

## **The Business of Science**

Every day men and women go to work in their professions. Some of us dig ditches for a living while others work as engineers that work out the mechanics of sending spacecraft into the cosmos. For our effort, we receive something called a wage. Our employer pays each of us a certain amount of money for the work that we turn out for them. If we are productive, we are allowed to remain in their employ and if we are not productive we are fired and replaced by someone who can meet our employer's expectations. Unless we're involved in organized crime, we expected to operate under a specific code of ethics where we do the best job that we can possibly do, represent our employer by treating clients with honor and respect, and we are expected to produce results using honesty and integrity. If we work in such a manner we are often promoted to a higher status within our company and we are rewarded with a better wage and sometimes public or company recognition. Take into account that I am writing from America and I speak from a Capitalist point of view. If you live outside North America then perhaps you might notice some similarities but also some differences. In Capitalism, people work mostly in a production-based economic model.

Science works in a different mode than most of the world is familiar with. Science works in an outcome based economic model. Many people do not realize that most of science is funded by grants and/or private funding. One good example can be found in a comedy titled "Back to School." In the movie the main character wants to go back to college, figuring that if he is there he can help his son to stay in school and in addition so that he too can get a college degree. In the movie, there is another character that is a tenured professor in the colleges' school of business. The main character is a businessman who became quite successful because he saw a niche and took advantage of that need thus becoming very rich. The professor of economics contends that the main character is not able to attend the school because of poor high school grades and missing transcripts. The main character counters that if he's allowed to attend the school he'll build a new wing on the college if he's allowed to attend. The college, in want of a new wing, allows the main character to attend the school. This is a good example of an outcome-based system, a sort of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch your back."

Now I'm not saying that all scientists operate on this basis, but science as a whole is built upon this principle. As I mentioned above, almost all of science is funded by both public and private grants. People and organizations that provide grants do so on the premise that the scientists that they are funding will produce scientific evidence for something that they (those

giving the grants) are interested in proving. Another thing that spurs science on is when a scientist or a group of scientists have a personal conviction, idea or theory that they want to advance. They will often pitch their ideas to several sources until they find one source that deems their study fund-worthy. Albert Einstein, in an attempt to prove that gravity bends light sought out several benefactors until he finally found a man who wanted to advance his (Einstein's) theory. The expedition was funded and a small group of men set off for Crimea but were instead captured and labeled as spies because of political turmoil at the time. His theory would be proved a few years later in another part of the world. If scientists would crack open the Bible, they would realize one very important aspect of funding by grants:

*The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender. Proverbs 22:7*

During the past two hundred or so years it has become quite evident that science isn't solely in existence for science, but it is also a lucrative way of making a living. Yes, there are still some scientists who are compelled by truthful conviction, but much of science is ruled by those giving the grant rather than the truthful results that come from truthful verification from repeatable laboratory results. There are six steps to the scientific method:

1. Purpose/Question. Ask a question.
2. Research. Conduct background research.
3. Hypothesis. Propose a hypothesis.
4. Experiment. Design and perform an experiment to test your hypothesis.
5. Data/Analysis. Record observations and analyze what the data means.
6. Conclusion. Conclude whether to accept or reject your hypothesis.

If the six steps above are followed then there is a good chance that the results will be accepted by the scientific community and the result will be an accepted theory. When a theory is accepted by the scientific community and it has been proven time and time again then it becomes a scientific Law. True science is demonstrated by a thirst for knowledge, not by political pressure or monetary gain. In addition, true science strives to find the truth for the sake of knowing the truth. False science exists to destroy people, places or things. False science is often motivated by political or military purposes.

A good example of junk or false science is found in what is commonly called "the Theory of Evolution." To promote this theory, evolutionary scientists often use circular reasoning to promote what it perceives to be a truth. For example, if you were to ask a scientist how he can

date a layer of strata he or she would say that they date strata by the fossils that they find in that strata. If you ask them how they date fossils they will tell you that they date fossils by the strata in which they are found. Another dating method is called “carbon dating.” Since the universe is being affected by atrophy, everything decays. Elements and decay to become other elements. For instance, uranium decays to become the element lead. For you gardeners out there, the leaves that fall Autumn decay to become mulch and later good planting soil. Everything alive consists of carbon. The rays of the sun affect carbon creating something called “carbon 14.” Carbon 14 decays over time. The result is that something that died two thousand years ago should have much less carbon 14 than something that died five hundred years ago. The problem is that science relies on what it supposes that the sun has always shined upon the Earth in a constant manner. They do not take into account diminished sunshine because of volcanic ash in the atmosphere, the cycling of the sun between more and less active times. Places on Earth that experience less sunshine because of seasonal effects. Here are just a few examples of errors that were noted when using Carbon 14 as a dating method:

