

Mark Sargent: The Spinning Ball You Think You Are On Is Flat?

March 31, 2015

Hello, Hello Everyone, this is Alexandra Meadors of Galactic Connection.com and today is March 31st, 2015. Now I want to ask you guys, have you been wondering what it would be like to be here at this time, March 31st, this is a magical time of the year. We've all talked about this for months and months and months. What was it going to be like around this Spring Equinox. And here we are today and there's some major gurglings going on about military factions and Seal factions getting ready and militia stepping up and martial law, which by the way, I think is totally garbage. I just want everybody to know that a lot intel and a lot of messages have come forth through many of us who are either psychic or clairvoyant, we are all receiving the same thing, that we are literally on the threshold of something fantastic about to go down. So I just want you to remember to hang in there, hang tough, don't get caught up in the fear porn, everybody, because there's a lot of it going around. And there is a lot of the documents being released which are showing what the government is really doing to all of us around the world.

So who better to bring on on board today than our very up-and-coming quick-rising star, Mark Sargent. Seriously. I cannot believe - it's very interesting because I did not set up this radio show. My husband very much pursued this because he's been pursuing research on the Flat Earth for quite some time. I think you guys remember last summer we put a very comprehensive interview together about some of the things that we had uncovered. And we were blown away. Just the concept of being on flat earth. We had heard about it but we didn't really embrace it until we really dived into some of the details. So today what I thought I'd do is to kind of turn it around. It's funny because last week's interview the gentleman I interviewed, Sheldon Nidle, doesn't really believe in the Flat Earth, so we've got all kinds of different opinions and viewpoints today. But Mark has some very pretty convincing arguments, if you want to call it that, and for those of you who are not following him, he's just came out on the internet with a flare. He is from Whidbey Island, Washington, that sounds pretty.

Mark: It is pretty.

Alexandra: I bet. He was born in Seattle, grew up in South Whidbey Island, and founded the Brimstone Fireworks Company. And I just cracked up - it was shut down by the ATF in his junior year, awww...

Mark: Yeah, if you're not getting into trouble in college you're not trying, in my opinion.

Alexandra: I just cracked up. He spent three years as a sous chef at a Greek restaurant and won the first computer pinball world tournament in 1994. He was hired to a PC game publisher in Boulder, Colorado, which I think is now where you are.

Mark: I am here.

Alexandra: He spent the entire year playing computer games for a living - Oh gee, that's tough.

Mark: It's a rough life.

Alexandra: – in 1997. He stayed in the Boulder technical sector ever since. And he's never been married, never had kids – which actually there's a lot of us around, by the way, that do that – and the most extensive time is spent trying to unravel the hidden truths of civilization and, what I would say, conspiracy. (**M:** Shhhh) And the never-ending search for the meaning of itself. If I had to pick a single motto, Mark says, it would be 'hope for the best and prepare for the worst.' And a close second would be, 'Don't regret what you've done, regret what you haven't,' which I totally agree with.

So with that said, welcome everybody. You are attending an interview with Galactic Connection.com, I even forgot to say that. Please visit my website at GalacticConnection.com, you will be accessing the largest online library of articles, events, news, education, conspiratorial uncoverings, everything from Quantum Physics to Spirituality. So we've got quite a bit to show you if you take a little walk up to Galactic Connection's website. So anyway Mark, thank you for coming on today.

Mark: Oh thank you very much for having me.

Alexandra: You are welcome. And as anyone might notice who are really heavily involved with the Flat Earth theory, people are going to notice Mark's been really getting a lot of coverage as of late, and he and I were just talking about, isn't it interesting that literally, overnight there's been a flurry of information and people connecting with one another regarding the Flat Earth. There's no accident to this.

Mark: No, no, there can't be. I've never seen such traction around a topic that should not be getting any traction whatsoever.

A: It's amazing.

M: Yeah.

A: And I'm also noticing, and which we'll bring up later, there's a little bit of friction amongst the Flat Earther people.

M: A little bit, but as of today, that may be mending.

A: Good. I'm glad to see that. We don't need that.

M: No, we don't. And just let me know when you want me to talk about that and I'm more than happy to let you know what the progress is.

A: We'll dive into that. What I really want to start out with is, why do we see the same picture in every classroom, in every book, every science book, from the time that we were educated from a very young age, why do we see the same picture of the Earth?

M: Because it's the only picture they've ever released. It is the strangest thing you'd ever expect, but from 19 – and it really depends when you date-stamp that picture and everybody knows what picture I'm talking about – it is a very cloudy Earth with the bottom part of Africa and all that they are proposing as Antarctica with the crescent cloud shape right next to it, they put that thing up there either in the late '60s or the early 70s and that was the only picture that NASA ever produced. And all the way up until, at least 2000 and, probably, the mid thousands, [000s] it was amazing. I looked for more 15 years ago, back in the year 2000, and literally, people don't understand that if you did a

Google image search or just a general internet image search that's all that you got – just rows and rows and rows of the same picture. And that's how good for me this thing was – as far as how big and how deep it was because no one even noticed it. Everybody was like, oh, it's just that NASA is crappy with their job.

A: Yeah.

M: They had no idea that, no, it's the only picture that they are going to release until the composites started coming out.

A: Well, and that's my next question is, so the composite of the Earth – how many pictures is that a composite of?

M: You mean how many composites are there out there now? There are hundreds of them. As a matter of fact, ever since Google Earth came into effect, which is one giant 3D movable composite image, that really took over from that point on. Because people were just taking screenshots of Google Earth. So that just fills the internet. But by all means anybody who wants to go to YouTube there's videos, there's people who've dedicated – I haven't dedicated videos entirely to it – but there's people who have dedicated videos to just showing all the different rows of composites, thousands, thousands at this point. And you can spot them. They're really easy. Even NASA will release some composites and they are not shy about saying, yeah, they're composites. Because most people do not ask, Well, where are the real shots from space?

And as far as – now that's still images. What's more interesting though, is you try to find an actual video of the Earth from space. Then it gets all, you know, very, very tough to find. If you do find something that is revolving you get the early stuff that they released didn't have clouds morphing and that was caught almost immediately by the internet hive mind. So, they can't get away with much nowadays.

A: So clarify for the audience why the Earth is composited in the first place.

M: The Earth is composited in the first place – I'll be as blunt as I can here – because the Earth is isn't what you think it is. It is not this shape. It's never been this shape. I think in the first 4500 of our existence it was not this shape. It was considered a flattish enclosed disc system and 500 years ago it all of a sudden became this and then for 20 generations we were pushing this in the classrooms. So the composite images – they were desperate. You got to the point where once the internet got high-speed, once we abandoned modems and went high-speed you had to release these composite images. No different than why you had to create these Space program. But you had to create the composited images because otherwise more and more people would notice, like me. If you wanted images – I'll give you a quick example. The I-phone default – that globe picture on the I-phone – I can't remember which version it was but that is a composite image and the reason why the guy created that for the phones was because he couldn't find any decent images out there. So he had to create his own. And there's interviews on that, he was interviewed. There's videos on Youtube that you can find. It's great.

A: So what exactly happened 500 years ago to change the concept of the Earth being flat with 4-square corners to actually being a globe? What exactly happened at that point?

M: It changed from the proverbially 4-corners of the Earth model. 500 years ago – Copernicus was the one who was credited for it and the truth was, yeah, even his stuff wasn't released until after he had passed away. He had sat on it because it is a huge leap of faith. You think – people watching this – if you think this is leap of faith from this [indicating the globe] to a flat model. Imagine 500 years ago when all of history thought it was a flat model and you had to make a leap to this [globe] and say, okay, if we wrap this around a ball and have it spinning a 1000 miles an hour and then you have that moving around the sun at 60,000 miles per hour, then it's a globe. It's an immense leap of faith. It's a huge leap of faith. But it caught on, especially in the science community. And then the religion groups had to sort of bend with it because it's such a big change to a globe and a flat model that religion didn't want to be left behind. Let's say religion was wrong, no, we'll go with this. It's still in our books, we'll go with this. And so, religion thought, whatever. God created the globe just as he created the flat sphere therefore, we'll move forward with it.

So everybody was on board. But what the problem was you couldn't prove it. There was not physical – not like today's experiments where they take this 10 or 20 years to prove something out. No. These guys were centuries away from proving it. Balloons weren't invented until another 200 years. The first planes weren't going to be around for another 400 years. Rocket technology wasn't going to be around until almost 460 years later. And that's when you first got a chance to take a picture, when you went high enough and find out what it really looked like.

So the dilemma is once you got high enough to take the picture, if it didn't look like this and you had already been preaching this in the schools and the universities for the last 20 generations, are you going to tell people? Are going to let that out of the bag? Because at that point there's a big shift and I cover this in some of my videos – there's a big shift from spirituality and how mankind looks at the world and each other. It's a big roll of the dice and if you know the authority and know the power structure, it's man, we'll have to take three steps back before we can get this under control again so they made the decision not to.

A: Well, what I was going to ask you was, if you go back to the Biblical part of things, (**M:** Yeah) and it said, "And God said, Let there be light and there was Light. And God saw the light, that it was good. And God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and he called the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day." Now get this. "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide" – there's the clue guys – "the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God divided the firmament." So what's your interpretation of that?

M: Oh, that's a great interpretation and I use that the most often because it's the most recognizable. I mean, it's Genesis. And not only is it the first book of the King James, it not only is – I hate to do this because other religions are going to yell at me – not only is it the first book of the King James Bible, but it is also the first chapter. So you can't go any further back than that, which is again why religion would absolutely latch onto this. All religions would latch onto this. I've got a wonderful pdf document that covers every culture. Every culture talks about this.

A: That's what I was going to say.

