

Geocentricity

Is the earth at the center of a finite universe, and stationary in it (termed Geocentricity), as the Bible indicates? Or, is what science claims to be true: That the earth is but one of many planets in endless, meaningless orbit around the sun; and the sun is the center of the solar system (of which there are countless others in an infinitely large universe)? This question is important because the issue raises further problems, such as, is the Bible trustworthy? Is scientific truth truer than Scripture? Shall science preempt the meaning of Scripture? And even more problems arise: Does God exist? What is man? Is there a heaven beyond the stars? Here I argue that geocentricity is both biblical and scientifically valid, and that what science alleges (termed Heliocentrism) is simply an ideology that is scientifically unsound.

First, let's be sure we understand terms. Geocentricity means the earth is central and immobile in the universe. (Geocentricity itself may/may not involve rotational movement, i.e., spinning on its axis.) Heliocentrism refers to the sun at the center of our solar system, with all the planets, including earth, revolving around it in their respective orbits, and they all rotate. (Don't confuse "rotate," i.e., spin on its axis, with "revolve," which is a planet's motion around the sun.)

What does Scripture say? Earth was created first. A firmament then was created, after Earth already existed and was stable in its position. Then on a subsequent day, the heavenly bodies (sun, moon, and stars) were placed into that firmament. The heavenly bodies are meant to be subordinate to Earth, to serve Earth. The Bible is geocentric in its totality. Isaiah 38:8 *must* mean the cosmos is geocentric. Joshua 10:13-14 demands geocentricity. Earth is God's "footstool" (Isaiah 66:1); it therefore is fixed and stable; it's at rest relative to heaven. The New Jerusalem coming down from heaven (Rev 21:2-3), Jacob's ladder, Christ's ascension, Elijah's being taken up, etc, all imply an Earth at rest and fixed relative to heaven. Earth is the focus of God's attention, and only God is infinite; so the universe must be finite, and if so it has to have a center. The Bible throughout assumes Earth to be central.

In the 2nd century AD, Claudius Ptolemaeus' *geocentric* scheme was adopted by the church. It was accepted for 1500 years as dogma because it conformed to biblical cosmology. In 1543 AD, Nicholas Copernicus, reading the ancient pagan Greeks (in particular, Aristarchus), suggested that the universe instead was heliocentric. Luther called Copernicus "a fool." Around that time, pioneer astronomer Tycho Brahe (of Denmark), on the basis of exceedingly careful observations (and his Christian faith) declared the universe to be *geocentric*. Brahe's geocentricity was confirmed by subsequent early astronomers, eg, Baer, Cassini, and Carpenter. Brahe's understanding was that the earth is central and immobile, and the sun revolves daily around the earth, carrying all the planets as they revolve around the sun.

Galileo, however, arrogantly declared Copernicus' heliocentric view to be a demonstrated fact, and he dared the church to scientifically refute it (an impossibility). He claimed that the Scriptures needed to be "re-interpreted" if the church thought they're geocentric. Others joined Galileo in repudiating geocentricity. Johannes Kepler (Tycho Brahe's brilliant protégé) betrayed Brahe and pronounced the universe to be heliocentric. Kepler claimed the universe was "mechanistic," and that science had priority over the Bible. Isaac Newton used Brahe's data but foolishly chose heliocentrism as the basis for his laws of motion. Giordano Bruno declared the universe to be infinitely vast, and that the sun was just another star. Rene Descartes popularized heliocentrism and a mechanistic, deterministic universe. These figures initiated a metaphysical revolution in the Western world, denying the authority of Scripture because it taught something contrary to what was alleged to be a true cosmology. That "Copernican revolution" gave rise then to the Enlightenment, and a humanist and naturalist movement that produced the ideas of evolution and billions of years. The Copernican revolution is the foundation upon which modern, secular (anti-theistic) science rests.

Physicists then set to work to try to prove heliocentrism. Observations such as stellar parallax were (and still are) touted as proof. But certain critical experiments suggested otherwise; they indicated that the earth was at rest. It wasn't moving! Horrors. But Einstein came to the rescue with his theory of relativity. Einstein's postulates (relativity) supposedly were then "proven" [they weren't; other explanations for that "proof" have been suppressed because if relativity isn't true, geocentricity is]. So Einstein, it's now universally asserted, made irrelevant those experiments that showed an immobile earth. Key to relativity is the now-established dogma that the speed of light is constant, it's an absolute. But that's simply not true! The speed of light can only be measured two-way, and that's meaningless. What's necessary is to know the *one-way* speed of light, and that cannot be measured, it's impossible.

