

# Einstein Versus the Bible

Dr Thomas M. Strouse

Bible Baptist Theological Seminary

3-11

## Introduction

In the year 1881 two events occurred posing the potential of affecting biblical Christianity detrimentally. Both of these events were the culmination of movements which brought a devastating assault on the Lord Jesus Christ and His Scripture, namely the movements known as Biblical Criticism (17-19<sup>th</sup> centuries)<sup>1</sup> and the astronomy of the Scientific Revolution (16-18<sup>th</sup> centuries).<sup>2</sup> In the field of bibliology, B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort produced a new Greek text based on the novel theories of textual criticism leading to the *English Revised Version* of the Bible. The underlying Greek text, based extensively on Codex *Sinaiticus* and Codex *Vaticanus*, became the foundational text of the Critical Text (CT)<sup>3</sup> and the textual impetus for modern versions.<sup>4</sup> The fruit of this event did indeed lead to the widespread apostasy permeating English-speaking Christianity because the CT eviscerated the “practical” absolute authority of Scripture, which authority was recognized traditionally in the *Authorized Version*.

The second event, in the field of cosmology, was the employment of the interferometer by Albert Michelson (1852-1931) to prove once and for all the validity of “the Copernican Principle.”<sup>5</sup> Nikolas Copernicus (1473-1543) speculated that the sun was the center of the “solar system” and hence the earth translated (revolved) around the sun at about 66,000 mph (19 mps). The Michelson experiment was a simple effort to show that the earth moved through the “Aether” (ether)<sup>6</sup> at this rate. Michelson split a light beam in his interferometer and sent the

---

<sup>1</sup>The anti-supernaturalism of German Lutheranism’s unregenerate ministers spawned a multitude of critical theories or “criticisms” of the Bible, including Higher Criticism, Lower Criticism (= Textual Criticism), Form Criticism, Historical Criticism, Literary Criticism, Canon Criticism, etc.

<sup>2</sup>Although new scientific theories emerged in the disciplines of physics, biology, human anatomy and chemistry based on empirical evidence for the betterment of man, those speculative ideas of Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo challenged the veracity of the Bible and fifteen hundred years of biblical interpretation.

<sup>3</sup>The *Textus Criticus* changes, omits and questions about 7% of the *Textus Receptus*, which difference is equivalent to the total number of words in Jude and Revelation.

<sup>4</sup>Which versions such as the *NIV*, *NAS*, and *ESV* question or delete significant doctrinal verses and passages such as Mk. 16:9-20; Jn. 1:18; 3:13; 7:53-8:11; Acts 8:37; I Tim. 3:16; and I Jn. 5:7 *et al*.

<sup>5</sup>This is the code jargon used by scientists to circumvent employing the dreaded expressions “heliocentricity/geocentricity.”

<sup>6</sup>It was also known as “luminiferous ether.” The biblical term for ether is “*firmament*” (רָקִיעַ) which Christ created on the Second Day of creation (Gen. 1:6; cf. also Col. 1:16). The “*firmament*” is a

beams perpendicular to each other, recombining them on a photographic plate with the assumed interference fringes produced by different speeds. The difference in speed would occur as the beam traveling with the supposed translation (revolution around the sun) movement of the earth through the ether would be impeded by the ether with respect to the perpendicular beam which would not be impeded by the ether. To Michelson's surprise, he found that the experiment did not demonstrate that earth moves through the ether. The apparent failure of the results seemed to validate the Ptolemaic system, or the biblical teaching of geocentricity. This result disturbed incredibly the scientific community, but especially a young mathematician named Albert Einstein (1879-1955). After all, the Scientific Revolution began with Copernicus' work (1543)<sup>7</sup> which assumed but did not prove that the sun was the preferred center of rest, and that the earth translated around it annually. For three and a half centuries cosmologists built their theories upon the supposed validity of copernicanism with no empirical evidence.<sup>8</sup>