M: And not just the big five religions but your tribal religions. Every native, indigenous population all over the world, they all had the same sort of belief. And that was a solid immovable structure covered by some sort of canopy that displays everything that we see in the sky and it was a wonderful thing. As a matter of fact, the first ones that got away from that, from what I was reading recently was the Chinese in 200 AD. and they were considered nuts at the time when they did it. Because everyone else was going, are you kidding? Why would you ever think about this?

What I thought was so interesting about that was, 'the waters from the waters.' Because several people have said to me as far as a closed system goes, what's on outside of it? And it's like, is it possible that it literally is water on the outside. Could we actually be in an enclosed structure in an ocean somewhere? Well, that's very possible.

A: You know that it's funny that you say that Mark, because through my investigations and the amount of reading and research that I've done in the past, it really seems to me that Dark Matter is – and it refers to this – as kind of a black ocean.

M: Yeah.

A: And it's actually referred to as that in some of the ancient scripts. The other thing is by opening the door to this theory we are really having to look at our selves completely different internally.

M: Yes.

A: Because now, once again, we are back to 'we are the center of the universe.' Now, not from any egotistical standpoint. (**M:** Yeah) It's more about the spiritual journey. And what are we going to do when we find out who we really are, which is what this kind of leads to, is who are we really.

M: Agreed. Agreed.

A: So what do you think, it says here even the Hebrews considered the Sun and the Moon to be the small bodies near to the Earth and it's clear in Joshua 10:12, granted everybody knows I'm not a big Bible guru or a Bible thumper by any means, but it's interesting to bring the correlation back to the Biblical aspects. It gives it specific localities in which it stood still. And this is in Isaiah, it says, quote, "God sits enthroned on a vaulted roof of Earth and its inhabitants are like grasshoppers." And in the book of Job, it says, "God walks to and fro on the vault of Heaven." When you talk about the firmament what exactly is that? What have you found that to be?

M: From everything that I've seen, it appears to be a very solid and I know I over-use it and I'm going to keep using it, because everybody can relate to it – the Truman Show-like enclosure that seems to be impenetrable. It seems to be fairly high although the height is really disputed. For me 400 kilometres high is about fine, but other people say it's higher. But it encloses the whole thing. I'll throw another Isaiah quote to you, "He who sits on the circle of the Earth." It doesn't say it's a ball, it doesn't say it's a globe, a circle. But as far as the firmament is considered, yeah, a very, very large structure that maybe be being projected on from the outside as far as the planets and the stars are concerned, but your point, the Sun and the Moon are seeming to be separate from that. And for me, again I know that

there's some disputes in the Flat Earth circles, for me I go with the traditional flat model which says that 3-dimensional objects which spin around the circle and then adjust themselves according to the seasons.

A: Interesting. So do you agree that the Sun and the Moon are the same size?

M: It's very possible. It's extremely possible.

A: Why do you say that?

M: Because, well, look at the eclipses for one. The Moon slides over the Sun perfectly, coincidentally.

A: That's a good point.

M: And don't think that they didn't notice that you can only see exactly one side of the Moon. Why didn't they get that thing rotating I have no idea. But it just feels right. When you look at the two during any eclipse it seems – I know it's going to sound silly, but it seems they could be possibly be the same size, even though they say the Sun is 92 million miles away and the Moon is 237 thousand miles away. But yeah, it could very be possible that they're the same size.

A: Which leads me into – for any who haven't followed Mark's Sargent's videos series, you want to tell where to find them?

M: Oh, you don't have to look hard now. All you have to do is Google "Flat Earth Clues" and it'll come up. Apparently, I'm the only one using that term until somebody trademarks it. It's on Youtube and you don't even have to go to Youtube if you don't. But that's the only place to find them at the moment – well, besides of all the mirrors – I put a little thing in there saying feel free to share these videos and people have just been mirroring these things.

A: That's the way to get the awareness up.

M: Yeah.

A: Now we are up to the 11th one. I noticed it was released just recently. Do you have a 12th one percolating?

M: A 12th one is in the works right now. The 11th one is called, Souls is the System. The 12th one is called Real Eyes. And I am still working on that one. That's one's about the power of illusion and I want to make sure that I get that one right before I release it. I'm not just going to throw filler up. I've released a ton of content already in a short amount of time. I don't know where most of it came from. It was like a bolt of the blue. I just woke up, and, I've got to do this –

A: Gee, I wonder who that could be?

M: No seriously, I had a dream –

A: How long ago did this start with you, Mark?

M: It's embarrassing to say how short it was. I think it was less than seven weeks.

A: Less than seven weeks, guys. How many total videos have you made already?

M: I made the Intro, and then 11 Clues, so 12 of those, 3 trailers, and there's 6 interviews already up on the Channel, another one is supposed to be shipped to me pretty soon and everything else this week.

A: So seven weeks, we're talking sixteen videos and six interviews and you're wondering why you woke up one day and you said to yourself, Oh my God, why do I have to do this?

M: Yeah.

A: That's the way Spirit works. And it's incredibly excellent for this to be being released which one of the reasons that I felt compelled to do it. Now with that said, let's talk a little bit about why people would even believe that the Earth is not round. I thought it would be really cool to go into the whole thing about the measuring of the dip of the Earth – how they say that the first mile is 8 inches – can you go into that kind of thing?

M: Oh I can, to be honest though, I try to avoid the old arguments about why the Earth isn't round because the arguments don't go anywhere as far as you know – the amount of dip per 6 miles – I have had so many people come back – honestly the only consensus is there is no consensus. Because I know the old test that was done years ago was like, okay, for 6 miles there should be a 16 foot drop.

A: Right.

M: And I have seen that test. But at the same time other people have said it's less than that. Less than half of that and other people have said it is more. The point that I was been making about it – before I released these videos I was bouncing around certain things and I was going, you know what, these are arguments that generally don't go anywhere. So I tried to go with the bigger broad strokes that nobody hadn't talked about. But I know where you are going with this and yes, tests have been done in the past and people will argue on both sides, but unfortunately, the arguments – if you get too many nerds in one room before ten minutes are out you're wondering what formula you are talking about. And it's, well okay, you don't even know which side even to root for at that point because everything gets lost in math.

A: I'm giggling because I'm sitting here thinking – are you a nerd, Mark?

M: I . . . haa . . . yeah, (laughter) I'm looking at all the comic book art that sits around my place. I used to own a comic book shop years and years ago. I remember the movie The Unbreakable with Samuel Jackson and Bruce Willis, Jackson being the comic book artist shop owner. That was, and still is me to a certain degree. You don't see that behind me. So yeah, I am very much a nerd.

A: So do you agree that the lighthouses – you can actually see a lighthouse a 100 miles away? Have they proven that? I know you can clearly see them. So they use that as one of their arguments to prove that this truly is a flat earth.

M: As much as I would like to endorse them, what I try to tell people, I say, look, there are a bunch of Youtube videos out, in fact, there's more coming out like everyday now, which is fantastic.

A: That's amazing. This is overnight, guys.

M: When I go into Youtube and say Flat Earth, then I say 'today' or 'this week,' I see players now –

they literally came out of nowhere. And they're like 'we're talking about' 'we're talking about' so to that point anybody who wants to go out and see videos where people literally – the big test is going to a beach somewhere and set up your camera and fire it off, you know, between one and four feet high and see how far you can go. And there's some very interesting videos out there of people taking long range, or fairly long range videos because the cameras have become so much better and they are seeing distances which really aren't showing much of a drop. So that is very, very interesting.

A: Imagine that! And you know what, for so many of us who intrinsically kind of have a knowingness about this reality, this matrix, it doesn't take a whole lot to talk us into it. But you're still having those out there, the naysayers that say I have to have the scientific proof. And the unfortunate thing is, just by me diving into all the details of this, I'm finding that those theories and those tests, those diagnostic tests they've used to try to prove that the Earth is not round, they're arguing about whether those tests are legitimate. Because it's the starting point from which you decide to take a test.

M: Agreed. Agreed. Is there such a thing as an objective test? Because you are already skewing it before you even start, absolutely.

A: Yeah. So how do we go there? So talk about the vacuum. I think that is a really good subject.

M: Is there a vacuum? From this are we going to delve into the aether argument?

A: Yes.

M: After that? Okay. Because I have actually brushed up on that, because of you? Believe it or not.

A: Well take it away.

M: There is an argument out there and that is if we are in space and space has a vacuum and vacuum is nothing and we know full well that air will rush into a vacuum, wouldn't it take a heck of a lot of gravity to keep the atmosphere that we have on the planet, wouldn't the atmosphere just blow right off, or wouldn't you get to that point – kind of like what they call the pop point where you're getting – as you are leaving your atmosphere, wouldn't you get to the point between atmosphere and the vacuum and you would pop through it. But that argument for me doesn't hold much weight either, because there's a real good point there and that is, from a vacuum standpoint wouldn't the vacuum, especially in the giant expanse of space which we are supposedly in wouldn't that pull, have a tremendous pulling force on the atmosphere that we have? And I think it is a great argument. It's an old argument but it's a good one in my opinion.

A: So basically, where we sit is those that believe in gravity so and those that don't, can you talk a little bit about that?

M: Gravity – and people can look this up online – gravity is one of the most confusing things – even on a globe – gravity is confusing no matter where you are. It doesn't matter if it's in an enclosed system or if it's in a globe system. And I know that some people say, Oh gravity is easy, it's based on mass and density. However, if you look deeper into it most scientists would say, yeah, gravity is one of those things we really haven't nailed down yet. So for me, from an enclosed point, gravity is easily manipulated. Let's put it that way.

In an enclosed model some people will say – on a flat model – people will say, well, it's still based on density and you can . . . and that is fine. But for me, since everything seems to be artificial, then gravity should be artificial too. And by that I mean some sort of molecular magnetism. Yes, magnetism right now is limited to metals and electricity and it seems very limited but what if it wasn't? What if you could magnetize things on a molecular level – couldn't you simulate something like – oh, I don't know – gravity? It would be pretty easy to do, once you got to that point. And people would say, no, no, that's impossible. Really? They said heavy-than-air flight was impossible. And if somebody built a structure this big do you really think that anything is out of bounds for this group? I highly doubt it.

