point of visibility on Mount Rose at about 9,000 feet in elevation. The trail at this point takes you behind the mountain in the foreground which is in the range of 9,500 feet. So, we've dropped nearly 1,700 feet in elevation from our original photos and we can still see quite a bit of Mount Shasta as the flat earth model predicts.




Mount Whitney

From The Top of Mount Rose

Mt Rose to Mt Whitney as The Crow Flies




Mount Whitney from Mount Rose




Mount Whitney, the tallest mountain in the contiguous United States, stands at **14,505 feet (4,421 meters)** above sea level. It is located in the Sierra Nevada range of California.

Mount Whitney and Mount Rose are approximately 209 miles (336 kilometers) apart in a straight line. Mount Whitney, at 14,505 feet (4,421 meters), is the tallest mountain in the contiguous United States, located in the Sierra Nevada range of California. Mount Rose, standing at 10,776 feet (3,285 meters), is the highest peak in Washoe County, Nevada, situated within the Carson Range between Lake Tahoe and Reno.

Mount Whitney From Mount Rose



Mount Whitney From Mount Rose



a to c


Mountain	PH _(min) [ft]	FE (Vanish) [mi]	FS D _(inv) [mi]	Rose Dist	Obs View [mi]
Whitney	14,520.0	7880	4.30	209	132
Rainier	14,411.0	7821	4.26	529	337
Shasta	14,179.0	7695	4.20	185	116
Castle Peak	11,827.0	6418	3.50	420	267
Hood	11,240.0	6100	3.33	390	248
Rose	10,776.0	5848	3.19	0	NA
Lassen	10,465.0	5679	3.10	115	71.6
Buttes	2,210.0	1199	0.65	110	68.4
747	130.0	71	0.04	10	4.4

Again, it is tempting to think we should be able to see one peak from the other on the fake sphere because both are so tall. Once again the constant View Slope of the fake sphere which is still 0.64, though, from point **c** rather than point **a**, as the height of Mt Rose does effectively shorten the distance to the point of interest. In the case of Mt Rose at 10,735 feet, our viewing distance is shortened by $10,735/0.64 = 16,773$ ft or 3.18 mi (distance from **a** to **c**). So, Mount Whitney would then be $0.64 \times (209 - 3.18) = 132$ mi below our view from Mt Rose.



Castle Peak, Sawtooth Mountains, Idaho

From The Top of Mount Rose


The Peaks of Interest Layout



Castle Peak Photos From Mt Rose



Castle Peak From Mount Rose



Fake Radius = 3,960 mi

Fake Circumference = 24,880 mi


a to c

Mountain	PH _(min) [ft]	FE _(Vanish) [mi]	FS D _(inv) [mi]	Rose Dist	Obs View _[mi]
Whitney	14,520.0	7880	4.30	209	132
Rainier	14,411.0	7821	4.26	529	337
Shasta	14,179.0	7695	4.20	185	116
Castle Peak	11,827.0	6418	3.50	420	267
Hood	11,240.0	6100	3.33	390	248
Rose	10,776.0	5848	3.19	0	NA
Lassen	10,465.0	5679	3.10	115	71.6
Buttes	2,210.0	1199	0.65	110	68.4
747	130.0	71	0.04	10	4.4

The constant View Slope of the fake sphere is still 0.64, though, from point **c** rather than point **a**. So, the height of Mt Rose in viewing Castle Peak on the fake sphere does affect the View Slope. It does so by effectively shortening the distance to the point of interest. In the case of Mt Rose at 10,735 feet, our viewing distance is shortened by $10,735/0.64 = 16,773$ ft or 3.18 mi (distance from **a** to **c**). So, Castle Peak would then be $0.64 \times (420 - 3.18) = 267$ mi below our view from Mt Rose.

Sawtooths Back to Mt Shasta & Mt Rose

June 24th, 2024 From Horton Peak 9,986 ft
Sawtooth Wilderness, Shasta in the distance.



The Sutter Buttes

From The Top of Mount Rose

Sutter Butte Facts

The tallest of the Sutter Buttes is South Butte, which stands at an elevation of 2,122 feet (647 meters) above the surrounding valley floor. The Sutter Buttes, often referred to as the "World's Smallest Mountain Range," are a small circular complex of eroded volcanic lava domes and flows in Sutter County, California, in the Sacramento Valley.


The Sutter Buttes and Mount Rose are located in different regions of California and Nevada, respectively. The Sutter Buttes are situated in Sutter County, California, while Mount Rose is in the Carson Range of Nevada. The distance between the peak of the Sutter Buttes and the peak of Mount Rose is approximately 110 miles (177 kilometers) in a straight line. However, the actual travel distance can be longer depending on the route taken, as it would involve traversing various roads and highways through different geographical terrains.

Sutter Buttes From Mt Rose




On a climb of Mt Rose, a 10,785 foot peak near Incline I took this photo on the way down at about 10,735 feet. It looks straight across Donner Lake towards the Sutter Buttes, the shortest mountain range in the world. With the naked eye in the bright sunlight, and lack of contrast with mountains in the view, you can't quite make out the Sutter Buttes but, watch what happens when we zoom in on them in this photo on the next slides. I shouldn't be able to see them at all on a fake spherical earth at any magnification because of the fake curvature of the earth, as they are only 2,120 feet high and the range in between is about 9,000 feet high. They would be over 70 miles below the horizon on the fake sphere.


Sutter Buttes From Mt Rose



Mt Rose to Sutter Buttes As The Crow Flies




Sutter Butte Model



The Flat Earth Model is What We Actually See

The mountain between Rose and the Sutter Buttes is Anderson Peak, 8,860 ft. As the upper left model indicates, the view slope over the intermediate range will allow us to see all 2,120 ft, 110 miles away. It is tempting to think that we could use similar reasoning or concept on the fake sphere but, that's not how the optics would work on the fake sphere. On the fake sphere, the Buttes would be blocked from view by the fake hump between it and Rose. The next slides will show you really wouldn't see the Buttes, by a lot.

Mt Rose to Sutter Buttes As The Crow Flies




Fake Radius = 3,960 mi
Fake Circumference = 24,880 mi

Mountain	PH _(min) [ft]	FE _(Vanish) [mi]	FS D _(inv) [mi]	Rose Dist	Obs View _[mi]
Whitney	14,520.0	7880	4.30	209	132
Rainier	14,411.0	7821	4.26	529	337
Shasta	14,179.0	7695	4.20	185	116
Castle Peak	11,827.0	6418	3.50	420	267
Hood	11,240.0	6100	3.33	390	248
Rose	10,776.0	5848	3.19	0	NA
Lassen	10,465.0	5679	3.10	115	71.6
Buttes	2,210.0	1199	0.65	110	68.4
747	130.0	71	0.04	10	4.4

The constant View Slope of the fake sphere is still 0.64, though, from point **c** rather than point **a**. So, the height of Mt Rose in viewing the Sutter Buttes on the fake sphere does affect the View Slope. It does so by effectively shortening the distance to the point of interest. In the case of Mt Rose at 10,735 feet, our viewing distance is shortened by $10,735/0.64 = 16,773$ ft or 3.18 mi (distance from **a** to **c**). So, The Sutter Buttes would then be $0.64 \times (110 - 3.18) = 68.4$ mi below our view from Mt Rose.

Lake Tahoe

Interesting Observations



Lake Tahoe

Location: The Sierra Nevada Mountains of the US, along the state line of California and Nevada.

Lake Tahoe is a freshwater lake in the Sierra Nevada of the Western United States, straddling the border between California and Nevada. Lying at 6,225 ft above sea level, Lake Tahoe is the largest alpine lake in North America, and at 122,160,280 acre·ft it trails only the five Great Lakes as the largest by volume in the United States. Its depth is 1,645 ft, making it the second deepest in the United States after Crater Lake in Oregon. It is roughly 22 miles long and 12 miles wide.