- *Living penguins have been carbon dated and the results said that they had died 8,000 years ago! This is just one of many inaccurate dates given by Carbon dating.*
- *The shells of living mollusks have been dated using the carbon 14 method, only to find that the method gave it a date as having been dead for 23,000 years! (Science vol. 141 1963 pg. 634-637)*
- *The body of a seal that had been dead for 30 years was carbon dated, and the results stated that the seal had died 4,600 years ago! (“The Illustrated Origins Answer Book” by Paul Taylor)*
- *What about a freshly killed seal? Well, they dated one of those too, the results stated that the seal had died 1,300 years ago. (Antarctic Journal vol. 6 Sept-Oct 1971 pg. 211)*
- *Antarctic seawater has a low level of C14. Consequently, organisms living there dated by C14 give ages much older than their true age.*
- *A Lake Bonney seal known to have died only a few weeks before was carbon dated. The results stated that the seal had died between 515 and 715 years ago. (Antarctic Journal, Washington)*
- *Shells from living snails were dated using the Carbon 14 method. The results stated that the snails had died 27,000 years ago. (Science vol. 224 1984 pg. 58-61)*

The examples above and below are sourced from the following website. It is a very informative website with much more information. Please visit them at <http://www.angelfire.com/mi/dinosaurs/carbondating.html>

Methods for dating older objects and nonorganic things like rock are flawed too and cannot be relied on by someone who is honestly seeking the truth. Scientists involved in evolution use the Potassium-Argon Ion dating test to determine the age of rocks and such. There are problems with Potassium-Argon dating, as exemplified below:

- *“Scientists got dates of 164 million and 3 billion years for two Hawaiian lava flows. But these lava flows happened only about 200 years ago in 1800 and 1801. (“Dry bones and other fossils” by Dr. Gary Parker)*
- *Volcanic ash has also been known to give dates much older than they actually were.*
- *Lava flows at Mt Ngauruhoe, New Zealand gave erroneous dates (from K-Ar analyses) ranging from <0.27 to 3.5 (± 0.2) million years old. These rocks were “observed to have cooled from lavas 25-50 years ago”. (“Radioactive ‘dating’ failure: Recent New Zealand lava flows yield ‘ages’ of millions of years” by Andrew Snelling published in: Creation Ex Nihilo 22(1):18-21 December 1999 – February 2000)*
- *The equipment was checked and the samples were run again to exclude the possibility of lab error but similar results were obtained. (“Radioactive ‘dating’ failure: Recent New Zealand lava flows yield ‘ages’ of millions of years” by Andrew Snelling published in: Creation Ex Nihilo 22(1):18-21 December 1999 – February 2000)*
- *Because the actual age of these rocks is known to be less than 50 years old, it is clear that these K-Ar ‘ages’ are due to ‘excess’ argon which was inherited from the magma source area deep in the earth. (“Radioactive ‘dating’ failure: Recent New Zealand lava flows yield ‘ages’ of millions of years” by Andrew Snelling published in: Creation Ex Nihilo 22(1):18-21 December 1999 – February 2000)*
- *See also the video: Mount St. Helens: Explosive Evidence for Catastrophe Dr. Steve Austin*

We see in just the dating methods of science there are problems. In real science, these methods would have caused the scientific community to castigate evolutionists and dismiss the Theory of Evolution. However, in a scientific community that has an agenda and a bias, these things are allowed to remain. There is good news about evolution, however, in that there are so many scientists that see the myriad of problems with Darwinism, that same Darwinism is starting to come under scrutiny.

The scrutiny that comes upon Darwinism would be a good and fair thing if those who had suspicions were to consider all viable replacements for Darwinism. If one can look at the history of Darwinism one could see that the Scopes Trial did a lot to establish Darwinism into our

modern culture. Basically, it all has to do with religion vs. religion. There might be some that would argue that Evolution is a science, not a religion. But let's look at some things in regard to evolution.

