

Creation, the Fall and the Curse

And the significant repercussions today

Introduction

There are many reasons why we should study the creation narrative and the consequent fall from grace. Indeed, there are many good books and sermons on these subjects. However, here I want to take a new look at this in order to understand what happened at the curse. This is chiefly with a view to counter some standpoints, especially those whose apologetic rests too heavily upon modern science.

Sometimes modern apologetics are based on a hermeneutic that is close to liberalism, to secular rationalism. Their starting point is not Scripture, nor Biblical theology, but secular reasoning, or even 'A' level academics. In other words the foundation is man and not God.

When we come to evaluating the Edenic world we are not dealing with a world as it exists now, nor should we expect physical laws to be the same as that observed in a fallen world dominated by sin. Thus we need to observe what actually happened at the Fall and the curse in order to understand what the newly created world was like.

This then leads to hope because the new world that believers will occupy after the Second Coming will be like it in many respects, but this time the situation is secure, certain and eternal because Christ is amongst all and the centre of creation.

Creation

Creation week						
Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7
Heavens and earth. Watery earth part of the heavens.	Heaven separated from earth	Dry land appears	Sun, moon & stars (i.e. the original photons were concentrated into stars etc.)	Living creatures: birds in air, creatures in sea	Living creatures on earth.	God rested
Light created (i.e. energy).		Earth and seas			Creation of man.	
Light and dark separated; day & night		Vegetation				
Thus space, time, matter and then light (photons).						

Some points to note

- The Hebrew word for an ordinary 24-hour day, *yom*, is used. There is no idea here of epochs of time when *yom* is used with an ordinal number.

- The days are just numbered until the 6th day, which alone has the definite article, ‘the sixth day’. This is highlighted because man, the crown of creation, was created and formed out of dust on the sixth day.
- The recorded observer of creation is pictured as standing on earth. The earth is the centre of creation.
- God did not create the universe as an immediate, finished system. He first created the raw material for the universe, then crafted this into a final design, imparting energy in a series of steps. Note Gen 1:2, ‘without form, and void’; in Hebrew this is *tohu waw bohu* i.e. ‘unformed and unfilled’.
- This creation involved the work of the three persons of the Godhead. The Father planned and designed it (1 Cor 8:6); the Son called it into existence (Jn 1:1-4; Col 1:16-17) and the Spirit applied and activated those words (Gen 1:2; Job 26:13; Ps 104:30).
- In the creation of man the involvement of the Trinity (as a plurality of persons) is boldly stated (‘Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness,’ Gen 1:26).
- The word for ‘created’ (*bara*) is only used for significant new steps in creation. That is, the heavens and earth (verse 1); new life forms (verse 21) and man (verse 27; three times in this verse). Thus Gen 2:3 refers to both ‘created’ and ‘made’. The aspects of inanimate matter are formed, or made from existing materials, often using the phrase, ‘let there be’ (light v3; firmament v6; dry land v9, plants v11ff.; stars v14ff.).
- There is no conflict between Gen 1 and Gen 2; they are certainly not the work of different authors.¹ The difference is in style – Genesis 1 is strictly chronological history; it is not myth, figurative, fanciful or based on a framework of different sagas compressed into a literary idiom of days.² Genesis 2, however, is not chronological but is concerned with emphasis; emphasising and expanding certain points of creation teaching.
- The big bang proposes that a burst of light (energy) came first before matter; the Bible says that matter came before light.
- The residual background radiation found in space may have resulted from the remainder of the initial creation of light energy after the concentration into stars.
- Many scriptures tell us that after creating the heavens God ‘stretched them out.’ The properties of a medium change as it is stretched out. ‘Who stretched out the heavens...and established the world’ (Jer 10:12; see also Isa 42:5, 45:12, 51:13; Jer 51:15 etc.). This stretching (no time given, some suggest day two of creation week, i.e. Gen 1:6-7) would affect the properties of the firmament and this would, in turn, affect deducing distances of stars (light may behave differently in the furthest points of the firmament). In fact faint lights, currently taken to be very distant stars, may actually be reflections on the firmament. Furthermore, the speed of light varies according to the medium it passes through; this speed at distances far from the earth may be very different to its speed observed on the earth. This could mean that the initial velocity of light at the end of day two was higher than it is now by many orders of magnitude. The stars may not be as far away as suggested by modern science.³
- The first material is not hydrogen (as modern physics) but water.
- The firmament of the heaven is space. What this is composed of will be discussed later.
- Biblical creation is at complete odds with the current models of cosmology.

¹ As in the Higher Critical Documentary Hypothesis, which makes the Pentateuch the work of several different authors spliced (redacted) together by an editor quite late.

² That is, the Framework Hypothesis. A false theological view of Gen 1 to avoid literalism.