Lake Tahoe breaks the fake spherical model in many ways. Let's take a look.

The Facts of Lake Tahoe

The average water elevation of Lake Tahoe is approximately 6,225 feet (1,897 meters) above sea level as is the water elevation at kings beach lake Tahoe

The average water elevation at Kings Beach, Lake Tahoe, is around 6,225 feet (1,897 meters) above sea level


The average water elevation of Pope Beach, Lake Tahoe, is approximately 6,225 feet (1,897 meters) above sea level.

The average water elevation of Emerald Bay, Lake Tahoe, is approximately 6,229 feet (1,898 meters) above sea level.


The average water elevation at Sand Harbor, Lake Tahoe, is around 6,225 feet (1,897 meters) above sea level

So, these are the elevations determined by barometric pressure around the circumference of Lake Tahoe. What I'll show shortly is that if the earth were a sphere, these elevations don't make any sense. The northern and southern shores of the lake should be significantly lower than the center of the lake due to the fake curvature of the fake spherical earth. Let's look closer.

Tahoe Model 1, Elevation Impossibilities



A circle would be the line of constant elevation anywhere on a sphere.



If Lake Tahoe were really sitting on a sphere, because it is more rectangular than circular, the elevations as measured by barometric pressure, around the lake, cannot be identical at 6,225 ft as the previous slide showed. The elevation of the width would have to be about 58 feet higher than the length elevations which is not the case. Myth again busted.


$$(3,960^2 - 6^2)^{1/2} = 3,959.995$$

$$3,959.995 - (3,960^2 - 11^2)^{1/2} = 0.01 \text{ mi or } 53 \text{ ft}$$

Tahoe Model 2, View Impossibilities


So, if Tahoe really did have a hump of water in the middle, it would obscure 14 miles of my view from Tahoe City of the Heavenly Valley Ski Mountain and 7.7 miles of the Homewood Ski Mountain looking from Sand Harbor. Neither is the case.

$$\begin{aligned}m &= \text{slope} \\m_{\text{earth}} &= 0.64 \\OV &= 0.64 * 12 = 7.7 \text{ mi}\end{aligned}$$




$$\begin{aligned}OV &= m_{\text{earth}} * \text{Distance} \\OV &= \text{Obstructed View} \\OV &= 0.64 * 22 = 14 \text{ mi}\end{aligned}$$

m_{earth} is the average slope of the fake spherical earth at points E and N



The mountains around the lake are less than 10,500 feet or 2 miles high so, you wouldn't be able to see any of them from any shoreline of the lake which again is clearly not the case. Myth busted yet again.

Lake Tahoe Observations and Analysis




One of the Satanist deceivers or one of their deceived might argue that the camera height affects all of this and I didn't account for that. So, let's account for that. The constant View Slope of the fake sphere earth is still 0.64, though, from point **c** rather than point **a** as the camera was held at 5 ft. So, my height in viewing Heavenly Valley Ski Mountain from Tahoe City on the fake sphere would very slightly affect the View Slope. It does so by effectively shortening the distance to the point of interest. In the case of Lake Tahoe, our viewing distance is shortened by $5/0.64 = 7.8$ ft or 0.0015 mi ☺ (distance from **a** to **c**). So, $0.64 \times (22 - 0.0015) = 14$ mi of the roughly one mile high above lake level Heavenly Ski mountain would be obscured from my view. Hmm. That's right, the mountains would be 13 miles below my view slope.

a to c

	Eye Level [ft]	FE (Vanish) [mi]	FS D_(inv) [mi]	Distance	Obs View [mi]
Tahoe E/W	5.0	3	0.0015	12	7.7
Tahoe N/S	5.0	3	0.0015	22	14.1

Lake Tahoe Observations and Analysis, Model 3

Minimum Resolution of a Typical Constricted Pupil = 0.02 Degrees



$$OS = x \sin(\theta)$$

$$x = OS / \tan(\theta)$$

$$D_{inv} = x \cos(\theta)$$

Object	Size [ft]	FE (Vanish) [mi]	FS D _{inv} [mi]
Person	6	3	0.0018
Boat	10.0	5	0.0030
Boat	20.0	11	0.0059
Boat	30.0	16	0.0089

$$D_{inv} = OS / (\tan(\theta_{inv}))$$

OS = Object Size

D_{inv} = Distance to Loss of Resolution

For Flat Earth Distance to Disappearance Calculations

What this shows us is that on Lake Tahoe or any other body of water, objects disappear from view because of the human eye's ability to resolve them, not because they go behind the fake water hump. We see from the upper right table that, under ideal conditions, we would only be able to see a 6 foot tall human from 3 miles and we wouldn't be able to see any boat less than 20 feet long before it even got to the top of the fake hump which is supposed to be in the center or 11 miles away (east to west). Hmm. Even worse North to South.

Other Tahoe Observations

Additional Fake Sphere Myth Busters

Sand Harbor Water Level, 30x Zoom, Panoramic



Notice the water level curve in this photo? Exactly opposite of what a spherical earther should expect. In their defense, I haven't thought about the panoramic camera optics or photo construction effects to this yet. Extra credit for the student who takes that on. ☺ And by the way, I see all the mountains I shouldn't see on the fake sphere. This view is Sand Harbor to Homewood, 12 miles away. All I should see is water on the fake sphere. Hmm.


San Harbor 30 Ft, 30x Zoom, Panoramic



This is interesting as I increase my elevation by 30 ft but, I have to move about 100 feet further from the shoreline which actually makes the mountains look smaller than in the water level photo. Either, I nor Tahoe are on a sphere or, Tahoe is in some kind of space time continuum or other SciFi anomaly. Not.

South Shore Casinos From 7,250ish ft, ~ 1,000 ft Above Emerald Bay

South Shore, 30x from 1k ft above Emerald Bay



South Shore, 20x from 1k ft above Emerald Bay



South Shore, 10x from 1k ft above Emerald Bay




South Shore, 1x from 1k ft above Emerald Bay



Observations: I'm 15ish miles from South Shore casinos. At 1x, you see no casinos, no boats even in the foreground. At 10x you begin to see boats which has nothing to do with the fake hump. It takes 10x to see boats at 5 to 7 miles and 30x to see the casinos and a small boat near the shore at 15ish miles. Both the boat and casino should be behind the fake water hump even at this high elevation. All photos taken within seconds.

South Shore From 7,250ish ft Above Emerald Bay



South Shore, 30x from
1k ft above Emerald Bay





South Shore Lake Tahoe From Tahoe City Marina




Observations: I'm 22 miles from South Shore casinos. At 1x through 30x, you see no casinos even though they're right there at the bottom of Gun Barrel. The bottom of Gun Barrel is 6,255 ft in elevation, just 30 ft above water level. I shouldn't be able to see that on the fake sphere. Even the mountain should be 13 miles below my horizon.

Observations From ~ 1k ft Above Emerald Bay



Observations: I'm 17ish miles from Sand Harbor. At 1x, you see no boats in Emerald Bay at 2 to 3 miles away. At 10x you begin to see a jet ski. 10x to see small craft (and not the pilot) at 2 to 3 miles and 30x to see the Ferry boat nearer shore at 15ish miles. The Ferry should be behind the fake hump even at this high elevation.

Sand Harbor, Water Level, 30x Zoom, Homewood




Query: What are the elevations of the highest and lowest points of the town of Homewood in lake Tahoe California

ChatGPT

Homewood is a small town located on the west shore of Lake Tahoe in California. As of my last update in September 2021, the highest point in the town of Homewood was approximately 7,000 feet (2,133 meters) above sea level. Its lowest elevation at the shoreline of the lake. Lake Tahoe's surface elevation is approximately 6,225 feet (1,897 meters) above sea level.