A: I thought Dubay had a really good interesting statement when he said, if there really was such a thing as gravity then – and we are spinning at the rate that they are claiming that we're spinning – then we would literally need like these big moon boots to make sure that we are locked down.

M: Yeah.

A: If we are spinning and everything else is spinning how do we stay on. He said gravity is such a classic easy way of explaining this whole thing away.

M: And Eric Dubay and I, we agree on a lot of points, a lot of points. And I just found out recently that he and I may not be as far off as we had thought. Yes, there was a, yes, – can I address that?

A: Sure, go for it.

M: For those you that have been following the Flat Earth circles, there has been a little bit of friction between Eric and I because we disagree on what I consider to be some fairly minor points. However, look, from my point of view we're all on the same team, we're still anti-globe and I have nothing bad to say about the man at all. Never have, never will. I followed some of his videos before I got into this and when you search Flat Earth his videos will come up first, at least today they are. And he's got a lot of good stuff out there. So listen to him. I know that he'll say – I don't know if he has said it on video – but he's said, Oh Mark, he's an imposter, he's horrible, (**A:** [big laugh] Oh Mark!) but he and I are actually, I think, for the most part in the same camp.

But he has an excellent point about gravity. And he's also right about the Moon boot argument. For me, it's also that simple argument that people can get their head around and that is, Look, like a merry-go-around, this thing is spinning a 1000 miles in the equator but if you are standing on the North Pole, in a globe you are spinning at zero miles an hour. So there is no pull at all. So if you put a 100 pound weight on the North Pole and then took it down to the equator, yeah, it may not weigh ten pounds less but it's going to weigh a little bit less because centrifugal force is going to try to pull this thing off. And people say, well no, no, it's not. Yes, it's going to be measurable. Don't tell me that it's not going to be measurable. We've got devices now that can measure anything. So it's absolutely something that should be discussed.

A: Well, Steve wanted me to put this out here. It says, if suck all the air out of a jar, a vacuum jar, and put sand in it, it will drop to the bottom of the jar. It says, tell us, would we just float out into space? You don't float when you're in a vacuum.

M: I don't know if I have an opinion about that because I don't know if I can get my head around it yet. So is he talking about if we knock out all of the atmosphere out of Earth, is that the argument? Would we go cascading off into space? It depends if you are talking about air pressure – is the lynch pin that is holding it down at that point?

A: Well, who knows?

M: Yeah, who knows?

A: How do we know any of this? Because they have so much technology that we aren't even aware of. Plus we live in an artificial intelligence matrix so, God only knows. Everything that we see we don't really know if that is real or an illusion.

M: Oh, absolutely. And more to your point, by the way, if that is also the case and I don't really touch on this because for me it was too easy to go down the matrix and the thirteenth floor argument. And I absolutely agree with you on this. But if you want to go down that argument than literally you're talking about a program in simulation in which case gravity is literally what they tell gravity – what they tell it to be.

A: Yes.

M: It's no difference than a video game. The characters can jump and down in a video game, they have gravity, because it's built in. If they want to make it ten times as hard, or make it a fifth easier. Oh yeah, easily.

A: So basically it could be just another program. (**M:** Yup, yup) The other thing I thought was really a good point was, we have been told for so long that we are just this little insignificant planet out at the outer orbit of this solar system kind of out in the middle of nowhere. (**M:** Yup) But yet, it says here that God said that we are the center of the Universe and cannot be moved. 1500 years ago everyone knew that we were the center of the universe.

M: Yup.

A: And that's just wild. We can't look at 1500 years ago and think, oh, they were so archaic, and they are so non-educated, and so non-evolved, you know.

M: But when the globe was created 500 years ago, what they did was, they really isolated everybody. Because they made this, just this little speck of dust in the middle of nowhere. Talk about feeling insignificant. The globe did it.

A: That's a good point.

M: If you go back to a enclosed system, which we may talk about later, everything becomes way more intimate. This giant mass of structure all of a sudden becomes a one or two bedroom apartment for some people.

A: That's a good point. (36:00) You started out, one of your very first series was talking about the film industry and Hollywood and the impact they've had on this whole topic. Can you talk a little bit about

Room 237?

M: Oh yeah. Oh yeah, yeah, you bet. Room 237.

A: And why was it called Room 237?

M: Room 237 was a documentary made about – and there's some people who say that, you know, because everything in Hollywood is in pairs – so for those who are fans of 237 you'll like it, but the other people who say, Oh go to Kubrick's *Odyssey* instead. Really, by the time you finish it you'll get about the same message. BUT, what it's about is, is that Stanley Kubrick who started the movie *2001*, he started producing it in 1963 which co-incidentally was the same time that NASA started up the Apollo programs and he worked on it for five years and the Apollo program really started doing their thing shortly after the release of his movie and the rumor was – and I believe it absolutely – that Kubrick was signed on to work for the Department of Defence because he was what they considered the best guy at reproducing technology that hadn't existed yet. Which he proved in *2001: A Space Odyssey*.

For those of you who haven't seen it, it's a 1968 movie, it's still in my opinion, probably the finest space simulation movie. The Moon footage of that movie – when you are going to the Moon you're looking at it and you're going, 'that's the most gorgeous thing that I've ever seen.' And for 1968 it blew me away.

So the rumor was that he was hired on by the Department of Defence to see what was possible in film to be re-created for a space program. What can you simulate in film. And they gave him an unlimited budget and he worked on it for five years. There again, what studio would ever allow a director to go for five years except that thing that was done last year, (**A:** That's true) with unlimited money. (**A:** It's crazy) But supposedly he was soured by the whole experience. I mean, you work for the government for that long eventually you're going to figure out the intentions and being a creative artist, and you know what, I really don't dig this. But unfortunately he couldn't get out of it. So he had to finish his movie, turn over all of his tech to them and then they went forward with the Apollo program.

Well, what was interesting was, like anyone, you want to confess but you can't. You can't tell anybody so what he did was – and again, you have to watch it to be sure, but in 1980 he built his confession into code and he set it into the movie *The Shining*, with Jack Nicholson in 1980. Again, everybody missed it. It was one of those things, he was brilliant enough that he knew that eventually – I think he died in 1999 shortly after he finished *Eyes Wide Shut*, and again people didn't figure it out. I think they didn't even pay attention until after he died. It's like the mystery of Stanley Kubrick and they started looking into it. And in that movie there's this wonderful scene and the main documentary is called Room 237 because 237 is 237 thousand miles from the Earth to the Moon.

And there's – I'm not going to do it justice – you really have to watch the documentary but there's some wonderful stuff in it where the room key is an anagram for Moon Room – how he designed the room key. The fact that the kid is wearing an Apollo 11 handmade sweater and he stands up during this one scene and you realize – the guy in the documentary didn't even catch it – this kid is wearing a Apollo 11 sweater – the kid is about 6 years old, right? And this is a 1980 movie so when did his mother make this sweater for him exactly? Little things. And how the room – basically, the analogy was

that everything in the Moon Room, which was Room 237, was fake. That was the whole thing. Everything was an illusion. But there was this beautiful dream, how it started out with the beautiful woman that turned into this nightmare and you could see everything – there are other little things he put throughout the hotel that just kept referencing it back. Little anagrams here and there. It was brilliant, brilliantly done.

A: It just goes to show you that Hollywood has many purposes. (**M:** Yeah) But one of the most significant is what they are talking about now, which is 'soft disclosure.' And unfortunately, they'll put a little bit of a negative spin on it. But when I was reading Room 237, which unfortunately, I have not seen yet, I really want to make sure that I do, when I was reading the description of it I thought, well how clever is that. So they got a budget for five years so they could check out how they could present this information to the public. (**M:** Yeah) What a better way to do it than to present it in a wide-screen amongst the public, make money from it and figure out what's the best way to do it. Because we already know they embed subliminals in the movies, you know.

M: Probably it was the most expensive and early versions of predictive programming that you could do. And it was perfect. Again, it was released in 1968 and in 1969 it was already starting in people's heads. It's like, oh yeah, the Moon missions. And it's already reinforced by 2001: A Space Odyssey. It was great.

A: Well, I do remember The Right Stuff. Now you were saying that basically the Apollo Missions had never been touched.

M: No. No, they weren't. And I'm a media junkie and I should know.

A: Can you talk about that for just a few minutes? It's really just huge.

M: I don't know why, but most people for whatever reason blew right by that. They're like, oh fine, NASA is discredited, and move on to the next clues. I'm going, guys, you don't understand. It's like Hollywood makes movies about everything. If there's a nickel to be made in Hollywood they will make it. You've seen that movie – they're re-doing Paul Blart: Mall Cop, this summer. They make movies of everything. They will milk it until, literally, it will not make money again.

And you are talking about the greatest achievement in the history of the civilization, right? And they waited, for the first movie they ever made was in 1983 which was The Right Stuff. And again, brilliant cast, very long movie, 3 hours and 12 minutes, and it was really just an astronaut training program movie. And it was set up perfectly for a sequel. It made a ton of money, it won a bunch of Academy Awards, I think it was nominated for the Best Picture but it lost to Gandhi. And it was set up for a sequel because at the end of those three hours, it was like, okay, we just barely got into low Earth orbit, perfect, let's do a sequel. Never happened. And then nothing in that genre happened again until 1995 with Apollo 13 and that was really just shot in the space capsule. That was like, of all the six missions, let's do the one doesn't land on the Moon, gets in trouble. Oh, let's fix things with air ducts and wiring. Again, a great cast, also very well reviewed and did very well. And after that, nothing.

A: Any comments from any of the actors and the actresses about this? That allude to maybe family knowing?