³ Radio signals of distant spacecraft imply that the craft are closer to earth than they should be. That is, radio signals appear to take less time than expected to be picked up on earth. However, the speed of light may increase at greater distances from us.

What happened in creation?

Before we examine what happened at the Fall and the ensuing curse, we need to get a grasp on what happened in creation and how the Edenic world was very different to our world.

Before creation God existed. There was nothing but God. There was no space, no darkness nothing at all. This is hard to conceive but it is the orthodox position. There was no time; only God.

Then God decided to create a universe out of nothing to manifest his perfect character. Thus this universe had to be perfect also. Genesis 1-3 describes this work of creation from various viewpoints and this is widely understood and needs no detailed comment. However, I wish to pick out some important facts.

Since God existed alone before creation, then the angels were created during creation week but we are not told when. Since angels live in heaven (the highest heaven, see later) then that heaven had to be created in creation week, and we are told that it was. Most commentators consider angelic creation occurred perhaps on, or just after, day two when heaven was created. So angels were in existence before the creation of man (day six) and heaven was in existence before the creation of solid earth (day three).

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form, and void; and darkness *was* on the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters. Gen 1:1-2

Then God said, "Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together into one place, and let the dry *land* appear"; and it was so. And God called the dry *land* Earth, and the gathering together of the waters He called Seas. And God saw that *it was good*. Gen 1:9-10

At the beginning the earth had no form, was void and appears to have been a sphere of water.⁴ The waters below (earth) were separated from the waters above - presumably the deep heavens or an expanse above the heavens (Ps 148:4) which forms the boundary of the universe. Past this boundary is God's glory (Ps 8:1). [See 'the firmament'.]

On this watery earth God formed dry land. On this dry land animal and plant life was created. However, notice that vegetation was created (third day) before the sun (fourth day). The original light separating the darkness was not the sun. This was not the light of God's person but created light on the first day.

One reason for the appearance of light days before the formation of the sun is to centre on God's person in creation not the sun. Ancient Near Eastern religions all focused on the sun; mainly because their days had many hours of sunshine and this set their minds on powers above them, which they personified. Thus the sun god featured centrally in virtually all Near East religion, starting with Nimrod. The Bible is different, the sun has a much lower place in creation. 'In the beginning, God' (Gen 1:1).

Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed *it was very good*. So the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Gen 1:31

This is the crux of creation week; everything was perfect because it was the manifestation of the perfect God.

⁴ Ps 24:1-2, 'The earth is the LORD's, and all its fulness, the world and those who dwell therein. For He has founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the waters.'

The firmament

A critical part of the created universe is the firmament; but nobody knows for certain what this is. The word comes from the Latin in the Vulgate, *firmamentum*, which is used as the translation of the Hebrew *raki'a*, which means 'expansion'. Thus it denotes the space or expanse immediately above us. It was originally regarded it as a solid body. It is plain that it was used to denote solidity as well as expansion.

What we can say is that:

- The firmament formed a division between the waters above and the waters below (Gen 1:7).⁵
- The waters under the firmament became earth (Gen 1:9); the waters above the firmament are usually stated to be space; but that is not what is stated. The stars are in the firmament and the waters are above it. The sun, moon and stars are in the firmament (Gen 1:14-18).⁶ But people also saw the firmament as the atmosphere (sky) since from our viewpoint there is no boundary between the sky above us and deep space beyond that. In fact the firmament is actually stated once to be the sky (Gen 1:20).⁷
- The firmament is also called 'heaven' (Gen 1:8)⁸ or 'the firmament of the heavens' (Gen 1:14, 15, 17, 20). This is a dual word (like 'trousers' or 'scissors'); i.e. a plural term denoting a singular object. It means: heaven, heavens, sky, visible heavens, abode of the stars, the visible universe, atmosphere, and heaven as the abode of God. This does not help us since it could mean the atmosphere, space, something beyond space or God's dwelling beyond that.
- We can see the effect of the firmament (Ps 19:1).⁹
- It is said to shine (Dan 1:3).¹⁰
- God's dwelling place in heaven is also stated to be a firmament, though this is 'HIS firmament' (Ps 150:1).¹¹
- What do we make of Ps 148:4; 'Praise Him, you heavens of heavens, and you waters above the heavens!' The *raki'a* supported the upper reservoir (Ps 148:4); it was the support also of the heavenly bodies (Gen 1:14). Therefore, what we see as the firmament of space is not the end but has 'waters' above it.

From all this, the best way to express the firmament is as an expanse. This expanse begins as the sky / atmosphere and then passes into the region of space. Above this region (not a void) there are waters and above that (after the boundary of the universe) is God's dwelling place, which is also an 'expanse'. The firmament is not a void but is very dense; the Hebrews saw it as a solid matter.

⁵ 'Thus 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.'