### **The Failure to find Empirical Evidence for Copernicanism**

The Michelson experiment was one of a series conducted to demonstrate empirically the evidence needed to support Copernicus' theory. For instance, earlier, D. F. Arago (1786-1853) recognized that the speed of light slowed in various mediums such as glass and water. He assumed it would slow in ether as well. He pointed light beams toward and against the earth's supposed movement, assuming that the ether would demonstrate the slowing of the speed of light in the one direction. His experiment detected no movement of the earth! A. J. Fresnel (1788-1827) attempted to explain the failure by his "trapped ether" theory. A. Fizeau (1821-1896) attempted to test the constitution of ether and concluded that the speed of light is neither increased nor decreased in ether. George Airy (1801-1892) conducted an experiment with two telescopes aimed toward starlight, one filled with water and the other with air. The earth's supposed movement would show a difference in the speed of light in the different mediums of the telescopes. There was no difference—suggesting again that the earth was in a fixed, motionless position! "Airy's Failure," as it is commonly known, failed to prove the assumed Copernican Principle of a translating earth around the immobile sun. This set the stage for Michelson's experiment, which he improved in 1887 with the help of Edward Morely (1838-1923) to show the earth's translation speed around the sun, but had to note "this conclusion directly contradicts the explanation...which presupposes that the Earth moves."<sup>9</sup> Variations to

---

hard but penetrable particulate of created mass (not a vacuous vacuum!), and thus its name, occupying the first and second heavens.

<sup>7</sup>*De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (1543).

<sup>8</sup>Although Galileo discovered through use of the telescope that planet Venus moves around the sun, suggesting the validity of Newtonian mechanics for the smaller body rotating around the larger, this did not disprove the immobility of the earth.

<sup>9</sup>Robert A. Sungenis and Robert J. Bennett, *Galileo was Wrong; the Church was Right*, Volume I (State Line, PA: Catholic Apologetics International Publishing, Inc. 2008), p. 7. This is an exhaustive

these aforementioned experiments have been conducted hundreds of times with more and more sensitive equipment, never demonstrating unambiguously the motion of the earth. In fact, the following are a series of quotes from famous scientists who have despaired at the lack of empirical evidence proving the assumed Copernican Principle. H. Lorentz said, “Briefly, everything occurs as if the Earth were at rest...;” A. Eddington lamented, saying, “There was just one alternative; the earth’s true velocity through space might happen to have been nil;” H. Poincare complained, saying, “We do not have and cannot have any means of discovering whether or not we are carried along in a uniform motion of translation” and “A great deal of research has been carried out concerning the influence of the Earth’s movement. The results were always negative;” B. Jaffe exclaimed incredulously, saying, “The data were almost unbelievable...There was only one other possible conclusion to draw---that the Earth was at rest...this, of course, was preposterous;” L. Barnett concluded, saying, “nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the Earth actually is in motion;” and finally, Einstein admitted, saying, “I have come to believe that the motion of the Earth cannot be detected by any optical experiment.”<sup>10</sup>

### **Albert Einstein and Relativity**

The “father of modern physics,” Albert Einstein, was disturbed that the Michael-Morely experiment seemed to perpetuate the Ptolemaic cosmology of the immobile earth. In 1905 he wrote his paper “On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies” in part, to counter the obvious conclusion of the Michael-Morely experiment. Later, he admitted that his Special Theory of Relativity (STR) “owes its invention entirely to the desire to make physical theory fit observed fact as well as possible.”<sup>11</sup> Einstein’s dilemma was between two basic choices, namely that the earth was at rest (Ptolemy) or the ether was at rest (Copernicus). The former was philosophically repugnant and the latter was empirically challenged. In 1895, at sixteen years of age, Einstein had his first “thought experiment”<sup>12</sup> imagining that he was chasing a beam of light, caught up with it, and observed that it was “frozen” in movement. This became the basis for his STR. The apostate Jew Einstein rejected the biblical truth that the earth is at rest (and therefore that the Scriptures and their Author are not absolute), and he rejected the Copernican Principle that the

---

work of two volumes, designed to show the biblical interpretation and Catholic Church history pertaining to the battle for geocentricity.

<sup>10</sup>Sungenis and Bennett, p. 7.

<sup>11</sup>Ronald W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times* (NY: Avon Books, 1984), p. 128.

<sup>12</sup>The Apostle Paul warned about extreme limit of man’s mind concerning truth, stating, “*But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.*” (I Cor. 2:9-10). The unregenerate and unrestrained mind of man is an open door to the doctrines of demons (cf. I Tim. 4:1) as Paul also warned, saying, “*Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ*” (II Cor. 10:5).

ether is at rest (with the earth supposedly translating through the absolute ether). He actually denied that there was any ether since the earth could not be detected as having moved through it (space is a vacuum). He cleverly shifted the frame of reference from the earth (both Ptolemaic and Copernican cosmology employed the earth as the frame of reference to whatever was moving) to the “observer,” and the “absolute” from the motionless ether to the speed of light. Einstein recognized that if light is the only absolute and its speed is finite (186,000 mps), the observer must be the frame of reference, which then allows for multiple frames of reference at any time.<sup>13</sup> The STR posited the backdrop for new physics, namely that *the speed of light is the “absolute”* in all frames of reference, that there was no ether but instead a vacuum in “space,” that the theory of heliocentrism which replaced biblical geocentrism was now replaced by acentricism, and that neither earth nor ether were absolute, but everything was “relative.”