M: No, as a matter of fact, well, little side notes, like Ron Howard, when he was asking for – because he likes to do his homework – he tried to ask for all the data stuff on the Apollo Missions and that was when NASA admitted to them, Oh yeah, by the way, we lost thousands and thousands of all the telemetry tapes – and so did our sub-contractors simultaneously – and people are like ‘what? What happened there?’ So Ron went and finished the movie anyway. But Tom Hanks was a big supporter of the Moon Missions so he went and did his own little pay channel, and I can’t remember what network it was, a little mini-series called From The Earth to the Moon. And I mentioned it because I had to mention it but literally, the reason that I mentioned it was because if it weren’t for him it wouldn’t have gotten made and that was the last production at any kind. Never mind Hollywood movies, there were no movies, there was no media on the subject made and it’s 2015 now and nobody is touching it.

And the reason that they are not touching it is because it hits too close to home and you can’t let that movie be made. You can’t. It blurs the lines too much. Because if a Hollywood studio movie makes a movie and they call it the Moon Missions, right, with a big cast and all this and by the time they’re done with that production and you compare it side by side, because that’s what the internet would do now, if you compared them side by side to the actual production, people would get this weird, creepy feeling as they are watching it going, wait a minute, you know. And the same thing with everyone who had produced it. Because Hollywood has those big production teams and as they would be making it the production teams would get that funny feeling and they just didn’t want to risk it. Which is why I mentioned Capricorn One, that movie could not be made today. In 1979 absolutely. It was an independent film but people don’t understand, no Hollywood studio picked that up. That was an independent film made by a CBS television producer.

A: Interesting. And they all essentially are kind of poking holes at the whole Moon Mission endeavour, aren’t they?

M: Which one?

A: Capricorn One.

M: Oh God, Capricorn One, yeah. The back story behind that was, there was a CBS television studio producer, the guy who worked in the studio, and he was old enough, or he had been there long enough, that when they were doing the second generation transmissions from NASA in the early 70s he was part of that. So it was coming through his studio and he was going, this is some the worst production I’ve ever seen, not from a debunking standpoint, it’s not that he thought the Moon Missions were fake, he was just going, that’s just terrible quality, from an entertainment standpoint.

M: Well, I could make a better thing than that. In fact, I could make better Mars Mission than they did with the Moon Mission. And he did. And when you watch Capricorn One, there’s some – especially now, if you’re a conspiracy person and you haven’t watched Capricorn One yet, it gives you the weird, goosebumps because –

A: I’m looking forward to it. I haven’t seen either one of these.

M: You have not watched Capricorn One ever?

A: I haven't.

M: You'll love it and I won't ruin it for you because there's a plot twist and you'll dig it.

A: I will, I'm looking forward to it.

Well, now let's go back in time a little bit. I noticed that you received a little heat from Eric on this one and that was the fact that you were bringing up Admiral Byrd. And you kind of started the whole scenario off with he being the Indiana Jones on steroids.

M: Yup.

A: And truly he was. Just for everybody to know. He not only had a Medal of Honor, a Silver Lifesaving Medal, a Navy Distinguished Service Medal, a Distinguished Flying Cross, and a Navy Cross. Wow.

M: The man could snap a Christmas Tree with the amount of stuff that was on his chest, absolutely.

A: That blew my mind. And the thing that, now of course, many of us question all the history that we read today because it's been manipulated but when you have that many medals and apparently, he was really esteemed for being very heroic and actually saving a lot of people's lives. He wasn't just trying to be in the background dictating, hey boy, go there and do this – be cannon fodder for me and that kind of thing.

M: Yeah.

A: Talk to us a little bit about how does Byrd set the stage for the whole Flat Earth.

M: And I'd like to defend, I'm not going to defend Admiral Byrd as much as you might think because there's a lot of conspiracy people that will say, look, because he was an Admiral and combine that with being a Mason, that's in his Wiki bio, that's perfectly fine, that people immediately they say, well, he's a part of the system and cannot be trusted. I totally get where you are coming from here. However, from an objective standpoint there were certain things that he did – and he didn't have to be him – it's just that he was on point – in my opinion he was a glorious messenger, meaning, he was the one regardless of what you thought of him as far as being military, and regardless of what you thought of him if he was involved in secret societies, he was still the point man when it came to world explorations. He did the North Pole in 1926 and then from 1928 to 1954 he just kept hammering the South Pole. And it looked like, regardless of whether or not he was in on it, whether he was told that, look, there's something out there, which is why I mentioned the Indiana Jones thing because there's a lot of little parallels going on. He's looking for something and it's obvious that people want him to find it, right?

A: Very obviously.

M: Yeah, very obvious. You know you don't spend your entire back part of your life in a horrible climate looking for something if you're not under orders most likely.

A: Well, not only that, but the 4700 men?

M: Oh yeah, yeah, Operation Highjump.

A: And South Pole expedition and the 13 ships.

M: Operation Highjump was shrouded in mystery to this day. We can speculate all we want – did they fight Nazis? Did they run into aliens? You're never going to find that out. No one's going to find that out for sure, but whatever it was, for me, they took care of it. So that was in 1946 and it seemed to be just, it was a hurdle on the road, absolutely, but by 1954 he became a messenger for what appeared to be the new Gold Rush. Which was, he came back to the States, he was in-between missions, the mission he was prepping for was Operation Deep Freeze which going to start in 1955.

In 1954 he was doing the circuit in the United States and he gets into this show on CBS and he starts talking and you can look up the Youtube video, again we are so lucky to have it, the fact that somebody in CBS actually released it – (**A:** I know) and he goes on television and he basically says 'Antarctica is the future.' We are going to go there, we're going to be there a hundred years, at least, there's more resources there than the rest of the world combined. He says, there's a mountain range made out of coal that would supply the entire world – oil, minerals, uranium, plus he hadn't even flown over this big expanse of land that he was talking about. And people are saying, oh, that's disinformation. No, no, no,

A: No, that was a live interview.

M: Well, it wasn't just a live interview. Look, if you're into disinformation, the last thing you're going to do is to tell the corporations that you're going to be rich. You're going to make a different cover story. If you don't want to go down there you're going say, Oh, there's nothing there. Or there's some toxic thing, or the ground is too salty, or we found nothing resource-wise. You're not going come back to the States and say, everybody is going to make money.

A: And basically he alluded to that. And the other thing, Did you notice this – is that in the Longines Chronoscope, that was interesting.

M: A horrible name.

A: If you notice in that interview, look it up folks. There's one statement that he makes and he's rattling off all the types of resources that are down there and he says, Uranium, and then he backtracks, kind of. Did you notice that?

M: Yeah, because he kind of let the cat out of the bag. He was going, maybe we shouldn't, he actually said that too, he's going, I don't want to talk – we really don't want to fight, I don't want to start a fight down there, when it comes to uranium. Because, let's face it, at that point the Soviet Union would have been, wait a minute – uranium? And then they would have been on it as well.

A: But I also think he was thinking of ETs.

M: Yes.

A: That's what come to me anyway.

M: Sure. But it got super strange after that because after he did the interview he heads back down there, and he does Operation Deep Freeze. And then in my mind that's when the world changed

because that started a change of events that to this day still it boggles me. Because they were so big. But the Admiral Byrd part of it was, even though he talked about all this money that was to be had down there by everybody – remember it wasn't just the United States that was down there. Russia was rebuilding after World II, Great Britain, Argentina, New Zealand, Australia, everybody was down there. And all of a sudden everybody stopped doing EVERYTHING.

A: Reached a halt.

M: And they said, not only that, they said all right everybody's leaving right now – again, it was like a horror movie. You've run into the monster, yeah, we're not staying here, and they all leave. And they put a treaty in place in 1959 that said, and people can look it up, it's still in effect to this day, and in fact, it's covered by a secondary treaty which is environmental, that says no corporation can go down there or do anything EVER. And as I'm looking at this and I'm thinking, when does that happen? Because every story you ever read, you can read it daily in the newspapers about what corporation is trying to do what with the influence that they have. The corporations, especially the petroleum industry is having unlimited lobby power. Unlimited. They are not even allowed to be petition going down there. They can't even talk about it.

A: See, when you see something that drastic occur, almost like a light switch, I can pretty much guarantee that it was Extraterrestrials. Almost guaranteed. Because it impacted the entire of the world. It wasn't just the United States.

M: No, yeah, –

A: They agreed to a treaty of what, 150 different countries, or how many?

M: When it was signed in 1959 there were only the first 10 or 12, depending on which part you read, but as every country that became a tradeable economic power came in on the scene in the world they were told to sign it. It was like, oh, by the way, you're a relevant country now, yes, sign this treaty. What do you mean? You're not going down to Antarctica. Really? For how long? You're not going down there. And so now it's I think, as of today, it's maybe 52 nations but they are the 52 economic powers of the world. But you can be guaranteed that anybody else comes online they'll all have to sign it.

A: I agree, just to bring a little of specificity on what he said, these are some of the quotes out his mouth. "Antarctica happens to be the untouched reservoir of natural resources." I thought that was interesting the wording that he used. "It has to do with the future of the nations." And this was strange and I wanted to see what you thought – "As the world shrinks," and then he stopped and he re-grouped and he said, "it will continue to shrink with an ever increasing acceleration thus bringing these places closer and in the future I can see a time when it will be very, very important strategically." That's a direct quote out of the recording.

M: Yeah. And you're absolutely right, which is very interesting as well because when I was first delving into this I wrote a thing in one my narratives where I was saying that everything became 'a shrinking world.' And I wrote that even before I saw his interview. And than after I had done this, people that had watched it were telling me I was giving them small world syndrome. And that's again the natural

reaction. That is absolute instinct. Once you find out you're in an enclosed structure, even though nothing changes, you look up at the sky, nothing changes in your world –

A: Something has changed.

M: Yeah, you feel that the world has become smaller. And it's very interesting that Admiral Byrd would have said that more than once, you know.