⁶ 'Then God said, "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and seasons, and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light on the earth"; and it was so. Then God made two great lights: the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also. God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light on the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good.'

⁷ 'Then God said, "Let the waters abound with an abundance of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the face of the firmament of the heavens."'

⁸ 'And God called the firmament Heaven.'

⁹ 'The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament shows His handiwork.'

¹⁰ 'Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament.'

¹¹ 'Praise God in His sanctuary; Praise Him in His mighty firmament!'

All in all it seems best to consider the firmament as the ether, or the plenum of Max Planck (which we will discuss later). This is very important to cosmology since the ether is denied by modern science.

Conditions in the newly created earth: the Edenic world

The crucial factor in this consideration, and one that is frequently forgotten, is that this world was not like our world at all. This is why many with a scientific background utterly fail to appreciate why physical laws were not applicable as they are now.

What is the chief difference? It is that God dwelt with his people on the earth. Heaven and earth were intermingled. The material world also had a spiritual component. Spiritual laws reigned on earth not physical ones because God and angels were there.

We need to get a grasp of God's decree of salvation here to help us see this clearly. What is salvation all about? It is a rescue operation, pre-planned by God, to facilitate the fellowship of God and man. This requires remitting sin and making sinners holy in Christ. The end result is that heaven and earth are again united, and that God dwells with men. Repeatedly we see in Scripture that God dwelling with man is the intention of the decree. Thus even the types, such as the Tabernacle and Temple, are stated to be a symbol of the ideal of God dwelling with men. At the end men are able to dwell with God because, not only are they legally adopted into God's family through justification, but they are materially made new creatures and eventually possess a transformed body like Christ's so that they are completely compatible with God's holiness.

Thus the end of salvation history is a reflection of the creation history before Adam fell into sin. At the end of time we see that God is the central energy source of the city of God (the whole kingdom)

The city had no need of the sun or of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God illuminated it. The Lamb is its light. Rev 21:23

There shall be no night there: They need no lamp nor light of the sun, for the Lord God gives them light. And they shall reign forever and ever. Rev 22:5

The sun shall no longer be your light by day, nor for brightness shall the moon give light to you; but the LORD will be to you an everlasting light, and your God your glory. Your sun shall no longer go down, nor shall your moon withdraw itself; for the LORD will be your everlasting light. Isa 60:19-20

Since this equates to what happened before sin erupted, where God fellowshiped in the garden with Adam, it is safe to say that the energy source in Eden was not the sun but God himself (remember that plants were created before the sun).

This means that physical laws cannot have been the same as they are now. Current laws of physics only apply to a world without God and damaged by sin. We cannot extrapolate backwards and say that they applied in a universe where God was at the centre, in a real way, energising it.

Therefore, in whatever description we have about this world we should expect to see significant differences to today; and that is what we find; life was not like it is now. A key

verse is Romans 5:12, ‘through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men’.¹² Thus the special conditions that were in place before the Fall included:

- The earth was ‘very good’. There was nothing bad, decaying or disordered. This has implications for existing physical laws.
- There was a spiritual, heavenly component to the earth, similar to what will exist after the return of Christ and the renovation of the earth. This was not an environment like ours today; it was not just material, but also spiritual at the same time. This also has implications for existing physical laws.
- God fellowshiped with men.
- Angels fellowshiped with men.
- Animals were different. Eve expressed no surprise to converse with a snake; so either all animals could talk, or snakes could talk, or angels could communicate through animals, perhaps by telepathy.
- Animals did not eat each other before the Fall but were vegetarian (there was no death). Since modern carnivores appear to be specifically designed to metabolise flesh, and even carrion, God had to directly supervise their digestion of vegetation. [Note that the Bible does not consider plants to have life; ‘soul’ or ‘spirit’ is not applied to plants. If there was no death before sin, then consuming plants was not killing them; they were simply consumed.]
- Since there was no death, sickness and no decay, bacteria and viruses were not harmful.
- Since there was no death man would have been immortal if he had not sinned. Thus the condition of plants and animals would also be different. Plants did not die in the winter since harsh winters only appeared after the flood, and there was no natural death (leaves dying off). We have no right to twist Scripture to say that there was no human death but some animal or vegetable ‘death’.¹³
- The fact that it did not rain means that plant processes were different and physical laws were different. Rain and rainbows only occurred after the flood (Gen 2:5, 7:4).¹⁴ The Edenic world was watered by a mist sent from God (Gen 2:6)¹⁵ and by a river (Gen 2:10).
- Note also that vegetation occurred on day three of creation but the sun was created on day four. Physical laws were different.
- God made trees grow so that they were immediately mature with fruit (Gen 2:9).
- The stars and the cosmos were designed to immediately appear with apparent age and maturity.
- Topography was different. Vulcanism, storms, earthquakes and mountain building only occurred after the flood.
- There was no significant ambient temperature change between day and night (see later).