In the current evolution model, the universe came into existence from just a tiny dot spinning very fast that one day exploded and became the endless universe that we see today. According to Evolution Theory, about 4.6 billion years ago lightning struck a puddle of goo that somehow contained all of the amino acids needed to create life, resulting in a single-celled plant/animal that colonized and through what would have to be countless mutations throughout the 4.6 billion years that single-celled entity evolved into all life forms that we see today. Through some sort of miraculous evolution process, and abolishing the fact that 99.999% of mutations are fatal or create sterility, allowing not only adaptation to the environment, but also allowed species to evolve into other species. According to current Evolution Theory, one day a cold-blooded reptile with a two-chamber heart evolved (without harmful mutations) into a warm-blooded bird with a four-chamber heart. That is just one of the cosmic miracles, but there had to be billions, maybe trillions of such miracles that had to occur without any being performing these perfect gene manipulations. Are you starting to see that evolutionists have to possess a very strong faith to believe these things? Having faith denotes a religious aspect to their belief, a faith that far exceeds that of any religion that has faith in a creator deity. In essence, to believe that something came from nothing all by itself, that order was created out of chaos, that somehow strong genetic mutations ceased for no reason and that you can believe in something even though you never saw it or still can't observe it today makes evolutionists the people with the greatest faith that ever existed on earth. And, it elevates mankind to a god status because mankind is the final result of evolution.

This brings us to an interesting quandary. If a person is, in essence, a god, they do not want to be subject to a higher deity simply because it would cause them to surrender their sovereignty to the higher power and it would cause them to be subject to the rules and regulations set forth by The Almighty. Such a person would go through great strides to prove that the Almighty does not exist, using all means possible, especially promoting things that expressly deceive people of other religions and/or create doctrines that water down the doctrines expressly of Judeo/Christian belief. This would be especially easy if the government and private party's that also consider themselves to be gods wanted a fellow god to disprove or attempt to disprove the existence of YHVH or to diminish how YHVH cares for His own creation.

So now that we've explored the beast of modern science, let's look at some of the deceptions that scientists have thrown at an unsuspecting public so that those scientists can profit from their vain imaginations:

### **Global Warming Evolved from Global Ice Age:**

One theory that scientists used to make a lot of money back in the 1960's and into the 1970's came in the way of saying that there was a climate change coming upon the earth that would result in a New Ice Age. It was all over the news. Here are three "Time Magazine" covers from back in that time:



Yes, back in the 1970's science wanted us to think that the Earth was going through a phase of global cooling. Just like today, they tried to get us to believe that we were introducing vast amounts of CO-2 into the atmosphere and that as a result, we were blocking the sun's rays from reaching the surface of Earth. Today they want us to believe that the heat reaches the Earth's surface, but the CO-2 acts like a blanket that won't allow the heat to escape. Interestingly, back in the 1970's is when the environmentalists started to pressure the public into utilizing mass transit. It was much better for Earth if we rode in buses and trains. I was always amused when the hippies would show up as protests and especially on Earth Day, simply because it seemed that the majority of them drove Volkswagen Beetles and vans which were some of the worst polluters and which got the worse gas mileage of the majority of the cars out there. It is also interesting that those in power took advantage of what was perpetrated to be a gasoline shortage, causing long lines at gas stations and gas rationing. All of this was done to

indoctrinate people to become “better stewards of Earth’s resources.” It seems that the purpose has always been to guilt those with resources to back off of the resources with the threat that we’re running out of fossil fuels and that we’re destroying the earth. The propaganda that CO-2 was a bad thing but they left out one thing, that is that plants take in CO-2 and in return, they supply us with oxygen. More CO-2 makes Earth greener and encourages the production of oxygen. YHVH caused equilibrium in His creation, but science always tries to dispute that fact and supplant that fact with their own little lies.

### **The Business of Science and Pharmaceuticals:**

Another place where science seems to be dragging its feet is in the study of cholesterol so as to procure a cure, but also in its blatant lie in treating the condition. First, it must be understood that Cholesterol is important, so much so that your body makes it on its own. The body uses cholesterol

*Cholesterol is a waxy, fat-like substance that’s found in all cells of the body. Your body needs some cholesterol to make hormones, vitamin D, and substances that help you digest foods. Your body makes all the cholesterol it needs. However, cholesterol also is found in some of the foods you eat. [Source: <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/hbc>]*

In truth, cholesterol in itself isn’t a bad thing. It used to be thought that cholesterol was responsible for clogging the arteries of humans, and it still may play a minor role, but research is finding that artery blockages might more be the result of inflammation of the arteries and certain ruptures in the arteries where the reaction to the inflammation suddenly blocks artery channels. Wouldn’t it make sense that your doctor telling you to take an aspirin a day might be for inflammation rather than platelet aggregation (clumping)? I mean, after all, aspirin falls into the drug classification of NSAID, which stands for Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drug.