A: And you can tell again, again I think that he had to think about that twice, and say, Oh my God, what did I just say? trying to be very careful. The other thing that blew my mind was, they had a list. I did a little bit of research on Antarctica and it says here, 'Silver, gold, cobalt, copper, chromium, iron, molybdenum, manganese, nickel, lead, titanium, uranium, and zinc. And then of course, there's just a massive amounts of oil down there.

M: Depending who you talk to, even if you are using the government's map on how big it is, it's a massive continent. At the very least, it is bigger than Australia. And people, again, this isn't like a Area 51 situation where you fence off a thing with scary signs and you put guard dogs and trucks. This is like sealing off a giant, this like sealing off the entire continental United States, basically, and putting a multi-national navy around it, putting a treaty in place and saying nobody goes there. We are talking about a HUGE amount of land. And nowadays, they are masking under a veneer treaty which is an environmental treaty. And of course, people say, of course, it's an environmental thing, we care about the penguins. I said, no, the penguins only live on the coastlines, for one. And second, and I might even go with that argument until you realize that that treaty was put in place in 1959.

A: Yes.

M: In 1959 'environmentalism' wasn't a word. Greenpeace wasn't even founded until 1971 and that was just a couple of guys with tie-dye shirts in a van.

A: That's hilarious.

M: I'm sorry, and some boats. So don't tell me that it's an environmental issue. It is not. And besides the corporations wouldn't care.

A: Yes.

M: Do you think oil companies are going to care.

A: Well, even now but – at least we are getting a little bit better.

M: The petroleum industry is going to get into the Alaskan state parks, if they haven't already. But they can't, I know, and it's a sad thing. But at the same time they cannot even bring up a press conference to talk about Antarctica.

A: Well, okay, so here we've talked about Antarctica and Admiral Byrd and those of you that haven't dived into the Flat Earth theory, you're probably wondering, well, why are we focusing so much on Antarctica. So let's talk a little bit about how does that apply – what role does Antarctica play in the Flat Earth theory.

M: I'm sorry. You're absolutely right. In an enclosed model Antarctica – if you think the globe is a strange thing – Antarctica becomes stretched, meaning, eventually on a enclosed world you have to have an outer ring. And if Antarctica is at the South Pole that becomes stretched to the point where literally it surrounds the entire outer rim. (Alexandra shows the map of Antarctica becoming the rim.) And if you think I am making that up out of thin air I suggest you look at the United States Geological Survey azimuthal equidistant map which is on the Wiki list of map of projections, you will see that very map.

In fact, somebody asked me today, where is it on the USGS and you could go on the government site and there's various different pages depending which document you look at and it's absolutely confirmed, that that's what they used. The United States Geological Survey uses that map that you just showed. And coincidentally, it's also the map used by the Flat Earth Society only, one was considered a legitimate map, and the other one is considered crazy-town. And you wonder why. Oh, oh, oh, AND... I'm sorry I forgot that too, and that map also is the basis for the United Nations flag.

A: Right! And that's the most interesting part of all. They've got it in our faces.

M: Yeah, the United Nations flag is the USGS map and is also the Flat Earth map only the United Nations flag is missing something and that is that's missing Antarctica.

A: Yeah. So everybody is just clear. Antarctica is actually the outer rim, all the way around. Okay.

M: It is a cold water, cold climate barrier –

A: And how tall are the walls of ice?

M: Oh, two miles. Antarctica is way weirder than people think. Not only do you have to dodge icebergs to get there, but once that you get there it goes almost two miles straight up and it stays at two miles. And you're pushing 10,000 feet, that's a couple thousand feet above altitude sickness for a lot of people and then you've got hundreds of miles and we don't know how many in all directions of nothingness. No plant life, no animal life, no indigenous populations, no ancient ruins that we know of, it is a harsh, harsh deterrent, so to speak.

A: And to make sure that no explorers go there. And speaking of explorers, I know that there are several – Matt Boylan, is that one of them? Cluff, what are the explorers that you have brought up, there's in my notes, I have –

M: For which part?

A: Well, Matt Boylan I have written down, and Rodney Cluff, apparently they tried to explore the North and South Poles and they were threatened.

M: I did not know this.

A: Hah!

M: You've got something on me. I did not know that they were threatened.

A: Interesting. Accordingly to the research I have, Rodney was threatened. They actually threatened to shoot him out of the water.

M: Really?

A: And they were turned away. So he had to split. Matt Boylan the same thing. And then there's this Mario Endeje(?) who also tried and he was denied. So for those of you who are wondering, well, why hasn't anybody explored this, why hasn't anybody discovered the edges of the world which are Antarctica, that was the whole reason we are bringing it up in the first place.

M: It's such a natural process that most people, you have to remember this system is very well built. The negative reinforcements on the outside and above, but down side is brilliant, in my opinion. The first part is, of course, the fact that the oceans are 3% salt solution which reduces the ocean discoveries like 95%, which makes you carry fresh water with you and that would completely change the waters once it's salty. But the time you get to the outer rim the temperature drops to below 15 degrees where salt water starts freezing. You run into icebergs and then if you can get past that you get to that frozen waste land. But it's a fantastic deterrent. Now, let's say you want to do that today. Oh, it's cold weather, that doesn't bother us at all. No. There's a multi-national Navy out there that is going to watch everything you do. Everybody on the ice they knows exactly where everybody is.

In fact there was something on the Antarctica, somebody sent me the Antarctica Board of Tourism recently that they just put in a new thing regarding remote drones. They won't even let you - because a lot of people are asking, Oh, can I bring my own little drone to fly around. They said, nope. Nope, you don't want to do that. They cover their bases extremely well. They don't leave anything to chance. Then again, that's what you would expect, because you're not going to let a corporation down there to make tons of money, that's how far you're willing to go. So as far as civilians doing things on their own, oh no. No. It may seem like you're not being watched. But you're absolutely being watched.

A: Oh absolutely. Now I would say probably one of the Number One most interesting thing to research is maps. I've always had a fascination with maps myself as well. And when you were talking about the USGS and how they were formed in 1879, that was kind of eye-opener to me as far as the way in which you map and how the globe that we use today is based on a map from 500 years ago? the 1500s maybe?

M: Oh no, no, no. Oh yes, I'm sorry. The one that is in front of the classroom, the Mercator map, that's 500 years old and that's wrong.

A: Okay.

M: Absolutely wrong.

A: Yet there are maps that they are able to do, and in fact, I just had some information that came in THIS morning where they said they are able to use a technology where they shoot the radar into the surface of the Earth and it creates extremely accurate map making.

M: Really.

A: Now get this. To the point where, it's so accurate that when you compare that map made it's very similar to the very old maps that were developed by those that were the ocean-farers there were literally creating maps strictly from supposedly traveling the oceans. Now how is that? That makes it

even weirder.

M: You're going to have to send me those links. If you are going to go down that road you might as well tell me what the core of the Earth looks like after you've dug 8 miles.

A: Right. Well, we'll get into that too. Just for everyone if you want to research this, he's talking about the azimuthal equidistant projection, right?

M: Yup.

A: That's what you were talking about? If you look at this it's very intriguing. Can you talk a little bit about that. The properties of the points of the map and how basically when people decide to map out a land mass you have to decide at what point do you start. Now I haven't really thought about maps in this detail and it kind of blew me out of the water.

M: Yeah, maps, and I know I'm not going to be able to do it justice. There are some wonderful documentaries on Youtube. But yeah you're right, it's not just where you start, but it's the format that you're going to use.

A: Correct.

M: Which is even weirder. It's almost like, again, I blame the globe for most of this, because you're trying to create a map off a 3-dimensional object when in reality it's not this sphere. So a perfect example would be the Mercator map versus the Gall-Peters map. The Mercator map was done, when they built it, it was done from the point of view from a really European-centric point of view to encourage shipping lanes. So all the continents, even though we look at them and they seem perfectly fine, that's not what they look like. So if you compare it to, I'm going to try to talk about this in my next video, which is to compare that to the Gall-Peters map, when you see it, it's again the conditioning thing, everything proportionally is correct. South America is way bigger than what we would normally see on a map. And Europe is way smaller. Africa is much bigger. Australia changes its size .

But the most obvious one – there you go – (Alexandra shows the Gall-Peters map) the biggest one is Greenland up on the top of the map, which, on the classroom map is 17 times smaller than Africa. But you wouldn't know that from the map that you're seeing on the classroom. They look about the same size. And people have been trying to get the Gall-Peters map into schools and they're having a really, really tough time because visually it's an affront to our conditioning. It's like, Look, we don't like looking at this. I'm even going to include a clip I think of the vid showing the West Wing thing, if you haven't seen it, where the lady from the President's office, while they're looking at the education system, and she's looking at the Mercator map and she goes, what the hell am I looking at? And he goes, It's where you have been living all this time. And it's a question of perspective.

A: I have another fantastic map here, thanks to Steve. And what it does, it actually shows what we think the map looks like because of what we've been taught versus what it really is. Now check this out. I don't know if you can see this.

M: Oh neat. People should freeze that. That's actually great. Where did you get that?

A: I don't know. He's just so into this. But look at the difference, folks. The black lines are what we have been told, the green lines is what it actually is.

M: Yeah, and I'd like to jump into and say this is not even a point of dispute. Ask any scientist. That's exactly what we are taught versus what actually is. And they won't even let that into schools. So people are saying, Oh, you know, how can this globe thing be right? Are you kidding? They won't even tell how big the countries really are. You really think they're going to bend, and say, Oh, by the way, it's not a globe.

A: Well and for those of you wondering how they can get away from this. The main thing is that during the time of exploration and also imperialism, I should use, there was definitely a motivation for the smaller countries to appear larger, and don't forget, these guys know the human mind like the back of their hand. I mean they know how we react and what we feel and how we can create better than we do ourselves. Thanks to places like the Rand Corporation, the military, even the prisoner of war camps, and Auschwitz. These are all areas where they have done a massive amount of work on learning how the human mind works and perceives. So they can create this whole Hollyweird scenario.