¹² Paul’s chief concern in Romans 5 is to argue the case for justification by faith and the existing sin of all men. Thus he highlights the fact that sin spread to all men as death spread to all men. However, his first two clauses affirm that death entered the world through sin. There was no death before the Fall. No death; full stop. Not just human death; no death at all. Whatever biological problems that causes logical thinkers, the fact is that God upheld this perfect creation and used means not known today.

¹³ Even if plants have no soul life (*nephesh*) like man, winter would cause dying back; i.e. the death of plant life.

¹⁴ A normal Hebrew word for ‘rain’ is used; and the Greek word in the LXX is also ‘rain’. As plants did not initially need the sun, neither did they need rain, Thus physical laws were different to today.

¹⁵ There is a dispute as to what ‘mist’ (*ed*) means in Gen 2:6. Some (EY Young; *In the Beginning*, p67) suggests that it may mean underground water supplies; the lexicons say it was a mist.

Everything in Eden was different; therefore, physical laws were different. We will develop this later.

The rebellion of Satan

We need to be very circumspect here and stick to what is certain. Very many popular preachers spend a considerable time expounding Ezekiel 28:1-19 and Isaiah 14:4-23 as references to Satan; but Scripture specifically states that the former is addressed to the Prince, and later King, of Tyre and the latter to the King of Babylon. In fact Ezekiel 28:2 says, 'you say, "I am a god, I sit in the seat of gods, In the midst of the seas," Yet you are a man, and not a god'. Also the references to 'cherub' in Ezekiel eliminate any thought of an angel; angels are not cherubim. Furthermore, the fact that Ezekiel records that the King of Tyre was 'devoured' and 'turned ... to ashes upon the earth In the sight of all who saw you' (Ezek 28:18) completely eliminates Satan as being in view. However, the passage does have some interpretative difficulties.

In essence, what these passages are doing are comparing the self-proclaimed glories of these rulers with idealistic forms, such as Adam in Eden, or an anointed cherub. Their hearts were lifted up to proclaim themselves as ideal men, ideal rulers, worthy of deification. This was typical in the ancient world where kings repeatedly deified themselves. Great kings and Pharaohs were considered divine from the time of Nimrod onwards. Even the Romans fell into this sin. Though there might appear to be superficial comparisons with Satan, there is no specific teaching about Satan in them. So we rule them out as any basis for satanic information.

What do we actually know about Satan's origin? Well this is not a paper on Satan or demons so we will limit our observations. Satan ('adversary') is the 'accuser' and also the devil (*diabolos* – slanderer, accuser); he was an angel created to minister to God and God's creation. The descriptions of Satan are all post-fall and so tell us little about his pre-fall state. Traditionally, he was the chief angel but certainly he was able to dominate the rebellion of a third of the angels against God (Rev 12:4).

Why did he rebel?

In God's eyes, privilege and leadership involves service and being last (Matt 20:16; Mk 9:35). Godly leadership is not like man's but is based on service not rulership. The chief sin of Satan (and man subsequently) is pride; not willing to bow down to others but wanting one's own way.

The business of angels was twofold: firstly in heaven, a ministry to serving God as messengers; spirit beings who are flames of fire (Heb 1:7). Secondly, on earth, to minister (serve) to those who are elect but have not yet received salvation (Heb 1:14). In the OT, before the outpouring of the Spirit, they had an extended role in safeguarding the saints and thus appeared more often. It seems that Satan, a chief angel (not necessarily the chief, that seems to be Michael) refused to serve Adam who was merely made of dust. Satan, as a glorious fiery angel was called by God to serve the elect, and thus serve man who was made lower than angels (Ps 8:5). Typical of God's kingdom, the greater was called to serve the lower – and Satan could not stand it.

This seems to be the spark that caused Satan's rebellion and the downfall of a third of the angels who agreed with him. All these fallen angels changed in their nature and became demons (evil spirits). Angels are always associated with fire and light but the natural composition of demons seems to be coldness and darkness; though they can temporally

disguise themselves as angels of light (2 Cor 11:14). If it requires a ‘transformation’ for Satan to turn himself into an angel of light, then he is naturally cold and dark. We also know that demons have no rest because they are under judgment (Matt 12:43) and this explains why Satan roams around like a roaring, restless lion (1 Pt 5:8). He is like a lion seeking to devour men since he was a murderer from the beginning (Jn 8:44).

Since this paper is about creation and the curse not demonology, we can ignore the many descriptions of Satan post-fall for now (prince of the power of the air, the dragon etc.). What we chiefly need to remember is that the devil is the father of lies (Jn 8:44) and that his chief weapon is deceit. This is why demons are symbolised as scorpions; they distract with their large fierce claws up front, but the real problem comes from behind with their poisonous tail (Rev 9:3, 10). This deceit is used to turn the mind of men away from God and to fall under the sway of the devil.