What science does in regard to cholesterol is they just assume that since they suppose that cholesterol is responsible for clogging the arteries of their test subjects, some of which might have been affected and some which were not, they should just recommend that everyone should be placed on some sort of anti-cholesterol medication. Using this sort of reasoning, we might just assume that since just a few people have allergies in Spring, we should just place everyone on an antihistamine, a rescue inhaler, and a steroid inhaler. Also, this is akin to saying that just because a few bad apples are found in any race or heritage group then all of that race or group must be a problem. No, there are more and more studies coming out proving that cholesterol is normal in

people and that everyone reacts differently to high levels of cholesterol. For instance, my own dad had “high cholesterol” in his blood chemistry. When he died because of meningitis the doctors wanted to do an autopsy on him to see why meningitis killed him so quickly and why treatments didn’t help. One of the results of his autopsy is that they looked at the arteries in his whole body and found that he had very little if any arterial sclerosis. In other words, his high cholesterol was normal for him and didn’t affect him in a negative manner.

If you’ve been to the doctor and your cholesterol level has been high, especially the LDL and triglycerides, the first thing that the doctor will do is tell you to adjust your diet. If your new diet doesn’t reduce your cholesterol levels, the next step will be to put you on an antilipidemic drug. Many of these drugs, especially the “statins” have terrible side effects, one being they are toxic to your liver. You only get one liver, and if you destroy it, you’re in danger of dying. Folks, you have to realize that most of the studies that are conducted regarding drugs and medication are done by drug companies (which have vested interests) and/or companies that are funded by drug company grants. These studies are used by the FDA (Food and Drug Administration) to determine if a drug is safe for human use. They usually conduct so many studies that any study that might prove that their product is harmful is quashed by those making the decision about the safety of the drug.

Now we have to look at another aspect of this whole biological drug safety research. Now let’s say that the studies show that cholesterol is bad for humans what is the first thing that those in power do. First, they tell you what you can and cannot eat. Then they convince you to take drugs that reduce cholesterol. Remember earlier in this article where I cited National Institute of Health, which said that Cholesterol is important for the human body because it aids in the production of hormones, vitamin D, and substances that help you to digest your food. Don’t you think that if you are taking medicine to inhibit cholesterol you are inhibiting a natural process that YHVH gave you to live in a healthy manner? Oh, and where is your cholesterol made in the body? It is made in the, are you ready for this, the Liver. Yes, drugs like “statins” might inhibit extra cholesterol, but they also affect your liver in a dangerous way that could destroy the only source of your body’s natural cholesterol. This is just something to consider before your doctor throws medications at you. Change your diet first and if things improve then maybe the pills aren’t the answer. Oh, and in addition, there have been studies of populations around the world where the people naturally have high cholesterol levels, and the people live much longer than those that are diagnosed with high cholesterol and have medications forced upon them.



Now, here is another way that science works in regard to cholesterol. Back three decades or so some “scientific” studies came out which tried to prove that the chicken eggs that many of us consume, have large volumes of cholesterol within them. The reports stated that we should be limited to maybe one egg a week, just to be safe. As the years went on the scientists started to tell us that we could eat maybe two or three eggs a week and the number kept going up. This went on for 15 years or so, maybe more. Then one day we heard that scientists came to the conclusion that it wasn’t the eggs that were causing the high cholesterol problem in people, it was the fats that people were using to cook the eggs. I’m waiting for a new scientific research study that proves that it’s not the oil anymore because that study is bound to come out. Let us now look at the progression. Some scientist gets a grant to study cholesterol. Another scientist gets a grant to find out what causes high cholesterol. The first guy finds that some people in his studies have high cholesterol and some of these people have developed heart disease. So right away, cholesterol is bad for everyone. The second guy finds that eggs have a lot of cholesterol so his study results in the news that the general public should avoid eggs because since cholesterol is a problem eggs are silent killers. The grant for scientist one will be extended because he’s discovered a supposed major problem. He’ll be funded by the government and drug companies. Scientist number two has supposedly proven that eggs are bad and that everyone needs to stop eating them and if they don’t, they will probably die of heart attacks. The second guy has made a foregone conclusion so he doesn’t need any more grant money. He’ll have to find work in another field that has an active grant, or he can make another announcement. He can contact the media and say that he’s found that two or three eggs a week might be okay to eat. He has now created doubt that his first study was accurate but he wants to find the truth. He gets another grant to continue his study. A year or two later he comes out with yet another study that says that eggs really aren’t the problem, it is the highly saturated fat that people are using to cook the eggs that are causing all of the problems. Now he gets a grant to study exactly what sort of oil causes the problem. In the meantime, the first scientist is having money thrown at him left and right. He’s getting grants from the government and pharmaceutical companies. The drug companies want him to identify what mechanism can be found that could curb high cholesterol. He finds that the problem is the way that the liver handles all of the extra cholesterol that is produced. He goes to work for the pharmaceutical industry which comes out with a variety of different drug classes that fight cholesterol through different mechanisms of action. As time goes on more and more scientists come into the process, some chemists, some biologists and a variety of others. A whole mega-scientific industry is now in full swing. Oh, and let’s not forget your family doctor.