Sand Harbor 25 Ft, 30x Zoom, Homewood

Breakers, not boats. If either of these were really boats, they would have showed up in the 40 ft elevation photo. As you can see, there is chop on the water. The reason it appears more angular is due to pixel shape combined with the zoom. All pixels are square. See also Mirage section to follow.




Bottom of the Homewood Chair Lift



Another oddity in this photo is the lack of definition of the feature in the red circle. It is clear at 40 feet and water level.

Sand Harbor 40 Ft, 30x Zoom, Homewood




Bottom of the Homewood Chair Lift

No boats?

Sand Harbor 40 Ft, 30x Zoom, Homewood

From Sand Harbor, water level, 30x Zoom photo.




Interesting that this feature copied from the water level photo is exactly proportioned to that of the 40ft photo and there doesn't appear to be 24 feet (water hump height) to 96 feet (view angle over hump) less of it in the water level photo.

Optics of The Mirage

You've traveled before in the summer on a long hot road and in the distance seen what looks like water on the road some distance ahead. This summer that happened to me and while I was watching it, a car appeared in it from the other direction and I could see the reflection of its headlights and car body in the mirage. Then it dawned on me that's likely happening on water too when you look across it. I worked on lasers and related fiber optics for a part of my career so I thought, I wonder if that is what is happening in a Mirage. It was. Here's what's going on:

The basic principles behind optical waveguides can be described using the concepts of geometrical or ray optics, as illustrated in the diagram.



Light passing into a medium with higher refractive index bends toward the normal by the process of refraction. Take, for example, light passing from air into glass. The rays are trapped in the glass by a process called total internal reflection. They are incident on the glass-air interface at an angle above the critical angle. The critical angle is the smallest angle of incidence that yields total reflection, or equivalently the largest angle for which a refracted ray exists. For light waves incident from an "internal" medium with a single refractive index n_1 , to an "external" medium with a single refractive index n_2 , the critical angle can be easily calculated. Using total internal reflection, light can be trapped and guided in a dielectric waveguide. The red rays bounce off both the top and bottom surface of the high index medium. They're guided even if the slab curves or bends, so long as it bends slowly. This is the basic principle behind fiber optics in which light is guided along a high index glass core in a lower index glass cladding.

The Tahoe Mirage Connection

In Thermodynamics there is a phenomena called a “boundary layer.” It is an interface layer between two media of different properties and or temperatures. Let’s think of an ice cube sitting on a counter. Between the ice cube and the counter there is a thin film of water and between the ice cube and the air above it there is a thin layer of water vapor. Right? Believe it or not, those two types of interface layers act just like the optical waveguide in our previous slide. These boundary layers have different refractive indexes from the ice cube and each other. Now, think back to our Lake Tahoe scenario. The average water temperature of Lake Tahoe is between 67 and 70 degrees Fahrenheit. On a 75 degree day, the boundary layer of evaporation between the water and the air can be between 2 inches and 10 feet high or thick depending on wind and other variables. Wow. What that means is that if I were to take a picture within that boundary layer across the lake my image should be fairly consistent with reality of the opposite shore. If instead I took a picture from above that boundary layer, I might be seeing something completely different especially if there is any angle to my camera and it falls outside the critical angle of the boundary layer of evaporated moisture between the air and water. In such cases, you won’t know what you’re really seeing in a photograph. Things could disappear or appear depending on their angle relative to the camera and the boundary layer.

Mount Whitney, Chemtrails & Flat Cloud Horizons


Myth Buster's Audition

Top of Mount Whitney, 14,505 feet

This is a 120 degree FOV. The furthest mountain in the distance is at least 150 miles away, far enough that fake sphere curvature should be obvious. So, the width of that range is also at least 150 miles.



$$d = (150 * 0.64)/2 = 48 \text{ miles}$$




Based on the average slope or curvature of the fake sphere, 0.64, over a 150 mi distance, the arc should cause the land on the edges of our photo to be 48 miles below the center point of the land in the photo. Hmm, not seeing it.

The Chemtrail Witness For The Defense

Fake sphere arc equation: $d = (D/2)*0.318$

What the Arc should look like.



From our vanishing 747 I know this jet is 30 to 50 miles out as I barely yet see it. To be conservative and fare to spherical earthers, I used 40 miles out in my calculations. It only gets worse if I use 50 miles out which is likely the reality.

The camera's 120 degree FOV makes this a 30, 60, 90 degree right triangle which makes our math simple. $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ The distance across the photo is 100 miles.

If we plug the 100 miles into our arc equation, we see on a fake sphere, the right and left edges of my photo should be $d = (100 * 0.64)/2 = 32$ miles lower than the center of my photo.

How many times and how many ways do I have to bust this myth, and wake you up to get my own show?

Vanishing 737

Query: How long would it take a 737 airplane to vanish from sight when flying directly away from a viewer?

ChatGPT

The time it takes for an object to disappear from sight when it moves away from a viewer depends on various factors such as the distance between the viewer and the object, the altitude of the object, and the observer's visual acuity, among other things. However, let's make some general calculations assuming standard viewing conditions. According to Boeing, the manufacturer of the 737 aircraft, the length of a Boeing 737-800 is approximately 39.5 meters (129.6 feet). Let's assume that the viewer can no longer see the plane when its apparent size reduces to a certain degree due to distance. If we take the average human eye's angular resolution to be about 0.02 degrees, and assuming a simple calculation where the plane appears as a small dot when it reaches this angular size, we can use some trigonometry to find the approximate distance at which the plane would vanish from sight.


Using the formula:

Angular size = Size of the object / Distance from the viewer => Distance = Size of the object / Angular size

Distance = 129.6 feet/ 0.02 degrees. Converting degrees to radians for this calculation. 1 degree = $\pi/180$ radians. Therefore, 0.02 degrees = $0.02 * \pi/180$ radians.

Distance = $129.6 * 180 / 0.02\pi = 371,277$ feet or 70 miles.

Why Don't Clouds Arc to Follow The Fake Sphere Curvature?



Don't forget, $PV = nRT$ By this law, if the earth were a fake sphere, the clouds should be arcing to follow it.

The camera's 120 degree FOV makes this a 30, 60, 90 degree right triangle which makes our math simple. $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ The distance across the photo is 130 miles.

Just like with the Chemtrails on the previous slide, the ends should be 42 miles lower than the center as these clouds are much further from my position. Likely 75 miles out. Again, I'm not seeing it.

The Moon Is It's Own Light

Biblical Confirmation


What's Wrong With This Picture?

Moonrise, Oct 30, 2023 7:37pm.
Sunset was almost exactly 4:50pm.




So, this photo is traveling east on HWY 431 into Reno from Lake Tahoe. The sunset was directly behind me 2 hours and 40 minutes earlier. There is an 11,000 foot peak directly behind me. The peak below the moon is about 6,250 feet. Before I took this photo, you could see the moon's glow behind the mountains. The mountain silhouetted by the moon's light to the right is 7,000+ feet high, higher than the moon's current position yet, we see no illumination of it by the sun. So, how again does the moon reflect the sun's light while the mountain next to it does not? How does the moon reflect the sun's light before it comes up from behind the mountain? And why don't I see the silhouette of Mount Rose on it?