The central scientific issue is, the complete inability of *any* scientific observation made from *within* a system to make a distinction between “moving” and “fixed” in an absolute sense. If you’ve ever been on a train stopped at a station, with another train stopped alongside, and you look out the window, for a brief moment, you see the other train moving. But soon enough, you realize that it’s *your* train that’s moving. Only people standing on the station know which train is really moving. Physicists are aware that the Tycho Brahe model is dynamically equivalent to the modern heliocentric (Copernican) model; it’s impossible to differentiate on the basis of physical measurements or experiments. Only someone *outside* the system can know, and that’s God. A century ago, physicist Ernst Mach warned: all motion is relative; science cannot detect or prove absolute motion. When we observe nature we see what we want to see, according to what we believe we know about it.

In other words, scientifically we can choose heliocentrism or geocentricity, and all astronomers’ observations support either choice. We believe what we want to believe. (It’s really an epistemologic issue, and scientists know little to nothing about epistemology.) Today’s men of science want heliocentrism to be true, for religious reasons [their atheism]; they’re absolutely committed to it. But geocentrism is scientifically valid. The sun annually shifts its position relative to earth, explaining the position of the sun during the seasons of the year, and the stars also shift as they are centered on the sun. This annual shift of the stars is misinterpreted as the earth revolving around the sun, and it accounts for the observed parallax. Heliocentrism is the view that’s preferred today, but it hasn’t been proved, and it *cannot* be proved. Geocentricity is mocked and ignored, but it hasn’t been disproved, and it *cannot* be disproved.

Now let’s think, Does the earth rotate daily on its axis? The supposed evidence that it does includes the Coriolis effect, earth’s bulge at the equator, the Foucault pendulum, and geostationary satellites. But while these are consistent with a rotating earth, they are, as well, for a universe rotating around the earth! In other words, the planets and the entire universe of stars are fixed on the sun, and so it all rotates around the earth daily. If the celestial bodies are all embedded in a “firmament,” as Scripture states, that’s fully realistic. It is impossible to differentiate whether the earth is daily rotating or the heavens daily rotate around the earth, because *within* the system, all motion is relative; only God, who is outside the system, can see which actually moves. From a dynamics point of view, there’s no reason to reject the view that the sun daily revolves around earth, it would appear on earth exactly the same as if earth were rotating on its axis.

Of course, geocentricity has its critics. “The secular world will laugh at us,” say our theologians. But they already are laughing at us because of the cross (1 Cor 1:18-20) and because of our belief in a recent creation. Let them laugh, God will vindicate us in the future. Another criticism: “A larger body centrally with its greater gravitational pull makes more sense than a smaller body centrally.” In other words, they say, the dynamics of heliocentrism makes more sense. But if the sun (with its planets) is embedded in a firmament, *that* is what would hold the universe intact, not the sun’s gravity. We should follow Scripture, not reason. And then, there’s this allegation: “Nothing can go faster than light, and a universe revolving around earth daily would involve fantastic velocities.” But Einstein said that nothing goes faster than light *with reference to the background of space*, so geocentricity doesn’t violate any physical constants. And we don’t comprehend all that a firmament entails.

The “firmament” may be an exceedingly dense, solid, invisible medium in which the celestial bodies are all embedded and that permits light to travel at infinite (one-way) velocity. We wouldn’t know such a medium exists if it weren’t for Scripture (Genesis 1:17). Science is aware of such an entity, calling it a “plenum.” It corresponds to what physicists of a century ago referred to as an “ether.” (Einstein’s relativity was to refute the existence of an ether.) By the way, because light travels at infinite velocity, the light from distant stars is visible on Earth instantly. The supposed millions of “light-years” for light to reach earth vanish.

* * *

We live in a world that despises God. It therefore seeks in every way to impugn His Word, God’s self-revelation. The Copernican revolution and all that it spawned, what we know today as Science and modernism, is bamboozle. It not only wants desperately to deny the authority of Scripture but, worse, to mock God’s Word. Let us therefore be courageous and refuse to compromise. Why? So that God is glorified by our commitment to His Truth. We should derive our worldview and understanding of all that exists from Scripture, not from unprovable claims that scientists make.