Today, key forms of this deceit are found in the fraudulent statements of false science. A classic example is that of evolutionary theory which claims to be a science but which fails to follow the very definition of science (repeatable observations in tests). However, there are many other forms of false science that bind the minds of Christians, some of which will be mentioned later.

Anything that turns the mind of the believer away from God’s revelation in the Bible is satanic in origin and must be resisted.

When did he rebel?

The truth is that no one knows. It must have been after the creation week, where everything was pronounced ‘very good’, which must have meant that there was no sin in the material or spiritual world. However, it must have been before the temptation of Eve since this is the work of the fallen angel Satan.

The Gap theory

It was once fashionable, especially in Brethren circles and popularised by the Scofield Bible, GH Pember and even by Arthur Custance, to teach that there was a gap between Gen 1:1 and Gen 1:2. In this gap it was suggested that the angelic rebellion took place and the subsequent war destroyed an original creation. This was largely to account for the massive death count resulting in the fossilised remains of dinosaurs and such like.

However, few believe this now since Hebrew scholars have long since demonstrated that the text cannot be twisted to mean this. The Hebrew grammar will simply not allow a gap between these verses.¹⁶ Furthermore, the end of Genesis chapter one and the beginning of Genesis chapter two state that the heavens and earth were ‘very good’ and ‘finished’ or ‘accomplished’.¹⁷ It is inconceivable to imagine a sinful angelic rebellion and the destruction of a whole world before these statements.

The immediate effects of sin

The entrance of sin into the world was through the temptation of Satan and the sin of Adam and Eve. This caused untold damage to creation. As a result of sin on earth even

¹⁶ Most phrases in Genesis 1 are connected by the Hebrew letter *waw*, [‘and’]. The *waw*-consecutive expresses a sequence of historical activity, one event following another, and thus the style is historical narrative not figurative metaphor.

¹⁷ Gen 1:31, ‘Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good.’ Gen 2:1, ‘Thus the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished.’

physical laws were altered. This was formalised by the edict of God in the curse upon man and the earth. It is important to understand what took place.

Death

The first result of the sin was that man died in that day. Though he continued to live, his life had changed. The first thing is that he became mortal; Adam would not have died if he had continued righteous. Adam was suddenly living under a death sentence. But worse than that his spirit died in that it was severed from God and Adam began to live in the death of sin. Unregenerate men are 'dead in sins' (Eph 2:1); when Adam became a sinner he immediately, that very day, became dead in sins (dead to spiritual life and holiness) as God promised (Gen 2:17). Adam's spiritual death would work itself out as physical death many years later.

Death had not existed in Eden until that day; death only arrived through sin (Rm 5:12; 1 Cor 15:21). This, in itself, is a very important point to remember. Thus animals in Eden were all originally vegetarian, for instance. Biological changes occurred to enable a change of diet to take place; indeed physical laws changed as creation was badly affected by the Fall.

Adam's nakedness

Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they *were* naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves coverings. And they heard the sound of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God among the trees of the garden. Then the LORD God called to Adam and said to him, "Where *are* you?" So he [Adam] said, 'I heard Your voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; and I hid myself.' And He said, 'Who told you that you *were* naked? Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you that you should not eat?' Gen 3:7-11

Let's establish some things. Firstly, Adam and Eve lived in the garden naked. They needed no clothes since the climate was so beneficial to human life. This alone tells us that climate was very different to today and it may be one reason why it was called 'delight' (i.e. Eden). Presuming that Eden was situated somewhere in the Ancient Near East (we can't be sure where it was since the river systems changed at the flood and some are unknown).¹⁸ Even in these warm climes today it can get very cold at night. This tells us that there was no significant ambient temperature change between day and night or between seasons.

Secondly, Adam was a perfect man; the greatest man apart from Christ. He was the head of the gene pool, created perfectly by God before any gene degeneration had taken place. Imagine the wisest, most capable man in history – Adam was wiser and more practical. Did Adam know that he was naked? Of course he did; he was not a fool. Many people suppose that the nakedness was embarrassment; but again remember that Adam and Eve were perfect and did not suffer from this weakness (Gen 2:25). So Adam and Eve were naked before the Fall and had no problems with it.

¹⁸ It has been placed in Armenia, in the region west of the Caspian Sea, in Media, near Damascus, in Palestine, in Southern Arabia, and in Babylonia. The site must undoubtedly be sought for somewhere along the course of the great streams the Tigris and the Euphrates of Western Asia, in "the land of Shinar" or Babylonia. The region from about lat. 33 degrees 30' to lat. 31 degrees, which is a very rich and fertile tract, has been by the most competent authorities agreed on as the probable site of Eden. "It is a region where streams abound, where they divide and re-unite, where alone in the Mesopotamian tract can be found the phenomenon of a single river parting into four arms, each of which is or has been a river of consequence." Easton's Dict.