The Moon is It's Own Light



The Moon is It's Own Light



The Atmosphere and Refraction of the Sun's Light

- Don't even start, no, the sun's light does not refract or bounce off the fake boundary between the atmosphere and space! That's another lie. * If it did do that, the mountains in the previous picture would be illuminated on the front side in line with the moon. Right? Now, if the sun was not in the earth, I guess the light could bounce off the firmament or dome between the waters of heaven and the waters of earth but, I don't know what the dome is made of or if it is reflective. The dome would have to have a proper "cladding" as in fiber optics to reflect, refract or guide any light back to or around the earth. There is no such "cladding" between earth's atmosphere (the waters below Heaven) and fake space. The dome could have a "cladding" though, who knows. And besides, in the Biblical model, the sun is in the earth so, there is nothing to refract or reflect anyway! ☺
- So, as Enoch and what of God's Word (Genesis) the Satanists gave us when they canonized our bible, (hiding many important books like Enoch from us) all say, the moon is its own light to illuminate the night and govern the seasons.

* I was R&D director for a company that built high power lasers. That's not how photonics and refraction work.

Eclipse Videos

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w9K-gs7YV1Q> This is one guys destruction of NASA's fake eclipse system but, he doesn't have a biblical view so, he doesn't quite have it completely right. According to Enoch, the Sun and moon travel into the earth at night and day respectively so, what you're actually seeing in this video is the projection of the sun and or the moon onto the firmament or dome covering the earth.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q3RBCV1swpk> This video speaks for itself. It demonstrates how a recent cosmic event allowed 80 percent of the earth to be illuminated simultaneously for a given amount of time. That couldn't actually happen in the spherical earth hoax model yet, it did. The whole world saw it and the deep state fake news even reported it so, it has to be true right? We just saw the man behind the curtain.

Other Interesting Observations

Asteroids

Meteor and Asteroid Impacts



Question:


Why are all craters on Earth at exactly a 90 degree angle to the "flat" surface? Not a single one has ever had any inclination or angle of trajectory prior to impact. If we live on a "spinning ball in space", what are the odds that every single impact from "space rocks" strikes the Earth straight down, at a perfect 90 degree angle?

San Rafael Bridge Video Dissection

A Lesson in Vanishing Points


<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EkM6jd2vZ24>

Vanishing Point of Perspective Drawing




Artists create the illusion of a scene diminishing in the distance from your point of view by using a vanishing point to focus all the lines in the image, and your attention. In this scene, I've highlighted the vanishing point with a red dot and focal lines with red arrows. Our vision in nature actually works the same way as you'll see in the following images and further analysis of the fake sphere San Rafael Bridge video. Note: all objects shrink in the X and Y planes at the same rate.


Vanishing Point of Perspective Drawing



Front View




Top View



Side View


San Rafael Bridge Actual



Now, let's go back to our San Rafael Bridge video dissection. In this version I very carefully drew boxes around an envelope of the boat at each time and distance stamp. I then grouped those envelopes inside one another in the upper right corner of the slide. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EkM6jd2vZ24>

Let's Revisit Our Vanishing Point Equation

Minimum Resolution of a Typical Constricted Pupil = 0.02 Degrees



$$OS = x \sin(\theta)$$

$$x = OS / \tan(\theta)$$

$$D_{inv} = x \cos(\theta)$$

Object	Size [ft]	FE (Vanish) [mi]	FS D _{inv} [mi]
Person	6	3	0.0036
Boat	10.0	5	0.0060
Boat	20.0	11	0.0119
Boat	30.0	16	0.0179
Boat	35.0	19	0.0208

$$D_{inv} = OS / (\tan(\theta_{inv}))$$

OS = Object Size

D_{inv} = Distance to Loss of Resolution


For Flat Earth Distance to Disappearance Calculations

What this shows us is that on the SF Bay or any other body of water, objects disappear from view because of the human eye's ability to resolve them, not because they go behind a fake water hump. We see from the upper right table that, under ideal conditions, we would only be able to see a 30 to 35 foot tall boat from 16 to 19 miles away and we wouldn't be able to see any boat less than 20 feet long before it even got to the top of the fake hump which is supposed to be in the center or 11 miles away (east to west). Hmm. Even worse North to South.


Spherical Earth Boat Vanishing Expectation

This is what the boat shrinkage in the vertical direction should look like as it moves away and over the fake curve of the fake spherical earth. Specifically, vertical shrinkage Y should accelerate as the boat moves further away. The boat's rate of vertical and horizontal shrinkage should initially be about equal until the boat's descent begins to accelerate down the fake sphere's curvature and becomes very much more rapid than the horizontal shrinkage. Instead, we see the opposite. As expected, horizontal vanishing remains constant while vertical vanishing actually decelerates. Hmm, that's a problem for Spherical Earthers.


Successive boat envelopes



Acceleration of Vertical Vanishing




Deceleration of Vertical Vanishing



Spherical Earth Boat Vanishing Expectation

This is what the boat shrinkage in the vertical direction should look like as it moves away and over the fake curve of the fake spherical earth. Specifically, vertical shrinkage Y should accelerate as the boat moves further away. The boat's rate of vertical and horizontal shrinkage should initially be about equal until the boat's descent begins accelerate down the earth's fake curvature and becomes very much more rapid than the horizontal shrinkage. What we actually see are slow and then accelerating horizontal shrinkage rates as you would expect based on vanishing point theory and initially accelerating vertical shrinkage rate followed by a rapid slowing its shrinkage rate. Hmm, that's a problem for Spherical Earthers.

Successive boat envelopes




Horizontal Vanishing

Seconds Out	Box Width [in]	Ship Width [ft]	Shrink Rate [%]	Box Height [in]	Ship Height [ft]	Shrink Rate [%]
15	1.44	28.7		1.75	35	
30	1.19	23.7	17%	1.38	27.5	21%
45	1	19.9	16%	1	20.0	27%
60	0.75	14.9	25%	0.63	12.5	38%
75	0.44	8.8	41%	0.44	8.8	30%


Vertical Vanishing

Note: The ship width is 82% of its height. So, whether the ship is 30, 35, 40 or anything in between feet tall, the relative vertical and horizontal shrink rates don't change.


San Rafael Bridge Analysis




Front View




Front View




Front View




Front View




Front View



Side View




Front View



The reason the boat's vertical vanishing appears nonlinear, faster initially and slower after about 60 seconds is because the center of the boat drops below the observer's point of view. Assuming the observer is 6 feet tall and probably on a pier about 3 feet above the water, once the boat shrinkage reaches about 18 feet, from the observer's point of view it's going to appear to shrink more slowly. So, we're clearly not dealing with a sphere here. We know from our Tahoe study that on the fake sphere, at 12 miles the boat should be behind 7.7 miles of water. At 10 miles out it should be behind roughly 6.4 miles of water. The boat looks like it should be about 35 feet tall so, we should not see any of it at 10 miles out yet, we see all of it, just a proportionately smaller version of it. Better still we see the water barrier of the bridge tower Pilon which we shouldn't be able to see at all. If you used a telephoto lens or telescope, you'd see all the boat. Myth busted. Here's a video of how waves create a false horizon that fools you into thinking the earth has curvature. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N1QXFnv-8c>

San Rafael Bridge Model



At 10 Miles the boat and Pilon should be 6.4 miles below our view slope or horizon yet, I see all of both.