In STR, the frame of reference, the observer, is at rest the speed of light is absolute. However, Einstein needed to posit a theory to deal with the accelerated observer because of the phenomenon of gravity. He invented the theory of General Relativity (GTR), speculating that gravity would bend light. Thus, time, space and light were no longer constant in this new theory. His imagined universe now incorporated such fantasies as “black holes” and Riemannian or non-Euclidean geometry. Smolin demurs, saying, “General Relativity is the most radical and challenging of Einstein’s discoveries...The theory goes much deeper: It demands a radical change in how we think of space and time...All previous theories said that space and time have a fixed structure and that it is this structure that gives rise to the properties of things in the world, by giving every object a place and every event a time...General relativity is not about adding to those structures...It rejects the whole idea that space and time are fixed at all. Instead, in general relativity the properties of space and time evolve dynamically, in interaction with everything they contain.”<sup>14</sup>

### **The Reaction to Einstein**

Both Einstein and modern physicists questioned the validity of his theories. For instance, Einstein around 1912 admitted, saying, “the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light in a vacuum must be modified.”<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, he confessed, saying, “I am really more of a philosopher than a physicist.”<sup>16</sup> Theoretical physicist and cosmologist Steven Hawking pointedly remarked, saying, “We already know that general relativity must be altered. By predicting points of infinite density—singularities—classical general relativity predicts its own downfall... When a theory predicts singularities such as infinite density and curvature, it is a sign that the theory

---

<sup>13</sup>This humanistic subjectivism is the basis for the ultimate solipsism which states “I only exist.” The outworking of Einsteinian physics is that everything is relative to me as the creator of my own universe.

<sup>14</sup>Lee Smolin, *Discover*, September 2004, p. 39.

<sup>15</sup>Arthur Lynch, *The Case Against Einstein* (London: Philip Alan, 1932), p. 209.

<sup>16</sup>Leopold Infeld, *Quest—An Autobiography* (NY: Chelsea, 1980), p. 258.

must somehow be modified.”<sup>17</sup> In a commemorative work, Wright excoriates Einstein’s theories, saying, “Albert Einstein got it wrong. Not once, not twice, but countless times. He made subtle blunders, he made outright goofs, his oversights ere glaring. Error infiltrated every aspect of his thinking. He was wrong about the universe, wrong about its contents, wrong about the inner workings of atoms...In 1911 Einstein predicted [by Relativity] how much the sun’s gravity would deflect nearby starlight and got it wrong by half. He rigged the equations of general relativity to explain why the cosmos was standing still when it wasn’t. Beginning in the mid-1920s, he churned out faulty unified field theories at a prodigious rate. American physicist Wolfgang Pauli complained that Einstein’s ‘tenacious energy guarantees us on the average one theory per annum,’ each of which ‘is usually considered by its author to be the definitive solution.’”<sup>18</sup> Einstein’s two theories, which revolutionized the scientific world and the “moral universe,” received impetus from the failed Michelson-Morely experiment to detect the translational movement to the earth through the ether, and received revelation from his fertile imagination left to the Gnostic counseling of demons, and produced the “*science falsely so called*” (I Tim. 6:20).

### **The Trouble Geocentricity Poses**

Copernicus speculated that the sun, not the earth, was the fixed center of creation. Over four hundred years of experimentation has yet to produce unambiguous evidence for the Copernican Principle. All of the supposed objections to geocentricity can be answered in the geocentric model, such objections as stellar parallax, Foucault pendulum, retrograde motion of Mars, geo-stationary satellites, etc. Sober scientists recognize their conundrum with the demise of copernicanism because of the lack of empirical evidence. The lack of data to support copernicanism causes trouble for post-Ptolemaicites. For instance, the trouble, complained Hubble, was an immobile and centralized earth, saying, “...a central Earth...this hypothesis cannot be disproved, but it is unwelcome and would only be accepted as a last resort in order to save the phenomena.”<sup>19</sup> In like manner, Hawking recognized what the lack of empirical evidence meant, saying, “All this evidence that the universe looks the same whichever direction we look in might seem to suggest there is something special about our place in the universe. In particular, it might seem that if we observe all other galaxies to be moving away from us, then we must be at the center of the universe.”<sup>20</sup> Another agenda must be behind modern science, and Einstein hinted at the real issue, saying, “A conflict arises when a religious community insists on

---

<sup>17</sup>Steven Hawking, *A Briefer History of Time* (NY: Bantam-Dell Books, 2005), p. 102.