Doc

Oh, and let's not forget your family doctor. Doctors are for the most part ignorant participants in this whole cycle of scientific fraud. Doctors read research papers that tell them the result of studies. Being scientists themselves, they trust that their colleagues are giving them good information. They want the best for their patients. I do believe that a very high percentile of doctors genuinely care for their patients and their care. In this scenario, you have a doctor or an HMO that is approached by drug company representatives. The doctors are shown all of the false data, and being trusting souls that believe in science and that science always tells the truth, they buy into the whole cholesterol debacle.

Last year sometime my wife went to visit a doctor and I went with her. I won't list the doctor's name or field of study. He talked to my wife about her situation after which time I brought up antilipidemic drugs, and that I didn't believe in them. The doctor gets red in the face and I thought that I was going to get a tongue lashing. What I heard next really made me respect this doctor. The doctor looked at me and said, "That's so much bullshit. All of the cholesterol crap is stuff that is made up by the pharmaceutical companies and they are running the whole show on that one. Cholesterol is natural in people and the drugs that they are being forced to take are hurting more than they are helping them."

If you've read any of my recent articles or have listened to our Opposing the Matrix radio show you probably know that back in April, I was diagnosed with colon cancer. The good news is that they removed all of the cancer (and a good section of the colon) as well as some affected lymph nodes. As my wife drove me up to the oncologist, I imagined all sorts of scenarios as to how this doctor was going to try to get me to take chemo. I was very surprised to find a doctor that was not opposed to alternative medicine, telling me that the chemo would probably have more negative side effects than I would want. I love doctors that think for themselves and allow their patients to think for themselves. You see, I have worked in pharmacy for many years and I have read about the effects. I love to work and if I was on Chemo, I would be exposed to a patient population that really don't know or they don't care about spreading infections like the common cold or flu. That is not good for immune compromised people like I would be if I was taking Chemo. Chemo also kills good cells. It is not selective in what it goes after.

### **Why Haven't Major Diseases Been Cured?**

When I was a younger man, even a child I can remember there being telethons on television to raise money for the research to cure disease. Over the years, billions of dollars, if not trillions have been donated to the cure of diseases like Muscular Dystrophy, Cancer, and

many other diseases too numerous to name here. I was sitting around the other day thinking that in the decades that supposed scientists have been researching these diseases hardly any advance has been made. Yes, some very good drugs have been invented to treat the symptoms of a disease, or even to bring them into remission, but nothing has ever been invented to actually kill virus' and cure autoimmune diseases.

Now I'm going to present something to you that maybe you haven't considered. Did you ever stop to realize that diseases that have been cured or should I say diseases that have been given high importance to in research are the ones that are brought on by sexual activity? This suggests to me that more money is funneled into these ailments because those who donate the money and those who donate the grants are involved in sexual immorality. For instance, when AIDS came onto the scene it became imperative that cures for this virus were of the utmost importance to cure. While AIDS, as far as we know, has no cure, it can be maintained and/or brought into remission by using some very exotic antiviral drugs that would not have existed had it not been for AIDS research.

Let's look at another killer, that being Hepatitis C. Hepatitis C is often associated with sharing dirty needles in the administration of illicit drug use, but Hepatitis C is a blood-borne illness that is spread through sexual intercourse. Just last year we started to see commercials on Television stating that there is now a drug that cures Hepatitis C. In addition, we now have commercials on television that are trying to convince that general public to get their kids vaccinated against a disease called HPV (Human Papilloma Virus) which is spread through sexual contact.

It seems almost sure that the reason why there has not been a cure for diseases like cancer, heart disease, and other killers is that the pharmaceutical companies make a lot of money on maintenance care and palliative care of the victims of such diseases. If it would only cost a couple of thousand dollars to cure cancer or heart disease, the drug companies would not be able to cash cow that they now have. If they could cure a disease in a six-month time period it would not be as lucrative as selling a patient a regimen of drugs that would last for a decade or more. It is simply evil mathematics, drag out the misery instead of cure it.