Fake sphere arc Obstructed View (OV) equation: $OV = (D)^*0.64$

Flat Earth (FE) $D_{inv} = OH / (\tan(\Theta_{inv})) = OH / 0.000349$ OH = Object Height

Object	Size [ft]	FE (Vanish) [mi]	Obs View [mi]
Person	6	3	2.1
Boat	30.0	16	10.4
Boat	35.0	19	12.2
Boat	40.0	22	13.9

Object	Size [ft]	Distance [mi]	Obs View [mi]
Person	6	3	1.0
Boat	35	1	0.3
Boat	35	5	1.6
Boat	35	10	3.2
Boat	35	15	4.8
Boat	35	20	6.4

So, from our equations and hence table, we see that on the fake sphere the boat would be obscured by 6 miles of water by the time it vanishes from shrinkage. It is well viewable at 14 miles we know and will yet be viewable at 16 miles when on the fakes sphere it would be 10.4 miles below our view slope or horizon. So, it's not going to be gone when it should be. It should actually be gone in 252 ft. Hmm.

$$FS D_{(Inv)} = OH / 0.64 = (35+5) / 0.64 = 252 \text{ ft}$$

The Oceans & My Swimming Pool

Orbits Don't Retain Oceans, Even During Their Periods (That's Funny)

Let's Look At The Oceans



So, I tried to use Chat GPT AI to show the water in the oceans can't work like they tell us it does but, GPT uses a Google internet data base snap shot so it maintains a pretty strict deep state narrative and has scrubbed competing narratives and even data. I'll copy and paste some of their lame excuses for their deceit. I got around this by using DuckduckGo as a search engine for data and then plugged it into GPT. I win.

My plan was to use GPT to prove all their BS data and related calculations for planetary motion affects "they" say keep the oceans in place was a key part of the fake sphere hoax. I eventually got around their fire walls and got them to use fluid dynamics to prove this but, in the process I realized there was a much easier and obvious way to do so, a way that makes it pretty difficult to challenge the math or anything else.

I decided to get data for actual tides on opposite sides of the fake sphere along the Equator, roughly 12,000 miles apart, and as close to the North and South Poles, also roughly 12,000 miles apart. Google wouldn't provide that data but, DuckduckGo was happy to oblige. As you'll see from the following slide, the data alone makes the spherical earth planetary motion hoax pretty obviously fishy but, I didn't stop there.

I then constructed two giant swimming pools, a flat earth pool and a fake spherical earth pool in order to calculate the relative magnitudes of fluid mechanics (gravity) and fluid dynamics (planetary motion) based hydrostatic pressures that would occur in them. Oh wow.

Flat & Fake Sphere Earth Swimming Pool Models



Hydrostatic Pressure Equations

We're going to need these equations and constants:

Fluid Mechanics: (Gravity Related Pressures)

$P=\rho gh$ (*Hydrostatic Pressure*) where:

- ρ is the density of the water, approximately 62.4 lbs/ft³,
- g is the acceleration due to gravity, approximately 32.2 ft/s²,
- h is the total height of water, in feet.


Fluid Dynamics: (Fake Planetary Motion Related Pressures)

Using the tidal equation: $h=A\sin(\omega t+\phi)$ where:

- A is the tidal amplitude,
- ω is the angular frequency,
- ϕ is the phase angle,
- t is time.

I calculated the tidal heights for each reservoir model

Tide Location Selections



Moon Phase:	Day 7		Day 14		Day 21		Day 28		
	1st Quarter	Full	3rd Quarter	New					
Singapore, Malaysia									
Hi/Lo Tide:	9.4	2.7	10.9	1.15	8.9	3.7	10.2	1.8	
Hi/Lo Time:	4:49am	10:26pm	11:34am	5:18pm	3:25pm	10:44pm	11:15am	5:08pm	
Sao Luis, Brazil									
Hi/Lo Tide:	14.8	3.7	19.3	-0.39	12.4	5.2	18.5	0.3	
Hi/Lo Time:	12:06am	6:38am	7:03pm	12:36am	12:44pm	6:15am	7:17pm	12:55am	
Godthab, Greenland									
Hi/Lo Tide:	11.3	2.5	13.1	-0.8	9.7	3.8	12.8	0.5	
Hi/Lo Time:	12:29pm	5:37am	7:17pm	1:50pm	12:47pm	5:49am	6:29am	1:16pm	
Ushuaia, Argentina									
Hi/Lo Tide:	4.4	2.7	6.6	0.92	5.6	1.2	5.8	1.25	
Hi/Lo Time:	12:09am	5:06am	4:22am	10:31am	11:00am	6:07pm	4:51am	11:21am	

My tide location selections are on opposite sides of the fake sphere along the Equator, roughly 12,000 miles apart, and as close to the North and South Poles as possible, also roughly 12,000 miles apart.

Food for thought: Why didn't God give us a South Pole star for navigation in the fake sphere's southern hemisphere? And why do compasses show true north and not true south in either hemisphere? Hmm.

Tides of The Earth

	Day 7		Day 14		Day 21		Day 28		
Moon Phase:	1st Quarter		Full		3rd Quarter		New		
Singapore, Malaysia									Equator
Hi/Lo Tide:	9.4	2.7	10.9	1.15	8.9	3.7	10.2	1.8	
Hi/Lo Time:	4:49am	10:26pm	11:34am	5:18pm	3:25pm	10:44pm	11:15am	5:08pm	
Sao Luis, Brazil							Singapore + 12,400 Miles		
Hi/Lo Tide:	14.8	3.7	19.3	-0.39	12.4	5.2	18.5	0.3	
Hi/Lo Time:	12:06am	6:38am	7:03pm	12:36am	12:44pm	6:15am	7:17pm	12:55am	
Godthab, Greenland							North Pole		
Hi/Lo Tide:	11.3	2.5	13.1	-0.8	9.7	3.8	12.8	0.5	
Hi/Lo Time:	12:29pm	5:37am	7:17pm	1:50pm	12:47pm	5:49am	6:29am	1:16pm	
Ushuaia, Argentina							South Pole		
Hi/Lo Tide:	4.4	2.7	6.6	0.92	5.6	1.2	5.8	1.25	
Hi/Lo Time:	12:09am	5:06am	4:22am	10:31am	11:00am	6:07pm	4:51am	11:21am	


Interesting Observations:

1. All sides of the fake sphere see the same phases of the moon on the same dates.
2. High and low tides half way around the fake sphere don't occur 12 hours apart.
3. High tides at the North Pole are much higher than those at the South Pole.
4. Low tides at the North and South Poles are much closer in magnitude.
5. North Pole high tides are higher than those in Singapore on the Equator.
6. South Pole low tides are roughly comparable to Singapore's on the Equator.

Conclusion: There is no way a fake Earth rotation, a fake Earth orbit about the sun and the moon's orbit about the Earth are keeping the oceans of the Earth in place or are the sole influence of the tides. We'll take a closer look in the next slides.

My Giant Swimming Pool

The blue bars in the next pages are reservoirs where X , it's length, is 100 miles, it's width 50 miles, it's height, h is 10,000 feet and the radius of the arcs are both 3,960 miles. I chose these values as they represented a reasonable chunk of an ocean and we could expect all the BS spherical orbit and rotation affects to operate on them accordingly, if they actually existed. The average depth of the Atlantic Ocean is about 12,880 feet (3,926 meters), while the Pacific Ocean's average depth is approximately 14,040 feet (4,280 meters). These values can vary depending on the specific location and features within each ocean. I began with the flat earth pool w/o BS spherical affects:




$$P=62.4 \times 32.2 \times 10,000 \\ =19,901,818 \text{ lbs/ft}^2$$

I then took the highest tide differential on the earth (to account for so called spherical system orbits and rotations), and applied it directly to my pool to determine the relative magnitude of gravitational verse planetary motion affects on hydrostatic pressure in my pool. The greatest tide differential between high and low tide on earth is 19 feet. That occurs in Sao Luis, Brazil, on the Equator. If we use that tidal differential in our reservoir we get a hydrostatic pressure change of only 534,656lbs/ft² while the gravitation related hydrostatic pressure is 19,901,818lbs/ft².


This is an insignificant impact. That's only 2.7% of the gravity related pressures and that's if an entire oceans worth of tide was in my pool. It is clearly not enough to influence basic gravitation related hydrostatic pressure effects of the oceans of the earth and no where near enough to keep them in place. Conclusion: Comparing gravity related hydrostatic pressures on my pool to those caused by fake earth orbits, moon orbit and the sun's affect, we get gravity caused values orders of magnitude higher.