M: Nice. Nice. That's a great map though.

A: Isn't it?

M: I'm going to look that up when I'm done.

A: Now tell everybody about – I don't even know how to say his name. Abu Rayhan . .

M: No, don't use his whole name. In fact, now you're going to screw me up.

A: Al-Biruni.

M: Al-Biruni, there it is. Yeah, his full name is Persian, it's tough to pronounce.

A: Okay.

M: So when we go to, that was one of those little titbits which I love, but debunkers come at me. Can't wait. When you look at the azimuthal equidistant map there are some notes on it. And it's really interesting because in the Wikilists of projections which are all pretty much grabbed from different sources, but the azimuthal equidistant map, which is tied to the USGS, which is tied to the UN flag, which is tied to the Flat Earth, and all these things – no other map is linked to so many things as this thing is, you look and you think that it's a typo because it says when was it proposed. And it was proposed in 1000 AD. And you think it is a mistake and then look and you see who it was proposed by and it was proposed by a Persian scientist named Al-Biruni.

And you look it up and sure enough he is the one that came up with this type of model, which was also interesting because 1000 years ago – that's when we thought the Earth was flat – (**A:** Yeah) and 1000 years ago we didn't even know the complete map. So his model was based on his perception of the enclosed world and we hadn't even discovered everything on it yet. And you think, maybe it's still not a modern thing, or maybe it's a broken link and then you look for it under Al-Biruni – NASA named a moon crater after him.

A: Wow.

M: Seriously? I don't know who left the USGS link in there, but it's absolutely legit. It's absolutely real.

A: And that's how they mess with us. You give us just enough information that's actually truth and they surround it with a bunch of garbage. You know. I think the other thing that's interesting about him – he was a mathematician, he was well-versed on astronomy, physics, mathematics, natural sciences, and also distinguished as a historian, chronologist, and linguist. Good God.

M: Oh yeah.

A: I mean this guy really knew his stuff and also do you know that he was the creator of geodesy.

M: I did not know that. That's really good.

A: Hey! Isn't it cool that I am actually teaching you something.

M: No seriously. That's how it works. You've got some good stuff.

A: It says here the creator of geodesy, which is also known as geodetics, a branch of applied mathematics and earth sciences, where the scientific discipline deals with the measurement and the representation of the Earth, including its gravitational field, in a three-dimensional time-varying space. He studied the geodynamical phenomena such as crustal motion, tides, and polar motions and design global and national control networks, using space and terrestrial techniques while relying on datums and coordinate systems. Woah.

M: This guy was super smart.

A: Yeah.

M: Extremely ahead of his time.

A: So obviously they definitely had his number.

M: And again, they are using his map. He basically built, described the entire enclosed system 1000 years ago and they are still using it to this day. And several people mentioned to me, look, it's in your face, on top of it.

A: It's totally in your face. So why do you think everything really started getting some momentum to the Flat Earth Society again around 1945? What do you think was the kicker for that?

M: Ummm, tough to say. It could have been just dissemination from other places. like the UN flag, for example, which was pointed out to me, when the final version of the UN flag was in 1946 happened to be the same year that Operation Highjump happened. So for me, I think it was the Flat Earth society at that point was starting to get – there was some bleed from the secret societies. Because you know that not everything – you can keep a secret pretty much but other things will go other places. I have no doubt that before that there were a whole bunch of these secret societies that knew that the Al-Biruni map was true. And had more detailed maps of their own that showed the edge on top of it.

A: Yeah

M: So, yeah, there seems to be a fevered pitch for a little while. But then it was kind of like – I'm not going to have the greatest analogy for it – but when you talk about something and you're super-psych'd up about it but then it becomes more real than you want it to be. Like something that becomes super-scary – Are we really doing this? – that's what I think happened there. Yes, the powers-that-be, the authority, they knew what it was like but they didn't know for sure, right?

It was still this myth, it was this legend, so Operation Deep Freeze, I think they even jumped the gun, they were like let's do the UN flag in 1946, we're going to get way ahead of this and then in 1956 Operation Deep Freeze happened – when you see it then it's like, Oh, man, this thing is actually real, you know, because then you have to change gears from a society standpoint – what do you do because we have to keep this thing under wraps.

A: Right.

M: And then it gets really weird and as far as the societies themselves, I think it was bleed-through from the other groups.

A: Interesting. Well, and the other thing is – let's just say this. There's so much more that came through in World War II because of the momentous impact it had, not just on us on all the beings within this so-called universe, which who knows how to define that these days, you know. And it just seems to me that 1945 was really the turning point for so much of this stuff. Now do you feel that it was after they made the discovery through Byrd's mission down there, do you feel at that point there was a lot of aggression in clamping the whole Flat Earth theory shut?

M: Massive. Massive.

A: Okay.

M: Because everybody went to freak-out mode. Almost immediately. There were moves being made that didn't make any sense until you started putting them all together. So in 1956 Operation Deep Freeze ends. But between 1955 and 1956 you find something. Something so huge, so jaw-dropping that not only can you not come up with a cover story for it, but you lockdown the entire continent – but that takes a few years. Right after that, in 1957, the United States and Russia – who left the ice at the same time – people say, oh, we have been enemies – Cold War blah, blah, blah, no, the United States and Russia have been in on it since day one. Everything they do – they talk to each other. Yes, at the lower ranks, fine, they can say whatever. But the United States and Russia at the highest levels were in on this. Because they had to be. One country could not pull this off by themselves, and they knew it. Everybody had to be – it was a combined effort. But mostly, it's been the United States and Russia.

They both started up the rocket programs in 1957, with a fevered pitch. It was like we have to get this thing going – we're going to create the space race, right? That will get people going naturally, because it didn't make any sense. And then with a year after those first rockets going up they decided, yeah, they're going to put nukes on top of them and start firing them straight up. And they did that starting 1958 – literally within the first three shots that they took, the United States took, Russia had to catch up a little bit, they formed NASA immediately in 1958. And then shortly after that in 1959 they locked down Antarctica. But NASA, when it was formed it was really the militarization of space. They had to

control the skies and that was the outstandingly big, broad move in the United States' part because at that point they controlled all science aspects regarding space. If you were an engineer and you were a scientist and you wanted to deal with space, for the next 40, 50 years you had to go through NASA.

So again, rocket program, firing nukes, from NASA, lockdown Antarctica, turn around, keep firing nukes until 1962 when Russia and the United States both stopped on the exact same day – oh, it's a moratorium, no, it's not a moratorium, they were done. They were done mapping the whole thing out. It took them 4 years to figure out where everything was up there and once they stopped firing, then they decide oh yeah we're going to do the Moon program.

A: Is there anything to show what they found out? I mean are there any maps that reflect what they found the firmament to be?

M: All we know, unfortunately, all we have are the public records of the shots fired and the supposedly altitudes that they were sent to. And you could look these up. They are in Wiki. Everything I did wasn't referenced in some weird site, it was mostly standard Wiki stuff that you can find. Although I'm sure you can find some government stuff on it.

A: I'm laughing Mark, because I even got an email this morning, saying, well, you know Wikipedia is owned by the network.

M: Oh fine. Yes, of course. I got ya.

A: Not necessarily trust that either, you know.

M: But at the same time, you've still got to believe – they release stuff every once in a while I think because they think it's the right thing to do. It haunts them way later. I'll give you another example. The Van Allen radiation belt discovered by a NASA employee in 1959 in the same exact year that you lockdown Antarctica. And the Van Allen radiation belt, the message was, oh yeah, there's something super deadly above you, oh no, no, it's not a dome, it's just a big layer of radiation that nobody can go through. And that backfired on them because in 1959 – that was still ten years before the first Moon shots, right? So they had ten years to figure out a technology to get through this imaginary radiation belt that they had created. But it wasn't long enough because they realized the only way to get through the radiation is some heavy lead shielding and they couldn't put it in the capsules 'cause it would make it too heavy. So they just sent the capsules anyway and decided, oh, we just won't talk about it'll just trail off. We are not going to talk about it, right?

Six Moon missions back and forth through this supposed radiation belt and nobody died without shielding. And you can go on Youtube, there's great new stuff that's coming out even this month where there's NASA guys that are going on television and saying, that we need to deal with this radiation problem. Well, what are you talking about? You already dealt with it. 50 years ago. So what are you talking about it now for? Anyway.

A: You know that it's interesting. There's actually a video out where the guy swears that the water within the nuclear power plants is perfectly safe to swim in.

M: Really?

A: I'm not kidding. He challenges everyone. He actually worked there for decades.

M: Was this an American or a Russian?

A: An American.

M: Really?

A: Maybe it was on the East Coast. I'd have to track it down. It's on my website if you look there, work with the search engine.

M: Sure.

A: Now, under Status Quo Series.

M: Status Quo, yup.

A: Basically you go over the 500 years ago and the perception of the Earth and how it used to be flat, then it turned around and they went into the whole global thing and the Treaty of Antarctica and that was off-limits. And you're talking about the astronauts were sworn to secrecy under the penalty of whatever. Now the Moon missions were launched. What is your perception of how many actual Moon missions really made it to the Moon?

M: None. The Moon missions – again, don't take my word for it – there are a bunch of documentaries out there. Every year the internet makes the Moon missions sillier and sillier to look at, to the point where – I'll take it one more step further – a site that I ran into recently which is – you can google this – is the third party evidence of the Apollo missions. Which is NASA has gotten so beat up about this, it's so hammered on this that they've had to release a secondary Wiki entire section that says, don't take our word for it, here are independent people, independent countries that have nothing to do with NASA, literally, they say this at the top of the page, nothing to do with NASA or the US Government that can confirm that we went to the Moon. I've never seen such back-peddalling in all my life. At this point they're just holding on by their fingernails, trying to keep this thing afloat. And it is not working. No. The Moon missions, no. Never, ever, never, never, never happened.