What I find alarming however is the news that has been coming out of Washington lately. If this news can be believed, there has been a very large child sex traffic ring that many politicians and many rich people have been taking advantage of for many years. Some of the news reports list high profile people like both Bill and Hillary Clinton, senators, congressmen

and many others who have partaken in this evil carnage. But then the light bulb comes on even brighter. This sort of activity could be why So much attention has been paid to curing diseases that are sexually transmitted. The purveyors of sexual perversion can feel free to pursue their escapades if there is a cure for Hepatitis C, AIDS, various types of venereal diseases and whatever else is down the pike.

For all that we know, there has been a cure for cancer and all of the other diseases that plague mankind. It just isn't available to the common man but is available to the elites. Think about it, in the past twenty years you rarely hear of the Rich Elite or any of the important politicians dying of any sort of incurable disease. As a matter of fact, a phrase that a good friend's mother once echoed seems to be prevalent in our conversation, that being, "evil never dies."

### **Mercury in Tuna Scare:**

Okay, so I don't remember exactly when this became a big deal, but if my memory serves me correctly the big Mercury Scare in Tuna made the rounds in the 1980's. I'm not going to try to glaze over the fact that there are chemicals and metals in fish that could harm people, especially nowadays. When the first mercury scare came out about mercury in tuna the seas weren't as polluted as they are nowadays, we're talking 30 years ago. There has always been a degree of minerals and metals within fish. Remember one thing, metals are heavy and they sink to the bottom of our seas and rivers. Mercury is a very heavy metal and, like gold seeks to fall in a flow quite quickly. Heavy metals and minerals have been flowing in streams, rivers and into the ocean since the beginning of time. Many times, these minerals enter waterways and seas as a result of landslides and such, but mankind does play in important role. Mercury is used in the processing of other ores such as gold. Since heavy metals like mercury tend to fall to the bottom right away, we would expect bottom feeding fish to have the highest mercury levels, right? Below is what science is telling us:

# MERCURY LEVELS IN FISH

HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW	
Bluefish	Seabass (Chilean*)	Bass (Striped, Black)	Monkfish*	Arctic Cod	Mullet • Oyster
Crab (Blue)	Shark*	Carp	Perch (Freshwater)	Anchovies	Perch (Ocean)
Grouper*	Swordfish*	Cod (Alaskan)	Sablefish	Butterfish	Plaice • Pollock
Mackerel (King, Spanish, Gulf)	Tilefish*	Croaker (White Pacific)	Skate*	Catfish • Clam	Salmon** (Canned, Fresh, Wild)
Marlin*	Tuna (Ahi, * Yellowfin, * Bigeye, Blue, Canned Albacore)	Halibut (Pacific, Atlantic*)	Snapper*	Crab (Domestic)	Sardine • Scallop*
Orange Roughy*		Lobster	Tuna (Canned Chunk Light, Skipjack*)	Crawfish/Crayfish	Shad • Shrimp*
Salmon** (Farmed, Atlantic)		Mahi Mahi	Sea Trout	Croaker (Atlantic)	Sole • Squid
*Overfished **May Contain PCBs		Data from: nrdc.org		Flounder*	Tilapia • Trout
				Haddock (Atlantic*)	Whitefish
				Hake • Herring	Whiting
				Mackerel (N. Atlantic, Chub)	
					

Taking in the assumption that bottom feeding fish would probably have the highest content of mercury, one has to doubt and question the chart above. For example, look at the chart's right side. Supposedly these fish are lowest in mercury content. However, having been a fisherman I know that catfish, crabs, crawfish, flounder, scallop, shrimp, and sole are all bottom feeders. Scallops are not bottom feeders in that they eat other fish, but they are filter eaters, meaning that they filter the water at the bottom of the sea which places them closer to the heavy metals that fall to the bottom. In the second column, they have lobster, cod, and halibut listed, all bottom feeders. According to science, all of the bottom feeders that feed on other bottom feeders or dead top feeders are okay to eat, but the top feeders are high in mercury content. This makes absolutely no sense. Notice also that the top feeders have asterisk's next to their names denoting that they are being overfished. Maybe it's not truly a mercury content concern, but an environmental concern. Maybe it's the environmental lobby that is causing science to make false comments.