Fake Sphere Swimming Pool



This is how the spherical earth hoaxers want you to think the water in such a reservoir behaves due to fake rotations and orbits of Earth, Moon & Sun.

What this demonstrates is, as soon as water lays on a curved surface, hydrostatic pressure builds astronomically because all the BS forces related to planet orbits and rotations are insignificant compared to the gravitational forces on the water in the reservoirs. On my flat earth, reservoir pressure evenly distributes itself across its base. In the fake spherical world, hydrostatic pressure increases 52.8 times at the low end of the reservoir as the water distributes itself in the direction of least resistance, down hill, to the bottom corners of the reservoir. If earth were actually a sphere, all our water would have drained into fake space in whichever direction is actually down on the fake sphere.



Laws of fluid mechanics & dynamics dictate the water will distribute and the resulting hydrostatic pressure.

The left blue bar below is a reservoir where X , its length, is 100 miles, its width 50 miles, its height, h is 10,000 feet and the radius of the arcs are both 3,960 miles.

In the right side reservoir, gravity moves the water to the lowest point until it impacts a pool wall, when the reservoir is centered anywhere but one of the fake poles. In this case, the height, $h2$ now becomes 100 miles or 528,000 feet and X becomes the width, 10,000 feet. This increases the gravitational hydrostatic pressure by 52.8 times making the fake orbit and rotation forces even less significant.

So What's The Deal With Satellites?

Something's fishy, the math doesn't fit the lie

The Starlink Satellite Array

- Starlink satellites are 9 foot cubes of aluminum
- Aluminum is 90% reflective
- Between 0 and 6,777 Watts of light are reflected to a ground location dependent on incidence and view angles
- The divergence of this reflected light is 33 degrees per mile
- Full divergence (180 degrees) is reached 5.45 miles from the satellite
- This equates to 1.4 Watts/square foot on the ground for satellites above 5.45 miles altitude
- The human eye cannot detect less than 0.001 Watts
- The dilated pupil is $\frac{1}{4}$ in, so it could see the satellite's 0.0076 Watts depending on ambient light
- The Satellites have no other illumination systems
- Satellite orbit is between 211 and 746 miles
- Satellite altitude is around 500 miles
- Satellite speed 17,200 mph @ 210 miles to 27,700 mph @ 746 miles

Food for thought: Why do fake sphere satellites require an altitude indication in addition to an orbit?

Starlink Satellite Observations and Questions

- At 17,220mph a satellite travels 209 deg/hour while the sun travels only 15 deg/hour? Hmm
- If the satellite is below the sun, how does it reflect sun light to earth?
- Why do fake sphere satellites require and altitude indication in addition to an orbit?


What Are We Really Seeing?

Satellite array of between 6 & 12 satellites moving so fast, the camera sees them as a line.



Questions:

1. Why do I only see one group of the array? How could it alone cover all the area below the visible sky?
2. Why would it be a straight line and not an arc?
3. If the satellite is below the sun, how does it reflect sun light to earth from it's bottom surface?

About 7:30 pm, mid-September 2023





Spherical Earth Model of Satellite Sunlight Reflection




Angle of incidence = angle of reflection. I'm not seeing how the sun's light could ever reflect to the dark side of earth off a Starlink satellite assuming the base of the satellite is parallel to ground which I assume is necessary for it's telecom purposes?

Flat Earth Model of Satellite Sunlight Reflection



Angle of incidence = angle of reflection. Huh, the Enoch flat earth model where the sun goes into the earth works. Imagine that. But then where do the satellites go at night? Well, they just fly in a large circle above and around the flat earth. Easy to do without being seen since the sun has gone down or into the earth.

Actual Starlink Orbiting



Satellites simply follow the circular latitude lines on the flat earth so they are only seen at night in the regions they are supposed to be geostationary in. Oh wait, why are telecommunication satellites moving at all? Aren't they supposed to be "geostationary" over their coverage area? I'm so confused. Next can o worms. ☺


210 Mile Orbit or, Radius, 17,200mph ☺

746 Mile Orbit or, Radius, 27,700mph ☺

Satellite array banks

Now you see why they have an altitude as well. ☺

Actual Starlink Orbiting



Satellites simply follow the circular latitude lines on the flat earth so they are only seen at night in the regions they are supposed to be geostationary in. Oh wait, why are telecommunication satellites moving at all? Aren't they supposed to be "geostationary" over their coverage area? I'm so confused. Next can o worms. ☺

The Only Way We Find Truth

"If ten people are in a room, and nine agree on how to interpret and respond to a situation, the tenth man must disagree. His duty is to find the best possible argument for why the decision of the group is flawed."

Other Stimulating Questions

Proverbs 25:2 “It is the **glory of God** to conceal a matter, But the **glory of kings** is to search out a matter.

Rainbow Optics?



Dome or Firmament causing a rainbow's arc?

Other Questions

1. If on the fake sphere, there are two or more planes of stars the earth orbits and revolves under, why is gravity constant and the same in the fake hemispheres?
2. How was Columbus able to circumnavigate a fake globe without a South Star or magnetic south?
3. Why don't we look to the sun, moon and stars for signs when God tells us He puts them there? Genesis 1 "Let there be light-bearers (sun, moon, stars) in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be useful for signs (tokens) [of God's provident care], and for marking seasons, days, and years; 15 and let them be useful as lights in the expanse of the heavens to provide light on the earth";
4. Why does Genesis 1 say God's Spirit was hovering over the waters He created and not around them as he would have to had He made earth a sphere? The Spirit of God was moving (hovering, brooding) over the face of the waters.
5. Why do you suppose God had to "dome" the earth? [Amos 9:6](#) It is He who builds His upper chambers in the heavens and has established His vaulted dome (the **firmament** of heaven) over the earth, He who calls to the waters of the sea and pours them out on the face of the earth— The LORD is His name. And how does a dome fit over a sphere? Hmm.
6. How much of what type of fuel would be required to keep a satellite in stationary or fake geosynchronous orbit for 5, 10 and 20 years? Please show equations and calculations.
7. In the flood of Noah, Genesis 7:11, God opened the "flood gates of heaven", in the firmament dome. If there is no gravity (fake space) somewhere between our sky and the dome, how then would the water have reached the earth?
8. If $PV = nRT$, why wouldn't there be atmosphere and gravity all the way up to the firmament dome? Show your work.

Other Questions

1. NASA does a lot of fake space videos like their moon landing. In them they often show us re-entry vehicles heating up to a fake gazillion degrees as they come from fake space and hit earth's atmosphere. What is that boundary from? I don't see it in God's model so, I wonder how the Satanists explain that?
2. Why does the sun's light disappear in the east and west almost immediately after sunset yet, while it is still above the horizon, it lights the entire sky as far as we can see from the west to the east?
3. Similarly, as soon as the sun begins to crest the horizon in the east, the entire sky from east to west is brightened. Why isn't there more of a gradient across the sky?

Food For Thought

- There are literally dozens Theorems, Axioms, Postulates and assumptions, all unproven, accepted as fact in the theory of the fake spherical earth. Isn't it interesting the rigor the Satanists now force real scientists through that have counter arguments to any of their narratives? It's almost as if by doing so, it somehow demonstrates the rigor of their fake science that was never done and hence validates it. Hmm, stinky.
- If evolution were true, why are there no new humans?
- If life just evolves, why have no new life forms been generated by the canned food industry? Literally trillions of canned foods have been consumed historically which exceeds the 1 in a billion chances Satanic fake scientists tell us that it takes for life to happen spontaneously as they say we did.