Suddenly, upon the entrance of sin, Adam declares that he was naked. Something very obvious and significant had changed. This was not embarrassment that he was unclothed. But what was it?

It is my opinion that as a perfect being in the image of God, the representative of God in the world, Adam glowed with glory. Adam had a radiance of divine glory that was part of the image. Shining skin is a result of being united to God. This is not far fetched by any means. Here are my reasons:

- Angels radiate God's glory because they are his ministers, doing his will (Lk 2:9; Acts 12:7; Rev 18:1; 2 Cor 11:14). Those who serve God in perfection (without sin) will shine.
- The Seraphim are different to both Cherubim and angels but are also servants of God associated with his glory and dominion, always close to God's throne (Isa 6:2-7). The name means 'fiery ones' or 'shining ones'. Their appearance appears to be human with the addition of six wings. Again we see that those who fellowship with, and serve, God shine with glory.
- Those who are called to represent God are changed from one degree of glory to another (2 Cor 3:18). We cannot see this glory since currently it is inside, in our new man. When we have a new body like Christ's, this glory will be visible (1 Cor 15:40). The physiology of the glorified man is different from its physiology today.
- At the end of our course, when our old nature is removed and we have a new body, we will shine (Prov 4:18; Dan 12:3; Matt 13:43).
- When Moses saw the Lord, in a very limited manner, the result was that his face glowed (Ex 34:29; 2 Cor 3:7).
- When the Lord was in the world incarnated as a man, he hid his divine glory; it was veiled by his flesh (Heb 10:20). However, at one point the Lord opened up that glory (as a man) just a little bit. On the mount of transfiguration his body shone, radiating glory. With him were two saints, Moses and Elijah, who now being free from sin, also appeared in glory (Matt 17:1-9).

It is entirely natural that those who are God's messengers should shine with the glory of God. There is nothing surprising in this.

It makes absolute sense to consider that Adam shone with divine glory as the manifestation of God's image in man. Far from being far fetched, it is necessary that it should be so. The God of glory, when manifested in a perfect man, will cause that man to shine with glory. We are called to that glory (Col 3:4).

However, God's glory cannot abide with sin. The moment Adam sinned the radiance vanished and Adam's body ceased to shine. He would know this immediately and be very worried. In order to face God in the garden, they sewed leaves together to make clothes¹⁹ to hide the fact that the glory had departed. The coverings were not to hide their embarrassment but to hide the fact that the glow had gone.

This is why it says that their eyes were opened. This does not mean that they were previously blind, as is plain to see (Adam named the animals, saw Eve etc.) but that they saw their sin. Their inward eyes were opened to know sin, guilt and shame. They saw something new. They not only felt guilty but also saw the loss of glory. Gill says, '*this may*

¹⁹ Not 'aprons' as KJV. The word can mean several things regarding clothing: girdle, belt, loin cloth, covering or even armour. 'Girding' in Scripture frequently means covering the whole person. Barnes: '*These leaves were intended to conceal their whole persons from observation.*' The Hebrew suggests twisting branches of leaves together, not sewing with a needle (which they did not possess anyway), and thus may imply a sort of poncho.

respect the nakedness of their souls they were now conscious of, being stripped of that honour and glory, privileges and power, they were vested with; and having lost the image of God that was upon them, and that robe of purity, innocence, and righteousness.'

So the nakedness is more than awareness of being unclothed but an awareness of sin that changed the image and resulted in the loss of visible glory.

Creation subject to bondage

Even before the curse was implemented changes occurred which made all creation suffer and change as a result of sin being set free in the world. God said that the moment Adam ate the forbidden fruit he would die (Gen 2:17); death appeared immediately the sin was committed and before God's curse. We could list some of the immediate changes as follows:

- Man became an omnivore and didn't just live on fruit. [This was formalised after the flood in Genesis 9:3; but the principle of sacrifice, which occurred when God provided animal skins for clothing (Gen 3:21; blood was need for forgiveness: Heb 9:22), involved man sharing in the roasted meat for certain kinds of offering (Lev 6:26, 7:6, 14:13).]
- Some animals became carnivores. Violence resulted in the animal world.
- Some bacteria became harmful to living things.
- Some viruses became harmful to living things.
- Physical laws changed (see later).
- All things began to suffer decay.
- Animal and plant life began to die.

We cannot be certain of the exact time that these things erupted since they are tied in with the formal curse pronounced by God. However, the introduction of death through sin already started the degeneration process before the curse was pronounced because God said that it would. The introduction of death caused ramifications throughout creation.