### Truth Be Told About Eating Fish:

In our new millennium, we have witnessed a variety of disasters that have affected the sea. The biggest of these disasters was the breakdown and destruction of Japan's Fukushima

Nuclear Reactor. To this day it is still spewing mass amounts of radiation into the Pacific Ocean. Why isn't science talking about this? Personally, I wonder if it is safe at all to eat tuna, especially if it was caught in the Pacific Ocean. Frankly, I wonder if it is safe to eat anything that comes out of the Pacific Ocean anymore. A couple of years ago the coast of Oregon played host to a few arrivals that washed up on shore, debris fields that were from the tidal wave that swept through Fukushima and its surrounding areas. This debris was not radioactive because it was swept out to sea by the tidal wave before the nuclear reactors in Fukushima became a problem. The image below is a more realistic illustration of how the radiation has spread in the Pacific Ocean. Based on this map I refuse to eat fish unless I can be guaranteed that it comes from the Atlantic Ocean.



[Map Source: <http://exopolitics.blogspot.com/peaceinspace/2014/02/leuren-moret-fukushima-radiation-has-made-hawaii-and-Pacific-islands-unsafe-for-humans.html>]

Back in the 1990's, I was working in a little pharmacy down in Carmichael, California. My boss hired a woman that immigrated from Armenia. I got to know her and her family well and often discussed politics, America vs. The Former Soviet Union. One day we started to talk about the American News Media. I expressed that I was angry that some story was not being reported upon accurately and said something to effect that they were lying about the true story. She told me that in Armenia she learned "they report to you what they want you to know." Now I sort of knew that, but saw that as a confirmation that the press all over the world was jaded and we very rarely got the truth concerning just about everything. To the best of my information,

radioactivity in the sea does not distill into the atmosphere, but airborne particles do, so any particles that became airborne from Fukushima traveled the Jetstream to fall as rain or just particles on North America and probably around the world. This means that anything eaten that grows from the soil or anything that eats something grown in the soil is probably contaminated by radiation. We are witnessing a man-made destruction of the Earth, but we know that this is a sign of the times mentioned in the prophetic books of Biblical scripture.

So what they're not telling us is:

*As of June 2015, the radiation in the Pacific Ocean reached the US West Coast; the seafood you've been eating from the Pacific Ocean is loaded with Cesium-137 and Strontium-90. Both radioactive. Strontium-90 mimics calcium. Both radioactive strontium and cesium may end up getting deposited in human bones, where the radiation wreaks havoc on bone marrow, causing bone cancers and blood cancers like Leukemia.*

And, proof of this contamination can be clearly seen:




Tumors found on Pacific Salmon. [Source of quote and photo:  
[<https://www.davidwolfe.com/fukushima-radiation-tumors-fish-seafood/>]

I am a firm believer that YHVH is more than able to preserve his people. Many of us pray over our meals before we eat. I think that we should be more attentive to doing that seeing that most of the food that is available to us is tainted in one way or another, even the food that is labeled “organic.” I think that it’s important to remember that YHVH has allotted a certain amount of days for each person and he has also ordained the method that he has chosen for us to go home. Earlier I mentioned that I was diagnosed with colon cancer back in April. I had the surgery and it appears to be gone. I’m going natural with adjunct therapy. When you hear the word “cancer” in your own diagnosis you start to think about things. You start to wonder if you have a limit of time to get things done. You start to wonder if the cancer will come back, or if it has hidden somewhere else in the body where it will grow more aggressively. You start to worry about your spouse and how they will get along without you. You think about all of the things that you want to do with your grandkids and with other loved ones. You worry about your parents because it is terrible for a parent to lose their son or daughter. But then you start to come around to realize that YHVH has everything under control. You start to realize that nothing happens unless He allows it to happen. You start to realize how much he truly loves us, then you know that when he has destined us to go home he will take care of those we leave behind and all the affairs that we leave on Earth. YHVH is love and love conquers all, and this knowledge makes “worry” flee from us.

### **Climate Change – Global Warming:**

There is no doubt that things are changing or perhaps “cycling” where the climate is concerned. The question that should be asked (and is being ignored) is whether global warming is natural or if it is man-made. The theory that a minority of scientists, the media, and the New World Order is trying to sell us is that man-made hydrocarbons are being released into the atmosphere and that it is creating a barrier that is not allowing heat to return into space, sort of like a blanket keeps us warm in the cold weather. What the proponents of global warming fail to mention is that there have been serious periods of global warming that occurred well in advance of mankind’s industrial endeavors, and, there have been some serious periods of global cooling between those times. This suggests a cycle that does not involve mankind but is a natural occurrence. See the graph below:





Yet another factor that false science forgets to share with us is that the sun goes through cycles. There are periods where the sun is more active and periods when it is less active. In the winter we use wood for heat. We have a nice wood burning stove mounted into our fireplace. When the stove is stoked and burning well it sometimes gets unbearable in our home so we have to the fan off. When the wood burns down the stove is less hot and it starts to get cooler in the house and if we forget to stoke the fire (like at 3 AM) the fire dies down and the house gets cold. In essence, when the sun is hot earth warms, when the sun is not so hot earth cools. Really, it's not rocket science.