<sup>18</sup>Karen Wright, “The Master’s Mistakes,” *Discover*, September 2004, p. 50.

<sup>19</sup>Edwin Hubble, *The Observational Approach to Cosmology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 50.

<sup>20</sup>Steven Hawking, *A Brief History of Time—From Big Bang to Black Holes* (NY: Bantam Books, 1988), p. 42.

the absolute truthfulness of all statements recorded in the Bible.”<sup>21</sup> Carl Sagan, along with the scientific community, must deny the notion that the earth is special or in a privileged place in the cosmos. He dogmatically asserts, saying, “The Earth is a very small stage in a vast cosmic arena...Our posturing, our imagined self-importance, the delusion that we have some privileged position in the Universe, are challenged by this point of pale light. Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark. In our obscurity, in all this vastness, there I see no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves.”<sup>22</sup> Without facts, Sagan becomes factitious.

The theoretical physicists must admit that the real issue is not science but philosophy. Sir Fred Hoyle acknowledges, saying, “We know that the difference between a heliocentric theory and a geocentric theory is one of relative motion only, and that such a difference has no physical significance.”<sup>23</sup> Likewise, Martin Gardner realizes Einsteinian physics cannot give absolutes, stating, “Do the heavens revolve or does the Earth rotate? The question is meaningless. A waitress may just as sensibly ask a customer if he wanted ice cream on top of his pie or the pie placed under his ice cream.”<sup>24</sup> This philosophical frankness has freed some to make pro-Ptolemaic statements, such as astrophysicist Yatendra P. Varshni concerning his evidence with the spectra of quasars. He stated, saying, “the quasars in the 57 groups...are arranged on 57 spherical shells with the Earth as the center...the cosmological interpretation of the redshift in the spectra of quasars leads to yet another paradoxical result: namely, that the Earth is the center of the universe.” Recently, scientist Marcus Chown hypothesized that the universe may be spinning like a swirling fluid. He asserted: “Look up at the sky. Almost everything out there is spinning around: stars, galaxies, planets, moons—they are all rotating. Yet physicists believe that the universe itself is not revolving. Why? It’s a question that Pawel Mazur can’t answer. Mazur, physicist at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, is one of a number who think it is entirely possible that our universe is spinning on an axis. If these people are right, it could make understanding the universe a whole lot simpler...rotation requires an axis, and a cosmic axis of rotation would bestow a ‘special’ direction on the universe—along the axis.”<sup>25</sup>

### **Relativity and Creationists**

It is a *non sequitur* that the unredeemed world of physicists would discern the lie of the pseudo-science about which Paul warned Timothy, saying, “*O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely*

---

<sup>21</sup>Albert Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions* (Pinebrook, NJ: Dell, 1988), p. 45.

<sup>22</sup>Carl Sagan, *Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space* (NY: Ballantine Books, 1977), p. 7.

<sup>23</sup>Fred Hoyle, *Astronomy and Cosmology—A Modern Course* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1975), p. 416.

<sup>24</sup>Martin Gardner, *The Relativity Explosion* (NY: Vintage Books/Random House, 1976), p. 184.

<sup>25</sup>Marcus Chown, “Do the Cosmic Twist,” *New Scientist*, 10 June 2006: 34-37.