A: So for everyone listening, there are so many disagreements on this topic. I can't begin to tell you how many people do not agree on this. Some people feel like there were about six that were made. Some think only one of them made it. And there's those that feel that none. So I would challenge anyone out there that can really come up with the testimony to prove, beyond a shadow of a doubt, whether we really did make it to the Moon or not. Because I know it was all manipulated.

Now let's talk a little bit about the PlaneFinder.net. I thought was very interesting.

M: PlaneFinder.net and FlightRadar24.com are real tracking systems that track planes all over the world. And what I was looking for there was, if it is an enclosed system – there are three rules you cannot break. One of course is the Space Program is an absolute sham. Two: there can't be any actual photographs of the Earth from space. But the third one which also is very interesting, is that on an enclosed system the plane routes in the southern hemisphere are not going to be correct because the map that you are looking at – if the map is literal – here's the difference – the USGS looks at the

azimuthal equidistant map and say, oh, it's just a projection. But from a Flat Earth standpoint it's literal. Which means there are two places on that map where plane flights will be wrong. And I mean very, very wrong.

And that is South America and Australia because they are literally at the opposite ends of the map. And on a globe, you can take shortcuts – because it's a globe, it's a sphere. From Australia to South America is 7400 miles, a piece of cake, no sweat. You go across the South Pacific. But if you tried to book these flights from these two points, it should be very easy, they bounce you all over the place. The most notable one is, if you go to Sydney to Buenos Aires, they bounce you off Los Angeles. And it makes no sense, or San Francisco. It makes no sense unless you are looking at a flat map. If you are looking at a flat map it's almost an exactly straight line. And this happens all the time. Or they will bounce you off to Dubai, or they'll take you to weird places.

In fact, a video came out just yesterday, a brand new one, where a guy – it'll say like, airline routes exposed – it's very good, where a guy shows little hidden refueling points, where planes look like they're going non-stop but they actually go off and they re-fuel real quick and they come down and there's a lot of little posts – the social media are screwing this all up for these guys because people will say, oh hey, I didn't expect this stop in this city, we stopped in blah, blah, blah. And you only have to see so many of those. And on top of that – so people were bugging me and saying, oh, there's non-stops – again, people's logic drives me nuts because you don't understand that 95% of the flights in the southern hemisphere are connections. Which shouldn't happen anyway. This is 2015. You can get non-stops anywhere. Ask the northern hemisphere. But when you watch these flights, or any flights in the southern hemisphere, anything below the equator, if you look at FlightsFinder.net those flights will disappear.

A: I have to tell you Mark, this happened to me. I just came back from South Africa last year and I was looking for the most direct flight from LAX to South Africa. And they took you to Boston, to New York City, and then they took you to Heathrow, okay, that's kind of your choices. And then I started thinking maybe I should take a flight to South America because it was just across the ocean from Africa. (**M:** Sure) Well it was about 1000 to 1500 dollars more even though it was less mileage and I thought, okay, well, they probably use the excuse it's not as common of a route, right? Well, then I thought, okay, let me see what else I can do going from there to Heathrow, well, they wanted to take me over to Dubai, which is way over here, compared to where I wanted to go here. What is that about?

M: Dubai seems to be a common thread, yeah.

A: And would be the same thing, so I had to bring that up.

M: No, yeah. And I'd like to also add and this problem is software and eventually it will be fixed which is why I mention it at the end of the video. People are saying that you shouldn't have told them because, look, you have to get it out there because eventually, they are going to plug this hole. Sooner or later. The GPS system is not a public system, it is a Department of Defence United States military system.

A: I'm glad that you brought that up.

M: As this gets enough attention they are going to figure out a way to plug this hole.

A: Yeah.

M: I'm still leaving the videos up there as a record.

A: For all of you listening that really want to dive into this now, this is the time to do it. If we can find any holes, gosh, you list five or six different companies that provide the logging of the planes.

M: Oh yeah, yeah.

A: And he says it's kind of watching paint dry.

M: Well, it's not as bad as you think because the planes disappear before you get bored. Watching boats, that's like watching paint dry.

A: I just think that is a trip. Now talk a little bit about the ceiling of the dome.

M: Okay. Everything that I've seen, people have asked me, oh, how high is it and what is it made of, the ceiling of the dome, as best as I can tell, if it goes up higher than 400 km, yeah sure, maybe. But it seems to be projected on – from the outside – it prohibits space travel pretty much entirely. Planes can fly up, because planes cap out a 10 miles. Spy planes cap out at – well, it depends on who you talk to because we're not even supposed, spy planes aren't supposed to exist, but they do – maybe 20 miles – it really depends but for me, it's not the snow globe thing where you've got a super, super high arc and you wouldn't need to that for something like this. Actually, it would be a relatively low arc from an efficiency standpoint. And from the best I can tell, impenetrable. Or if there is an opening it's guarded.

A: So are people thinking that it's ten miles.

M: No, no, no, that's just a – well, some people will say that – that is in dispute. But it's like – if you're building something like this from a creator's standpoint you're not going to interfere with (**A:** not making too low) yeah, because again, commercial airliners can get up to ten miles. And spy planes, if you are talking the Aurora Project nowadays, that one should be able to get up around 20 miles or so but I don't trust anything that's on a rocket as far as getting up there. But I have no doubt that the government knows full well how high it is.

A: Now speaking of rockets. There is footage up there about one rocket and missile after another going up and exploding.

M: Yeah. And that started back years ago during the high altitude nuke tests. In fact, one test which I love the name that they chose – it was Operation Fishbowl. And I thought, why would you name –

A: That's interesting –

M: That was a package of tests that they did. And I thought, really? So the first one was called 'Hard Tack' and then the next one the Americans, because the Russians don't name them the way that we do, and then the next one that we did, it was called 'Operation Fishbowl' and I thought why would you name it like that. Why would you, but, yeah, rockets fail all the time to the point where it would not surprise me at all if the astronauts ever were put in the top of the rockets. I don't think I would even

take that change if I were doing a space program.

A: I was just blown away Mark, how many there were. I mean, it was like a couple of them in 1958, 1959, 1960 twice, 1961, 1965, 1986 three times, 1991, 1996 twice, 1998, 2007 and 2013.

M: Yeah.

A: Unbelievable.

M: And that's the government sector. The private sector, there are only two private space programs currently running now, it's Space X and Virgin Airways. I can't remember what they call theirs. But those programs aren't going anywhere. There's little things that NASA does – one is to release news on a pretty much monthly basis. I've never seen a corporation or a government agency release as much news as NASA does on a regular basis. To the point where – we had scheduled this interview a while back and two days ago they just announced that, oh, yeah, Russia and America joint mission to Mars and we're going to build another ISS Space Station, in addition to the one that's already up there. And they do that to reinforce this. It's strictly to say we're up there, you're down here. We're up there, you're down here. And it's like, really?

You're talking about a Mars mission, it's never going to happen. Never, because they can't from a production standpoint, and I know people have heard this from me say this before, Look, moviemistakes.com and all the other sites that all they do is track movie mistakes that happen in any piece of film. There are nerds out there that literally go frame by frame on any piece of media and they will look for the mistakes. You cannot fake a mission to Mars. I'm telling you. Anybody who's thinking of doing that right now, you can't do it. If you try to do it, you will be shredded. It cannot be done. If you thought that the Moon missions were blown apart, Mars? You wouldn't even get to land before they start tearing you guys up.

A: Interesting. Why is it so more drastically difficult?

M: Because the public has access to stuff now we didn't have in the past. Like when they did the Moon missions they had no idea that the pictures would be analyzed on such a broad scope in such resolution to where, you've got somebody in Missouri at 3 o'clock in the morning that'll find something. The internet hive mind is total when it comes to finding. It might take them a while but they will find everything. And it just gets worse, meaning the technology that the public has now is actually almost caught up with what they have would have to try to fake.

So I'll use the Interstellar example. The movie Interstellar was released last year. I look at it and he's going to give his daughter the watch and the watch is in his hand, it says 3:00 o'clock, in the very next scene he's taking the watch off and now it says 8:20. I caught that in 5 seconds and that's a multi-multi-million dollar movie. The government doesn't have nearly the quality control that Hollywood does and that's why they get caught on all this stuff. And they just can't. I recommend, anybody thinking of faking a Mars mission at this point just pack it in. Retire early.

A: I love it. Well now you have alluded to bringing up drilling down within the Earth. Since we can't successfully go up and discover the firmament and discover the fact that we're inside of this so-called

glass-type covered dome over the Flat Earth, then a lot of people have said, well then let's go ahead and go down and see what we find. So can you go ahead and –

M: Yeah, again, the wool that's been pulled over your eyes is complete in all sectors, including what . . . if you believe in the globe the scientists will also have to tell you how it's built. Literally, from end to end. And everyone knows, and I included this in one of my videos, called Depth Perception which says that we all know that the ever brighter bands of molten material that's supposed to be in our globe, but people don't understand that no public company has drilled below, and it was the Russians that did it first, drilled below – I think the Germans did it second – the deep-core drilling, they went 8 miles down. And if this globe is 8,000 miles thick how are you telling me what the Earth looks like, if you only go 8 miles down. And from a design standpoint it also very, very good. Because, yes, people – all the populations down on the ground and we like digging – we dig for just about anything. So you don't want people to start digging – you know the old joke, I'm going to dig to China, because it actually wouldn't be China, it would be somewhere else if it is in America. In fact, you'd just dig into an ocean.

A: You're talking about this one, right? Can you see it?