Questions & Answers


Along the way

Questions & Their Answers

1. Shouldn't our focus should be on serving God, helping others find him? **Absolutely!** This conspiracy stuff is a distraction to that. **You see that's the thing, most of these things labeled conspiracy by Satanists and their deceived are a direct attack on our faith.** They hide God and His word from us and keep us from experiencing God in amazing new ways, all the ways He had intended in our relationship with Him. I know you don't agree with this yet but, I think you will soon enough. You see, most of my responses to you are not directly from me. I didn't know much if any of this stuff 5 years or so ago. God has been feeding me like the ravens with Elijah. Every time I go to mountains or wilderness to spend time with Him he shows me all kinds of new things I could only know from Him. Most of my counter arguments come from Him during these walks. As they come, I record them on my phone and then further research when I get down and bring them into our discussion. It's really amazing how it works. I'm doing this so that more people can experience what I'm now experiencing. Really, that's why. I'm not crazy or high. I'm am more spirit filled and led than at any time in my life. I want that for everyone.
2. Does gravity exist? **Absolutely.** It's just not caused by all the garbage Kepler and Newton told us they were. Per above, **none of that has been proven without circular reasoning, ridiculous assumptions, Postulates, Axioms and Theorems.** Why do objects released from your hand fall to the ground? **Because of gravity.** ☺ God created that force. We just don't know yet how He does it.
3. "The history of science has repeatedly postulated and proved these things, that's what science does. Its reproved in physics classes all the time." **That's how fake science works.** **None of the assumptions, Theorems, Postulates or Axioms I brought up that underpin the fake solar system model have ever been proven.** You know what they say about those who ass u me. ☺ They just keep building on a nonexistent foundation. God is our firm foundation.

Questions & Their Answers

1. “A better question might be, what force is acting on your sun and moon that causes them to curve around the surface of the flat plate and not travel in a straight line?” BB God or the “God Particle”. Remind me to get into the Hadron collider in Cern when we’re over this hump. Remember, both the sun and the moon are called lights in our bible and the book of Enoch the Satanists left out. I believe that. The phases of the moon are not because of the sun’s and moon’s rotations around the earth. I can’t prove it yet but, the moon’s phases are more likely settings or filters of some kind if you will. Remember the moon is to govern the seasons which it communicates to us via it’s phases. There used to be 13 months of exactly 28 days until Satan gave us our current calendar with 12 months and Satanic names. For later.
2. “Why do flight paths of airplanes flying between cities at different longitude, not take longer than similar cities in the northern hemisphere? For example, This flight on your flat earth model’s.” That’s “a” flat earth model, not mine. Here’s another, also not mine where there are several good options:



The map with north pole at the center would mean that things are way farther apart in the southern hemisphere and to fly from Sydney to Cape town, the shortest flight would be almost straight over the north pole, probably a 50 hr flight..

About The Author

Jeremiah 17:7 “Blessed is the man who believes *and* trusts in *and* relies on the LORD and whose hope *and* confident expectation is the LORD.”

About The Author

Education:

Master of Science, Engineering Management - Stanford University

Bachelor of Science, Mechanical Engineering - UC Davis

Japanese Manufacturing Techniques & Kaizen - Technology Transfer Institute of Japan, Tokyo Japan

PMP Training - Program Management Institute

Theological Studies – Fuller Seminary

40 Years in Silicon Valley, 17 Patents Granted and 30 Invention Disclosures:

<https://www.google.com/search?q=bryed+billerbeck&tbm=pts&ei=j8G5WbiZD46mjwPW7opA&start=0&sa=N&biw=1037&bih=595>

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/bryed-billerbeck-531a791/>

Delivered outstanding results for HP, Logitech, Microsoft, Samsung, Apple and most major Telecommunications companies.

Tech executive by day inner city missionary by night: Before I was married and began my own family, I worked through City Team Ministries of San Jose California to help kids in urban areas. City Team's goal was to teach Jesus. Mine was to teach Jesus, sports, job skills and break the demonic mind sets of poverty, entitlement and victimization brought to us by China's government arm here in the US called the Democrat Party. I worked and lived in the city of East Palo Alto, California a predominantly black, Hispanic and other minority community during the late 80s and early 90s when it was the murder capital of the US. At the time the High School graduation rate was less than 40%, college graduation rates were near zero and incarceration rates were greater than 60%.

About The Author (Continued)

I worked with 8 kids there from the time they were 8 years old until they graduated from High School. All of my kids graduated from High School and 2 from college. One of them graduated from UOP in business and received one of two awards given in a class of nearly 1,000 graduates. The first award given was valedictorian. Curtis, now my God Son (I am not Catholic) received the second award, a never before given award for outstanding community service for his work with children in that community. They only were aware of a fraction of what Curtis did. I and Jesus too I'm sure, wept. He's now a bank VP. Mentality and cycle of poverty broken. After High School, I dressed the boys up, practiced interviewing them and got them their first jobs at the company where I was Director of Production at the time. Of those boys, one is a sales executive for a Silicon Valley tech company, one is a teacher, one a chef and one works in masonry. (The good kind)

After the boys were launched, my wife and I left that ministry to begin our own biological family. We had 4 children, 3 sons and 1 daughter. That was 10 more years of teaching Sunday school and 10 more years coaching their soccer teams. They have trophies for championships, not participation medals. They were raised up in the way they should go. They are all kind hearted believers in Christ yet, competitive. Though Caucasian, they were ethnic and mindset minorities in the Cupertino California schools they attended; the only kids in their schools that stood for sanity, against the DS liberal mindset and that didn't have black hair. They were so good at it, even their liberal teachers respected, even liked them as they could out argue not just their fellow students but, even their liberal teachers. Facts, logic and tough love are so powerful. It developed a boldness in each of them, so proud. Our nation now has a newly minted Mechanical Engineer and Evangelist working for a construction firm in Southern California, a Marine and now Computer Scientist doing software near Phoenix, a High School math and physics teacher in Auburn, California and, a part time Wrangler, Hair Stylist and internet entrepreneur and influencer. <https://www.instagram.com/muahellie/?hl=en> All amazing, unvaccinated kids.

About The Author (Continued)

There are many more incredible stories within and around these of how God met me on my own road to Damascus, changed me from the inside out, used me and how He carried me through so many difficult valleys in life as promised, never leaving or forsaking me. I feel that God is moving me now to expand the inner city work I've been involved in with Pathfinders here in Reno Nevada. President Trump calls them "Freedom Cities." I think God might call them "Cities of Light." That's what the Lord, specifically God The Father, Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit, has put on my heart to create. I see corporations, churches and believers partnering and working together in the mentoring of students, job skills training and job provision for the jobs Trump will be bringing back to the US. The Gospel plus. Relationship, skills and confidence building. Winning practice. Faith and love with skin on it. And do it on a national and international level. I believe God wants me **to show people how blessed it is to be a blessing**, how easy and life giving it really is.



The End

Bryed Billerbeck
October 2023

NASA is Hebrew for Deceived

So why NASA and Not ASC, American Space Center or CSE, Center for Space

Exploration or USSC, USSEC, etc. ? NASA is not an administration and has nothing to do with Aeronautics. Hmm.



נִשְׁאַ

STRONG'S NUMBER:[h5377](#)

Dictionary Definition

h5377. נִשְׁאַ *nâšâ'*; a primitive root; to lead astray, i.e. (mentally) to delude, or (morally) to seduce: — beguile, deceive, x greatly, x utterly.


AV (16) - deceive 12, greatly 1, beguiled me 1, seize 1, utterly 1;

1. to beguile, deceive
 - (Niphal) to be beguiled
 - (Hiphil) to beguile, deceive
 - (Qal) utterly (infinitif)

SEARCH FOR
[נִשְׁאַ](#)




Wind in fake zero atmosphere




If they'd laundered less of the \$55M/day budget,
they could have had better fake space suits.

Twigs, all over Nevada desert.