so called” (I Tim. 6:20). However, it is a spiritual tragedy that Christian creationists are willing to countenance part of the lie and denounce the rest of it. Although Christian leaders in science such as Henry Morris, Russell Humphreys, and Donald DeYoung have rejected big-bang evolution (e.g., in the beginning there was nothing and it exploded!), they nevertheless have attempted to squeeze the creation of the Lord Jesus Christ into a Copernican and Relativistic universe. The venerable Dr. Henry Morris, creationist champion *par excellence*, succumbed to unbiblical surmisings, teaching that the universe was infinite! He interjects into the Bible the pantheistic presupposition of an “infinite universe,” stating that on the first day of creation “God created and energized the entire universe, the infinite sphere of divine activity and purpose.”<sup>26</sup> Dr. DeYoung exalted science above Scripture, stating, “The geocentric alternative leads to a fundamental problem: the nearest night star is Alpha Centauri, 4:3 light years away. If this star actually circles the earth every 24 hours, then its speed must be nearly 10,000 times faster than the speed of light! Such motion is clearly impossible in our physical universe. The earth’s motion is clearly shown by the graceful movement of the sun, moon, and stars through the sky.”<sup>27</sup> Did not the Christian creationists ever examine Scripture and the geocentric alternative? Dr. Gerry Bouw, in a very significant and interesting article, revealed some of the early correspondence among creationists and fundamentalists concerning the viability of championing geocentricity.<sup>28</sup> Apparently the Creation Research Society was examining the possibility of defending geocentricity when Walter Mulfinger, science chairman of Bob Jones University wrote a letter on Dec. 26, 1978 to the Creation Research Society Quarterly imploring the editor

---

<sup>26</sup>Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Record: A Scientific and Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996), p. 65. If the universe (henceforth the biblical expression “*heaven and earth*”) has no edges then it cannot have any center; therefore their argument can discount the biblical teaching of a physical center. The Bible with the following scriptural arguments easily refutes this foundational premise of Heliocentric Creationism: 1) God created the third heaven (Col. 1:16; cf. Job 38:7) with limitations (I Ki. 8:27). 2) God created the first and second heavens with limitations (Gen. 1:6-19; Dt. 4:32; Ps. 19:6). 3) Only God is eternal and infinite (Gen. 21:33). 4) God’s creation, in contrast with His infinite person, is finite (Ps. 90:2). 5) God will destroy the present heaven and earth and will create the new heaven and earth (Isa. 65:17; II Pet. 3:10-13; Rev. 21:1). 6) All that is “above the heavens[s]” (cf. Ps. 8:1; 57:5, 11; Eph. 4:10) is God Himself.

<sup>27</sup>Donald DeYoung, “Does the Earth Really Move? A Look at Geocentrism,” *Creation* 10 (June-August, 1988): 11. It is a tragedy that the Bible Dr. DeYoung claims to defend so easily and clearly refutes his human reasoning. Through the sage Job the LORD repudiated man’s fallible reasoning and knowledge with the challenge, saying, “*Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?*” (Job 38:33). Man does not have enough scientific knowledge to make the right assumptions. Contrary to Einstein, the speed of light has not been and is not absolute. Using DeYoung’s example of Alpha Centauri, its light would not have been seen by Adam for four years, contradicting the Lord’s original purpose of the stars (cf. Gen. 1:14-16).

<sup>28</sup>Gerardus D. Bouw, *The Bulletin of the Tychoian Society*, no. 54, p. 24, Fall 1990. For a further understanding of biblical and scientific geocentricity, see Bouw’s classic work, *Geocentricity—The Biblical Cosmology* (Cleveland: Association for Biblical Astronomy, 1992), 387 pp.

to stop publishing papers expounding the scriptural arguments for geocentricity. Mulfinger's arguments were exclusively scientific and void of any Scripture. For instance, he stated his sentiments contrary to verses such as Josh 10:13, saying, "The Tychonian view pictures the sun as revolving around the earth, but the other planets as revolving about the sun. Ridiculous! If the earth is massive enough to dominate the sun gravitationally, it will dominate the other planets as well. If it is not, then it will *be* dominated by the sun, and will orbit the sun as the other planets do. The Tychonian view requires, in effect, that there be *two* "most massive" bodies in the same system."<sup>29</sup>

Bouw concludes with the status of geocentricity among fundamentalists and conservative Christianity since those early days. He rehearses, saying,