Like I mentioned earlier, CO-2 isn't a bad thing. The atmosphere is made up of oxygen, nitrogen and yes, CO-2. Plant life on earth is wonderful in that it uses nitrogen and CO-2 for food. Plants absorb CO-2 and through chemical process plants release oxygen. They use nitrogen which comes to them through the rain that collects the nitrogen and brings it to the ground where the nitrogen is absorbed by the roots. What science doesn't tell you is that CO-2 is also taken up in water vapor that sooner or later condenses and comes back to the ground where it can be absorbed by the plants to start that cycle all over again. Whatever you send up into the sky, whether it is a baseball, a spacecraft or CO-2, it is all going to come back to the ground sooner or later.

Modern science liars, orchestrated by their NWO keepers fail to tell us the truth in many things. They are also skilled at using the good nature of people to further their cause. In recent

years there have been many lies perpetrated to gain the sympathy from well-meaning people. They show us polar bears adrift on ice flows and say that the bears are in danger because the ice is disappearing. They ignore the reports of the ice in the polar regions actually expanding and getting thicker. Just this week there was a report that scientists on their way to study in the North Pole region had to turn back because the summer ice was too thick to navigate through. The weather here in Oregon has been unseasonably cool all winter and all spring. Right now in the middle of June, we've only had five days above seventy degrees. My wife and I, expecting it to get warmer moved all of the wood outside along with the stove tools. Three days ago, in an effort to save on the electric bill we decided not to turn on the baseboard heat. We sat in our living room with jackets on as we watched television. It's June for goodness sake and it feels like it's early April. There is no doubt in my mind that there is climate change occurring, but it is global cooling, not global warming. Or, maybe it is as I have mentioned in other articles, that the earth's poles have moved. There is evidence that this has happened, but we will not explore that in this article.

### **So, What Are You Trying to Save David?**

We've seen that science has turned into a political machine. Science was once based on empirical evidence that could be reproduced in laboratory conditions and that could be observed by peers to verify as being true. There are literally thousands of scientists that oppose the idea of global warming. Many of them have suffered censure and humiliation because of their disagreement and some have lost their jobs or funding. That is not science, it is politics. Real science considers all possibilities and fosters discussion, not humiliation. Today, science is ruled by a minority of scientists that get paid good money for promoting political agendas. We are moving into a time when the Elites of this world are trying to form the world into a world government. They want to eliminate sovereign states, especially the powerful nations. They operate on the idea of "fairness" in the classic communist thought that all people should be in the same state, that no one country or people should be better off than another. The only way to do this is to tear apart the nations that are prospering and redistributing their wealth to other nations that are poor and destitute. In order to do this, they must completely gut the economic structure of rich nations. I mean, how would anyone explain the election of a Marxist-Islamist to the presidency of the United States just 7 years after Islamist declared war on the United States by destroying the Twin Towers. No sane nation would elect an enemy of the state, but a nation that has been deluded by Marxist/Leninist ideas for the past fifty years would be an easy mark.

The globalists have a few wrenches that have been thrown into their machinery. The Russians have rightfully asserted that the NWO Elitists exist and they have fought to slow down the advance of a global government. The British have realized the same thing and are exiting the European Union. Finally, the United States elected Donald Trump who is very anti-Globalist. A recent report came out showing that it was the United States that was paying the majority of costs for The Paris Agreement, a horrible agreement that would have destroyed the US economically and would have been a great device to turn our nation into a Third World nation. Trump pulled us out of the agreement, causing those who weren't supporting the agreement economically to become irate with the United States.

Global warming is going to be a hard beast to overcome. Money is pouring in from governments all over the globe and it is sanctioned by the United Nations. It would not surprise me to someday see that the false scientists who are promoting the global warming lie, becoming part of the wealthy elite, the new millionaires, and power players. False Science has become a religious entity and it will meld with lukewarm Christianity and every false religion of this world. They have become the false prophets of our time and will probably be a powerful force in the Beast System mentioned in Revelation.

This world is going to hell in a handbasket. The thing is are you ready for what is coming down the pike? Do you know Yeshua, because if you don't you won't survive because you'll either die in your sin, or you will join the Beast System and perish with it. The choice is yours. Yeshua is calling you, will you answer?