What does it mean to be subject to bondage, to futility?

For the earnest expectation of the creation eagerly waits for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected *it* in hope; because the creation itself also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groans and labours with birth pangs together until now. Rm 8:19-22

'Futility' (*mataiotes*) is a rare Greek word which means: 'what is devoid of truth and appropriateness, perverseness, depravity, frailty, want of vigour, nonsense, nothingness, emptiness, futility, frustration, purposelessness.' Probably the best meaning in this context is 'purposelessness'; the purpose of nature was lost after the Fall and all nature is now frustrated and perverse. Thus animals devouring other animals is not according to the original divine purpose. Death is not according to the original divine purpose.

Thus all of nature is in bondage to corruption, in slavery to perishing; it is damaged by sin and not functioning properly. This means that although we can look at nature and see the glory of God in designing such amazingly complex structures and creatures, we cannot see past this into the purposes of God's wisdom as to why he created them.

Nothing in creation is now working as it should and everywhere we see decay and death. In fact we observe cruelty, suffering, pain, futility and a lack of hope outside of the Gospel. This is why creation awaits the revealing of God's sons to be freed from this prison of sin and achieve the liberty of getting back in line with God's original purpose.

We must realise that there will be very significant changes in nature in the renewed new world. Nature will amaze us far more than now and many creatures will have properties they do not have now.

The curse

Catastrophes and "natural" disasters, such as earthquakes, floods and famines were unknown in the creation before the fall. Predatory behaviour in the animal world was unknown. Thorns, thistles, pests, and disease were unknown.²⁰

The entrance of sin into the world initiated the massive changes and downfall that we now experience, but this change was formalised by the pronouncement and judgment of God expressed in the curse. This is the formal result of sin.

So the LORD God said to the serpent: 'Because you have done this, you *are* cursed more than all cattle, and more than every beast of the field; on your belly you shall go, and you shall eat dust all the days of your life. And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise His heel.' To the woman He said: 'I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; your desire *shall be* for your husband, and he shall rule over you.' Then to Adam He said, 'Because you have heeded the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree of which I commanded you, saying, "You shall not eat of it": cursed *is* the ground for your sake; in toil you shall eat *of* it all the days of your life. Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you, and you shall eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for dust you *are*, and to dust you shall return.' And Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living. Also for Adam and his wife the LORD God made tunics of skin, and clothed them. Then the LORD God said, 'Behold, the man has become like one of Us, to know good and evil. And now, lest he put out his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever' -- therefore the LORD God sent him out of the garden of Eden to till the ground from which he was taken. So He drove out the man; and He placed cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to guard the way to the tree of life.

Gen 3:14-24

We need to note the curses here:

- The serpent was cursed.
- The ground was cursed. This is the formal beginning of the bondage of creation.

Note this, Adam and Eve were not cursed but were under the curse; they suffered the effect of the curse upon the ground. If mankind was cursed there could have been no salvation.

We need to note the judgments:

- The serpent was judged. It was cursed more every beast. It would move on its belly and would eat dust. Enmity was placed between it and the woman, and between its progeny and man. There was also the proto-Gospel promise that a man (Jesus) would bruise its head, and it shall bruise his heel. Clearly this judgment is centred upon Satan as the agent provocateur behind the serpent.
- The woman was judged: God multiplied woman's sorrow and conception; childbirth would now be painful. A woman's desire was for her husband (she was motivated to make herself attractive), and he was to rule over her.

²⁰ Lambert Dolphin; *The Ruin of Creation*.

- Adam was judged: he now needed to work to get food. Life would involve work. Agriculture would involve thorns and thistles, requiring effort. Death would come and man would return to the dust.

Thus the whole of creation suffers. The earth is cursed and creation is brought into bondage. The devil is cursed, setting the stage for a continual war between demons and men. Plus mankind is judged and placed under the effects of the curse in the world. Sin has dominated the world and the whole of creation is damaged and negatively affected.

It is at this point that the laws of physics formally came into effect, most notably the second law of thermodynamics (see later). These would have begun to appear upon Adam and Eve's sin but the cursing of the ground (nature) formalised the inherent degeneration within creation. Before sin appeared there was a divine building up (regenerative) process within creation with the constant inputting of energy by the direct action of God. This was withdrawn at the curse. God would now only indirectly uphold creation by his providence to stop it falling apart.

Sin in the universe

There are some that think that the fall of Adam plunged the whole universe into sin, but that is as mistake in my view.