"And that brings us to modern Christianity and its reaction to geocentricity. There the situation has changed. Christian resistance to a scripturally compatible model of creation has increased. We wrote earlier of the opposition of George Mulfinger to geocentricity. Mulfinger wrote that circa 1980. By 1985 Bernard (Bernie) Northrup, a Wickliffe translator, after a superficial examination of geocentricity and emotionally upset by this author's persistence in his faith in the A.V., declared geocentricity a heresy. People like Robert Kofahl, chemist, and the late Henry Morris, would get visibly upset if asked about geocentricity after their speeches. By 1992 an old Bible-Science group in Anaheim, California, declared geocentricity an 'end-time heresy.' Any person who professed geocentricity was ousted from the group. Likewise, the longtime head of the Flat Earth Society,<sup>30</sup> the late Charles Johnson, excommunicated any member of the Society who would join The Tychonian Society, the premier geocentric organization in the Americas, if not the world. It was clear that geocentrists were the least of all those who professed faith in the inerrancy and preservation of the scriptures."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>The impact of Mulfinger's influence over the fundamentalist and Bible-believing public cannot be overemphasized insofar that the science curricula for Christian private and home school education publications all contained the Copernican Principle throughout the science text books.

<sup>30</sup>Bouw's observation is significant since the Flat Earth Society wanted to remain on the other side of the globe [!] from geocentricity. Jeffrey Burton Russell's incisive book entitled *Inventing the Flat Earth—Columbus and Modern Historians* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publications, 1997), 117 pages, effectively settles once and for all that neither Columbus nor the medieval world believed in a flat earth, and that the perpetrators of the "Flat Error" were Washington Irving [1783-1859] and Antoine-Jean Letronne [1787-1848] (pp. 51 and 58 respectively). Their tenet was popularized between the years of 1870 to 1920 to mock Christians in the creationist-evolutionist debates, with epithets such as "flat-earth biblical" literalists and "flat-earth fundamentalists" (p. 46).

<sup>31</sup>*The Bulletin of the Tychonian Society*, no. 54. p. 24, Fall 1990.

## A Review of Biblical Geocentricity

The following outline lists the salient points of Scripture which teach physical geocentricity of the earth as the immobile center of the heavens. The Bible teaches consistently a geocentric frame of reference (the earth is the absolute fixed point around which all else turns).

- A. The Creation account teaches geocentricity exclusively (Gen. 1:1-19)
  - 1. The earth was created first on Day One and the heavens (dual) were created from the earth on Day Two (Gen. 1:2-6).
  - 2. The earth was completely distinct from the heavens and never placed in the heavens to revolve around the sun (Gen. 1:14 ff.).
  - 3. The Spirit of God (according to Ps. 104:2 clothed with light during the creation week) was the moving source of light around the stationary earth for Days One, Two, and Three.
- B. The biblically recorded structure of the universe is geocentric.
  - 1. The spherical earth (Isa. 40:22) was separated from the waters by the firmament (=heavens).
  - 2. The created heavens and earth contained the earth, the first heaven (face of the firmament), the second heaven, and the outer layer of water or a crystal sea (Ps. 148:4; Rev. 4:6).
- C. The movements are geocentric.
  - 1. The earth is stationary (Ps. 93:1, I Chron. 16:30).
  - 2. The sun, as a light bearer for the earth, has a circuit (Ps. 19:6; Eccl. 1:5).
  - 3. The heaven has a circuit (Job 22:14).
  - 4. The stars have their courses (Judg. 5:20).
- D. The Bible phraseology is geocentric.
  - 1. Sixty-seven times the Bible expresses that the sun rises, goes down, etc. (Gen. 15:12 to Jam. 1:11).
  - 2. The Bible teaches in two exceptional cases that the sun stopped or went backwards (Josh. 10:12-13; Isa. 38:7-8).
- E. The Bible analogies are geocentric.
  - 1. The earth hangs on nothing--it is not moving, it is hanging (Job 26:7).
  - 2. The earth has a place (Isa. 13:13).
  - 3. The earth is at rest as God's footstool (Isa. 66:1).
- F. Earth and Heaven are two distinct worlds (Heb. 11:3)
  - 1. They are distinguished ("*heaven and earth*") over 100 times from Gen. 1:1 to Rev. 21:1
  - 2. They have their own respective ordinances or laws (Job 38:33; I Cor. 15:40-41).
- G. Alleged heliocentric Scriptures

1. Isa. 24:1—the earth will be turned upside down (this deals with the Tribulation judgment by the massive, worldwide earthquake activity, and not with a daily rotation on its axis).
2. Job 38:14—the earth will be turned in judgment (again, as its context dictates this predicts God's judgment on earth and certainly does not teach a rotation on its axis).