All you have to do is
astronaut's v



Twigs, all over Nevada desert.




NASA Fakery

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sDrfdKR0GvU>



NASA James Web 2023



NASA vs FED - There's a whole lot of faking going on with the James Webb Telescope - FLAT EARTH



NASA IMAGE

Another Spherical Earther Video Takedown

Star Direction Reversal at Poles

What is Wrong With This Picture




In your video they showed a supposed time lapsed shot of the stars rotating in opposite directions at opposite fake sphere poles. Think about this, which direction are you looking at the north or south poles when you're looking straight up? North or South of course. YOU CAN'T POSSIBLY BE LOOKING AT THE SAME STARS! You'd have to be looking down from either pole with x-ray eye vision to see the guy in the north's stars and visa versa so, what the heck difference does it make which direction different stars are rotating? It sure as heck doesn't prove the earth is a rotating sphere flying through space. The only way you could ever see any of the same stars in both hemispheres ever is if in fact the earth were flat and the stars rotated around it.

Flat Earth Star Movement

So, if you go to the Equator and view the time lapsed star movement, what you see is on the right, stars moving in opposite directions simultaneously. So on the flat earth looking up from the equator you're in fact seeing stars rotating in opposite directions. This is made possible through celestial gears; the idea that the stars essentially form interlocking gears. Two gears rotates one way, while the other will rotate in the opposite direction. Before you go off on the gear example at right, know that gear 3 is deeper than gears 1 and 2 and gears 1 and 2 are not coplanar. This is how God changes the constellations to tell us what is coming biblically.

Bad news for spherical earthers, you cannot achieve the star rotation picture to the right as you can't see the equator from Antarctica, or the fake south pole. Note also the consistent radii of the stars on either side. That wouldn't be the case if we were on a sphere. The apparent curvature of the earth horizon is an artifact of the wide angle lens used. Had the earth horizon been centered in the lens, you wouldn't see any curvature.



Stars, like the sun and moon are likely projections onto the dome or firmament.

Circumnavigation

Here's a video proving circumnavigation of the earth, whether a flat one or the fake sphere, always happens east to west or west to east. Never north to south or visa versa. Hmm.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JTVA_OdPyPA

You mean they lied to us about Columbus? Nah, they wouldn't do that. Would they?


<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q3RBCV1swpk>


So, last July, 99% of the earth was in some level of daylight. This video shows, that's not possible on the fake sphere. Works perfectly on the flat earth map. Hmm.

The Earth is Flat: <https://t.me/GhostEzra/5974> <https://t.me/GhostEzra/6008>

<https://twitter.com/i/status/1386645978149707785>


We Never went to the moon: <https://t.me/GhostEzra/5128>






Sutter Butte Model

Drop traveling the Earth's surface in the fake spherical system can be calculated by: $d = r(1 - \cos(360 \times D/24,880))$



Sutter Butte Curvature Drop: 8,050 feet

In the Spherical Earth Model We Should See None of the Sutter Buttes.



The Flat Earth Model is What We Actually See

The mountain between Rose and the Buttes is Anderson Peak, 8,860 feet of it. So, on the fake sphere, the Buttes would have dropped another 2,108 feet behind the range between them and Mt Rose. If that were the case, from 10,950 feet 110 miles away, I should not be able to see any of the Buttes. Far from the case as it looks like I see most of the 2,120 feet of them. ☺

Sutter Buttes From Mount Rose Sensitivity Analysis

As we can only estimate some of the elevations and distances of the peaks in these photos, or extract them from area maps, I have compiled a sensitivity analysis to give a range of best estimate possibilities.

Peaks	Mount Rose (View Point)	Donner Pass	Donner Pass	Donner Summit	Emigrant Mt	Anderson Peak	Sutter Buttes
Non-Spherical World							
Height [FT]	10,735	7,056	7,500	8,300	9,838	8,860	2,120
Distance From Rose [Mi]	0	21	21	22.5	40	56	110
View Slope [FT/Mi]		175.2	154.0	108.2	22.4	33.5	
View Depth @ 110 Miles		15592	13710	9469	1570	1808	
Fake Spherical World							
Height [FT]	10,735	7,056	7,500	8,300	9,838	8,860	-8,050
Distance From Rose [Mi]	0	21	21	22.5	40	56	110
Fake Sphere Drop		295	295	337	1,067	2,089	
View Slope [FT/Mi]		189.2	168.1	123.2	49.1	70.8	
View Depth @ 110 Miles		16842	14960	10780	3437	3822	
Buttes @ 110 Miles		10912	9030	4850	-2493	-2108	

The main takeaway here is that the most likely scenario, the view across Donner Lake and past Emigrant Peak which exactly fits area maps and confirms the actual observation where, we see what appears to be most or all of the Sutter Buttes as we should on a Flat Earth while the math shows us, on the Fake Spherical Earth, the Buttes should be more than 2,100 feet below the horizon. None of the other possibilities really fit either model or area maps.


Sutter Butte Model

Drop traveling the earth's surface in the fake spherical system can be calculated by:
 $d = r(1 - \cos(360 \times D/24,880))$

We Should See None of the Sutter Buttes.

The mountains between Rose and the Buttes are between 7,500 and 8,500 ft. So, on the fake sphere, the Buttes would have dropped another 2,016 feet behind the range between them and Mt Rose. If that were the case, from 10,950 feet 110 miles away, I should only be able to see none of the Buttes. Far from the case as it looks like I see about 2,000 feet of them. ☺

The Flat Earth Model is
Sutter Butte Curvature Drop: 8,050 feet
What We Actually See




Sutter Butte Model


Drop traveling the earth's surface in the fake spherical system can be calculated by:
 $d = r(1 - \cos(360 \times D/24,880))$


We Should See None of the Sutter Buttes.

The mountains between Rose and the Buttes are between 7,500 and 8,500 ft. So, on the fake sphere, the Buttes would have dropped another 2,016 feet behind the range between them and Mt Rose. If that were the case, from 10,950 feet 110 miles away, I should only be able to see none of the Buttes. Far from the case as it looks like I see about 2,000 feet of them. ☺

The Flat Earth Model is
Sutter Butte Curvature Drop: 8,050 feet
What We Actually See







Mount Shasta From Mount Rose Sensitivity Analysis

As we can only estimate some of the elevations and distances of the peaks in these photos, and from area maps, I have compiled a sensitivity analysis to give a range of best estimate possibilities.

Peaks	Mount Rose (View Point)	Lassen 1	Lassen 2	Lassen 3	Lassen 1	Lassen 2	Lassen 3	Shasta
Non-Spherical World								
Height [FT]	10,735	8,941	9,098	9,235	8,941	9,098	9,235	14,179
Distance From Rose [Mi]	0	110	110	110	115	115	115	185
View Down Slope [FT/Mi]		15.9	14.4	13.2	15.2	13.8	12.6	
View Height @ 185 Miles		6427	6163	5933	6300	6047	5827	
Fake Spherical World								
Height [FT]	10,735	8,941	9,098	9,235	8,941	9,098	9,235	-22,818
Distance From Rose [Mi]	0	110	110	110	115	115	115	185
Fake Sphere Drop		8,071	8,071	8,071	8,817	8,817	8,817	
View Slope [FT/Mi]		89.7	88.3	87.0	92.3	90.9	89.7	
View Depth @ 185 Miles		9865	9708	9571	10611	10454	10317	
Viewable Shasta Height		1226	1069	932	1972	1815	1678	

The main takeaway here is that the most likely scenario, the view across the Peaks around Mt Lassen, confirms the actual observation where we see what appears to be more than 5,000 feet of Mt Shasta as we should on a Flat Earth while the math shows us, on the Fake Spherical Earth, we should see only about 1,678 feet of Mt Shasta.