M: Yeah, yeah. And that took years to do. So when you get down that far at 8 miles the temperature reaches a point where the drill bits really just start turning into clay and they can't do anything with it. So it's like, all right, we're done. So at 8 miles. . . 'cause people asked me, like how thick would the model have to be? Well not very, since the general population can't go below 8 miles, you could make it less than 100 miles thick, which is really thin compared to the width of it. And you'd still be able to do your things and people would say, what about the natural processes of lava and molten rock, and volcanoes – you have to understand that in a system this large, if it is artificial creating a molten rock system – not that hard to do. Giant blast furnaces, pipes that can pump it through – the only thing that you would hope for is that people don't make cities next to volcanoes which has happened in the past. And it wouldn't be that hard to do, plus that system also generates an extra amount of heat. It's similar to a heated seat in a car. So the temperature system could augment that as well. It's very efficient on all levels. So no, not a natural process.

A: 356 degrees Fahrenheit is what they reach at 8 miles. Wow.

M: Yeah. And then they quit. And then they said, the Germans tried the same thing and they quit. Yeah, there could be some military classified programs that could maybe blast through but even they, again, that's classified. How far down can you go with nukes – to just keep blowing holes down there. You might be able to get down to a certain point but at that point you're not going to tell people what's down there anyway.

A: Well it's interesting – there's been some intel coming out regarding the mining of gold. And some of the people that are coming out of these mines – they're basically saying I'm never doing this again because it's so incredibly hot.

M: Yeah.

A: They've gotten so deep into the crevices of the Earth supposedly and they can't handle it. I loved it

when you said that the car is made out of melted reformed polished rock.

M: Yeah, it's one of those things that's lost on people because they forget that we have technologies to do some of this stuff right now. And melting rock, that's an easy thing. We drive around on it every day. That's all cars and anything metal is, it's just the soft parts of rock that we've melted down and reformed. You scale that up, heck, we could simulate a volcano if we wanted to. I know we could.

A: That's a really good point. That's something that I never thought of so I want commend you on that one.

M: I did that totally sober.

A: One of my favorite parts of Mark's series is under the Souls In The System and I want to play a two-minute clip, you don't mind Mark –

M: Okay. Are you going to play it right now or are you going to cut to it?

A: Yeah, we're just going to play it right now and then come back in a sec. I just thought that this was so outstanding. I'm not going to say anything anymore. Let's just listen for a minute.

From Mark's video:

“ . . . better than an enclosed system is revealed.

Would you lie to hurt someone? Would you rob a bank, to commit fraud or embezzle?

Would you steal anything unless your life depended on it?

And while people would still get angry and fight would they maim each other,

would they kill? Would anyone knowingly commit murder?

Would you bully or to extort people for profit?

In fact, knowing that the world was created would you do anything malicious towards anyone?

If the world is not a globe but instead enclosed then wars end. Hate crimes end. Maybe not overnight, but quickly because you may be for the first time in your life actually accountable for your actions. You realize now that you are a very real soul in this enclosed system. And you have a responsibility towards your fellow man, one that can be boiled down into one simple rule – treat others better than you treat yourself.

This, this is why it's so important to show the world as it really is.

This is why I am asking the authority itself to open the door and let this secret come through.

You've kept this hidden for too long and the people who live here with you have been through enough.

This isn't about money or power anymore.

It's about our very souls. The essence of who we are.

Wealth and titles don't define your heart.

Hiding your entire world may have seen like a good idea at the time but we have gone way beyond that.

Have you actually seen our home recently? This needs to be fixed and it needs to be now.

The people won't forget the deception but they will forgive you for it because a truth like this will make them more noble.

Something we should have been since the beginning."

A: That was spectacular.

M: Thank you.

A: You must have been one of your moments of spiritual bliss, seriously.

M: Yeah it was.

A: That was powerfully stated.

M: Thank you. I hadn't actually listened to that for a little while. When I wrote it, when I initially went down that path with talking about the astronauts I got to a point where I had changed my mind – I took the positive approach and said look this can be something very, very good. This can be something very great for us if it is allowed to happen. And I firmly believe that. When I was writing it I didn't even hesitate. Everything I said just built on itself and to the point where by the time I got to the end I absolutely was convinced that everything I was saying was the right thing.

A: Ah, it was beautifully said. And seriously I'm glad that you presented it in such a way that where, let's not focus on being a conspiracy, let's focus on why this type of information needs to come out.

M: Yeah.

A: And to raise our awareness about just it being a possibility.

M: Again, I hate giving messages to the authority directly but this is their chance and they could turn this world around if they just let it happen.

A: Big time.

M: It is one of the few things, again in the conspiracy world there is so much negativity and there's so much darkness. And it's like, you know what, if this actually happened, especially with the social media with the speed that could get around, I think it would be such a fantastic shock to the system that everybody would just walk outside and they'd look at each other differently.

A: And we'd have peace and we would be living unified and accepting each other. No matter what we look like. No matter who we are and what we do for a living. That's where we are moving and that's the coolest part about Mark, is I see that that spiritual element in him. He's truly been guided and directed to present this information. And this is no way or shape or form trying to not acknowledge the work of Eric Dubay because he has done some phenomenal work. Please check him out as well. His last name is Dubay, who has really done some very tenacious work on presenting the more scientific

approach to the Flat Earth.

M: Yeah.

A: It's really something that interests you as much as it does me. One last thing, because we are getting to the top of the two-hour mark. I thought it was really interesting – there was one video out there, Mark, and I'm not sure if you know which one I am talking about, where it talks about how the rays of the sun – if the sun is so far away then the rays of the sun would be bent and they would be different than the way that they appear today. And they were basically saying how the sun is really much more above us or it's not so much that the sun is setting it's just getting further away at the horizon. And in one of the videos was outstanding because it actually showed the All-Seeing-Eye.

M: Yeah.

A: And I had a big aha when I saw that. What do you think of that?

M: You mean against the guy who made that particular one? Okay. I will say look – I subscribe to his channel. I know exactly who you are talking about. The channel's name is My Perspective. The guy's name is Rory Cooper and I actually talked to him on the phone a couple of weeks ago. I'm pretty sure that he is down in South Africa and regardless of, again, what he put out there if there is an image that seems out of place, he does give some very, very interesting takes on the 3-dimensional look – if you can get your head around it. He doesn't do a narrative, he uses some text but he does it from an artistic point of view with a lot of 3-dimensional positioning.

A: Yes.

M: It is very interesting. Check it out because, yes, and I've saved a couple on my machine where he goes a lot into sun angles and how things should look and things we take for granted, optical illusions which we completely miss and hopefully I'll talk about it my Clue 12. But again, if you can stay with him and pause it and re-wind it and watch it again. Don't watch it through and say he's totally lost me because he's trying to show you something that is literally right in front of you that should be – especially when it comes to sun rays and angles and how on a globe it should be like this and in a flat system it should look like this. Compare the two. Look, this is what should happen if this is what it is [a globe] and from the other side this is what I'm seeing. Tell me that I am wrong. It's somewhat controversial because again it's not exactly scientific like Eric Dubay's stuff. Eric fills a lot of holes that I don't. But Rory's stuff, is really interesting from a visual standpoint. Because it's all eyes. So yeah, I recommend it totally, check it out. I don't know if he's got any hidden things in there, I hope not. Rory, if you're listening, please don't. But –

A: Oh my gosh, you're so funny. Well, so, one last thing, if somebody were to come up and say to you, Oh, you're ridiculous. The Earth can't be flat because you have to consider the laws of similarities and everything is spherical. What would you say? Quick.

M: Think about it from this standpoint – if it is an enclosed system the builders, the creators, are going to be very, very clever to the point where I firmly believe at some point they wanted the globe illusion to happen. But it was going to be as a natural process. Because if the globe illusion happens we don't

run for the fence, we don't immediately dedicate our entire lives to beating on the fence, or the wall, or the barrier, or the firmament, and try to say, hey, whose on the other side of this? If it's a globe we don't even look for it. But as a natural process I think we were supposed to discover it by ourselves, maybe in the 50's, maybe in the 60's, depending when we actually got out there, who knows. If Byrd wasn't forced out there when would he have actually found it. But I think from that point forward it's been artificial.

The globe was supposed to be discovered decades ago and it was hidden from us. So from the spherical point of view, yes, everything in the sky is spherical because that's the part of the illusion. We're supposed to think that. Because as soon as we build this everything else becomes spherical, it doesn't become a plane anymore. The sun becomes a sphere, the moon becomes a sphere, all the planets become spheres, everything becomes a sphere instantly and it stays that way until somebody else tells us otherwise.

A: Good point. Good point.

Well, thank you, Mark. Just in case everybody did not remember, please access Mark Sargent's Flat Earth Clues I through II, and he has some other videos up there on YouTube.com. [markksargent – YouTube](#). You can also – I'm going to let you give out your phone number – you can also reach MSargent23@comcast.net and he's bold enough to put his home phone number which is 303-494-6631. I put that number at the end of every video and that's the phone right here. That's the phone. It's a land line, you can't text it, but I will leave that phone on until it is stopped blowing up to the point where, well, eventually, I'll just have to turn the ringer off and just answer messages, but it's been wild so far.

A: Well, and one of the other things that I really like about the approach that you have, he's really open to all of us submitting additional data, any other titbits that you feel will fill in some of the blanks, okay.

M: Oh yeah. I don't have all the answers.

A: We're all basically trying to swim through the murky waters to find out what's really our truth here. So I commend you Mark. Thank you so much for all the work that you are doing.

M: Thank you.

A: I appreciate it. So anyway, we're running out of time. I just want to thank everybody as always, you know how much I love you, and I appreciate you guys. You are the best audience. Your emails really keep me inspired and going and supported. So please know that ahead of time. Also don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions on the Implant Removal Series which is literally the best, I believe, in the world. And also my alchemical galactic formulas which are just a whole new ride of its own. So anyway, take care. Have a wonderful evening, and we will talk to you on what, the other side? No, outside the firmament? I don't know what to say, anyway. You have a wonderful rest of the week. Thank you Mark again, I appreciate all the that you're doing as well.

M: Thank you very much for having me.

A: You're welcome. Everybody, lots of love. Take care.