### **Caveat for Creationists**

Whereas creationists will defend the literal interpretation of Gen. 1:20-28, rejecting evolutionary heresies concerning the origin of plant, animal, and human life, they consistently capitulate to the unproven and Christ-dishonoring theories of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Einstein instead of the clear biblical cosmology presented by the Saviour. Whereas creationists adamantly defend on the basis of close exegesis of the Hebrew text the 24 hour day creation week and a recent 4000 year BC creation, with the same adamancy they deny that the earth was created first, that the heavens were created from the earth, that the original light source revolved around the immobile earth, that the creation was geocentric on the first three days, that the earth is distinct from and not in the heavens (to revolve around the sun), that the Scripture is completely silent about any semblance of the theory of heliocentricity, and that the phenomenological argument is irrelevant because Gen. 1 gives God's perspective and not man's. The modern creationist movement is flawed at its very foundation and is extremely limited in the real spiritual battle concerning the Lord's physical absolute (the Earth) which in turn supports His theological absolute (Jn. 3:16). Did not the Lord Jesus Christ warn apostate Jews, saying, *"For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"* (Jn. 5:46-47).

Why do Christians who profess faith in the Bible reject the overwhelming references to a geocentric cosmology, using the inconsistent hermeneutic of phenomenology, and accept heliocentricity, which teaching the Bible never countenances? Why do they embrace a theory built originally on speculation with no initial empirical evidence and no unambiguous evidence yet, while theoretical physicists recognize that either model can satisfy the science and mathematics, but prefer the model which leads away from the teaching that the Earth is a special place in the privileged position of God's creation (cf. Jn. 3:16)? Although peer pressure from the world and from Christianity may be intimidating, it will be a fearful time before the Creator of the heavens and earth for Christians to have to defend their Copernican and relativistic views to the Lord with an open Bible at the Judgment Seat of Christ (II Cor. 5:10-11).

"The Father made the sun go up and down,  
And the heavens go round and round,  
With Earth in her place,  
He sent Christ's saving grace,  
So His glory throughout creation should redound."

## Bibliography

- Abell, George. *Exploration of the Universe*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Bouw, Gerardus D. *Geocentricity: The Biblical Cosmology*. Cleveland: Association for Biblical Astronomy, 1992.
- Chown, Marcus. "Do the Cosmic Twist." *New Scientist* 10 (June 2006): 34-37.
- Clark, Ronald W. *Einstein: The Life and Times*. NY: Avon Books, 1984.
- Copernicus, Nicolaus. *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, translated by Charles G. Wallis, Prometheus Books, 1995.
- DeYoung, Donald. "Does the Earth Really Move? A Look at Geocentrism," *Creation* 10 (June-August, 1988): 11.
- Dingle, Herbert. *The Special Theory of Relativity*. London: Methuen & Co, 1961.
- Einstein, Albert. *Ideas and Opinions*. Pinebrook, NJ: Dell, 1988.
- Faulkner, Danny R. "Geocentrism and Creation." *Technical Journal* 15 (2, 2001): 110-121.
- Gardner, Martin. *The Relativity Explosion*. NY: Vintage Books/Random House, 1976.
- Hawking, Steven. *A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*. NY: Bantam Books, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Briefer History of Time*. NY: Bantam-Dell Books, 2005.
- Hoyle, Fred. *Astronomy and Cosmology—A Modern Course*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1975.
- Hubble, Edwin. *The Observational Approach to Cosmology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Infield, Leopold. *Quest—An Autobiography*. NY: Chelsea, 1980.
- Lynch, Arthur. *The Case Against Einstein*. London: Philip Allan, 1932.
- Morris, Henry M. *The Genesis Record: A Scientific and Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *Inventing the Flat Earth: Columbus and Modern Historians*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997.
- Sagan, Carl. *Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space*. NY: Ballantine Books, 1977.
- Smolin, Lee. *Discover Magazine*, September 2004.
- Strouse, Thomas M. "Biblical Geocentricity." *The Biblical Astronomer* 109 (Summer 2004): 69-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *He Maketh His Sun to Rise: A Look at Biblical Geocentricity*. Cromwell, CT: Bible Baptist Theological Press, 2010.
- Sunegis, Robert A. and Robert J. Bennett. *Galileo was Wrong; The Church was Right*. Volumes I and II. State Line, PA: Catholics Apologetics International Publishing, Inc., 2008.
- Van der Kamp, Walter. *De Labore Solis: Airy's Failure Reconsidered*. British Columbia, Canada: n.p., 1988.
- Wright, Karen. "The Master's Mistakes." *Discover* (September 2004): 50.