

Graham,

I NEVER claimed that Wormwood was 6 light “years” away... EVER. If it was, it would be part of some other star system instead of our own. Wormwood is the binary little sister (companion star) to our Sun. That means that it HAS to be MUCH CLOSER to our system to be in an orbital relationship with our Sun. 6 light “years” is just TOO FAR AWAY. It is possible for it to be “light hours” away from the Sun but light “years” is just too much distance.

Ref:

Planet	Distance in AU	Travel time
Mercury minutes	0.387	193.0 seconds or 3.2
Venus minutes	0.723	360.0 seconds or 6.0
Earth minutes	1.000	499.0 seconds or 8.3
Mars minutes	1.523	759.9 seconds or 12.6
Jupiter minutes	5.203	2595.0 seconds or 43.2
Saturn minutes	9.538	4759.0 seconds or 79.3
Uranus minutes	19.819	9575.0 seconds or 159.6
Neptune hours	30.058	14998.0 seconds or 4.1
Pluto hours	39.44	19680.0 seconds or 5.5

As you can see, even some of our own planets are light hours from the Sun. So it is NOT out of the ordinary for the more distant objects of our solar system to be light “hours” from the Sun because some of them actually ARE that far away. And they STAY that far way... PERMANENTLY. That’s where their orbit tracks are located. It is therefore not a great difficulty to believe that Wormwood could indeed be part of our solar system even though its orbital track might take it farther away from the Sun than the orbit of Neptune or Pluto... albeit in a different direction. But in ANY case, Wormwood would be light HOURS from the Sun, not light YEARS from the Sun... BIG DIFFERENCE. And in case, if you are wondering, there are 8766 hours in a year. And 6 light years would be 52,596 light hours... WAY TOO MANY light hours. It might be possible for Wormwood’s orbital trek to take it out 200 light hours or maybe even 400 or 500 light hours from the Sun. But it would not stray 8766 light hours away and certainly not 52,596 light hours from the Sun. Again... that kind of distance would place it in some other star system but not in an orbital relationship with our Sun. And the same reasoning would apply to anyone else claiming that Wormwood can be that far away.

As for Dr. Harrington, he might have gotten some hard evidence or he might not have... depending on what was on the photographic images that he captured with that 8” telescope he borrowed from NASA. Supposedly those photographic plates disappeared when they got back to Washington, DC. Only the people who arranged for their “disappearance” would know what happened to them and they are probably not interested in going public with their efforts at sabotaging Harrington’s investigation. If the nights that he did take those photographs happened to be nights with good viewing (“seeing”... if you’re an astronomer), then he MIGHT have captured something. Working with a good 8” telescope, the odds are that he actually DID get some good evidence. But exactly where that evidence is at this point many years later is another matter.

It was known that he was going to take a sky survey of the most probable location vicinity for Wormwood. It was also known that he had both visible light spectrum film as well as extended spectrum film that would also capture the Near Infrared part of the spectrum. Blink comparison was the filtering methodology of his day so it appears that he intended to extract Wormwood’s location via that method. We do it all electronically today, but Dr. Harrington had to use the equipment available to him back in his day. It took a lot of years for CCD cameras to catch up to the image capture clarity that Eastman Kodak was able to do for a great many years with their fine grain photographic emulsion film. The Kodak people were actually

VERY GOOD back in Dr. Harrington's day. They still are, but Kodak technology has now been superseded by the electronics of our day.

In any event, the technical problem would have been the same. He was looking for something in the NIR part of the spectrum located between RA 14 and RA 21 in the southern hemisphere skies but probably closer to RA 16 (by his own account). He knew that was the correct search area **MATHEMATICALLY** because he had run over 330,000 computer simulations for the previous 12 years. His repeated mathematical processing of the perturbation formula in those 12 years leading up to his trip to New Zealand allowed him to narrow the sky search to a **MUCH** narrower segment of the celestial sphere. He didn't have to go looking over in the neighborhood of RA 22 like you were claiming some years ago. Dr. Harrington already **KNEW** that Wormwood was not there. He didn't have to go looking in the neighborhood of RA 9 like you are now. Dr. Harrington already **KNEW** that Wormwood wasn't there. He didn't have to go looking for Wormwood in the northern hemisphere skies like you have been consistently claiming. Why? Because Dr. Harrington already **KNEW** that Wormwood wasn't there. Dr. Harrington would have gone searching for Wormwood in that part of the sky where Wormwood probably **WAS** located. He would not have gone looking for Wormwood in places that he **KNEW** ahead of time that it would **NOT** be found. The man had a PhD in Astrophysics. He was not a dim wit like you or me. So give the man some credit for knowing **SOMETHING**. He was **WAY** ahead of you. He was **WAY** ahead of me too. And I'm glad of that because it helps us to narrow our search parameters now even though he's gone. He was pointing the way before he died... in the grand tradition of the astronomers that preceded him... including Alexis Bouvard, John Couch Adams, Urbain Jean Joseph Le Verrier, Johann Gottfried Galle, Percival Lowell and Clyde Tombaugh... as well as others who were silenced before their findings could be made public... and others who live in fear for their lives even now.

And your borrowed (rented) Slooh or Microsoft WWT images don't really count for much since Slooh doesn't have a Near Infrared instrument capability. Yes... I asked them. They have some nice stuff, but not what is needed to search for Wormwood. And you are looking in the wrong direction at the wrong time of the year (the wrong side of the solar system). You **CAN'T** see Wormwood now because the Sun is in the way. So you are looking in the wrong direction. We **KNOW** that **MATHEMATICALLY**... compliments of Dr. Harrington. The perturbed planets were telling us which direction to go looking for Wormwood/PX. You are definitely looking in the wrong direction this time... just like all the other times. You may

have found “something”, but that does NOT mean that you found Wormwood/PX, it just means that you found something else. Well, “Yuppie!” for your something else. But DON’T pretend that it is proof of Wormwood/PX because it’s not. Anyone can take a faint Slooh or MWWT image and “claim” that it is Wormwood/PX but that does NOT make it so. Sorry, Graham, but that’s how it really works. And it sounds like you could use a serious dose of reality... something that seems to elude you where Wormwood/PX is concerned.

As for proofs of my claims... that is a different matter. You have not really read through any of my reasoning with any clarity on your end, so it wouldn’t matter if I was right/correct or not... at least not in your own mind. But I happen to know that Wormwood/PX is still inbound. Some “back channel” NASA and astronomy types have confirmed it. They won’t admit it publicly or on the record but privately is another matter. The weather and earthquake anomalies also confirm it. The historical record confirms it, including The Revelation, the Kolbrin, numerous ancient sources and a great deal of archaeological evidence. Wormwood/PX has been around for perihelion visits before. And it’s coming back around for another visit. All of its previous visits have been destructive for Planet Earth. According to the Designer of the Universe, His description in The Revelation says that this next visit will be destructive as well. Again, we need to warn people of the coming destruction... if they are willing to listen. Sometimes they actually do listen. Sometimes they do not. But that’s how it is when people are involved.

Gill Eriksen