Sin is confined to the earth. Here are some Biblical arguments for my position:

- Sin is where Satan is and Satan is confined to the aerial regions on earth.
- Where sin exists there is a need for redemption and redemption is only necessary on earth. Jesus is Saviour of the world and not the universe; He is Lord of the universe but saviour of the world, of earth.
- Where there is sin then there is a need for a saviour, but the Son was only sent to earth and not another planet.
- God's covenant with Noah after the flood was a covenant with creation but it is only applied to earth and the seasons on earth and not other planets.
- Sin regards man and man was only created on earth not other planets. Sin can only exist where there is moral life; such moral life is only found on earth since God only made man on earth.
- Sin is lawlessness it is rebellion against God's law, but God's law is only revealed on earth.
- The promise of blessing in God's covenant, for instance with Abraham, is universal (not just Israel) but restricted to earth.
- The universe was made through, to, and for Christ. Therefore it is the perfect expression of Christ and fit for its purpose with no corruption. The only exception to this is earth, which Scripture informs us rebelled against God and became sinful.
- Only earth is said to need reconciliation with God in the material universe, other than the cleansing of heaven from Satan's spiritual rebellion.

Scripture shows us that God's decree to punish sin affects heaven and earth but not space (the 'heavens'). Thus heaven and earth require reconciliation and cleansing.

Therefore God also has highly exalted Him and given Him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven [i.e. angels], and of those on earth [i.e. the living], and of those under the earth [i.e. the dead]. Phil 2:9-10 [No mention of the heavens, or stars, or planets etc.]

By Him to reconcile all things to Himself, by Him, whether things on earth or things in heaven. Col 1:20

Sin is moral, involving moral choices of the will. Therefore, material objects such as satellites and telescopes sent into the Cosmos do not infect the universe with sin or corrupt morally. The objects are material only with no moral quality.

Sin involves the devil and the devil is on earth

Surely this is well understood? Perhaps not, since I have received questions on it by modern believers. Yet the matter of Satan being confined to earth²¹ by an act of God's judgment is not only a very clear, elementary Biblical teaching but has been the subject of poetry, hymns, drama and prose for centuries.²² Secular people with a classical education are well aware of this and, until recently, everyone grew up with this knowledge.²³ Sadly, some Christians now question it.

Satan and his demons are not free to roam the universe because they are chained.

And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day. Jude 6

He laid hold of the dragon, that serpent of old, who is *the* Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years. Rev 20:2

'Chained' refers to bonds or fetters and by metonymy²⁴ means 'imprisonment, bound in jail'. 'Bound' means, 'to fasten with chains'. Both verses mean that Satan is confined in a prison at this time. This prison is the earth, as well shall see.

He who sins is of the devil, for the devil has sinned from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil. 1 Jn 3:8

From this we learn that those who sin have involvement with Satan. The source of their temptation is satanic lusts placed in their old nature. We also learn that Christ came to destroy the work of the devil and he only came to earth, not other planets. Thus sin and the devil are restricted to earth.

Job agrees with this,

And the LORD said to Satan, "From where do you come?" So Satan answered the LORD and said, "From going to and fro on the earth, and from walking back and forth on it." Job 1:7 also 2:2

The presentation of the sons of God before God, which Satan gatecrashed (Job 1:6, 2:1) can be explained in various ways. First, it may not have been in heaven or involved angels. 'Sons of God' is a term usually used of men (Matt 5:9; Lk 20:36; Rm 8:14, 19; Gal 3:26). Secondly, if it was in heaven and was of angels this could have been a special dispensation of God to enable the lesson of Job to take place. In any case there is no involvement of the material universe outside of earth.

²¹ Sometimes this is described as the 'underworld' or 'hell', with the thought of a prison under the earth (due to the KJV mistranslation of 2 Pt 2:4). Clearly there is confusion as to what Tartarus means in Scripture and not Greek mythology (see later).

²² For example Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Dante's *Inferno* or the Old English poem *Christ and Satan*.

²³ I was taught this in school and Sunday school from the age of four.

²⁴ Metonymy: a figure of speech whereby an attribute of a thing is substituted for the thing meant; for example or 'the turf' for horse racing.

We must understand that the Jews considered that there were three heavens. The first heaven was the atmosphere. The second heaven (often called the 'heavens', Gen 1:1, 2:1) was space, the realm of stars, the cosmos. The third heaven was the dwelling place of God and angels, which Paul was caught up to see (2 Cor 12:2); all these were created. As a result of sin, heaven (the place of angels) needed a reconciliation as well as earth (Col 1:20), but not the universe.

The rebellion of Satan and a third of the angels arose in heaven but this resulted in them being cast down to earth.

His [the dragon's] tail drew a third of the stars of heaven and threw them to the earth. Rev 12:4

The symbolism of Revelation here is not hard to fathom and all commentators would agree that Satan is depicted as the dragon (Rev 20:2) and the third of the stars of heaven are the angels that fell to become demons. So Satan is restricted to earth. If Satan is restricted to earth then sin is restricted to earth also.

Jesus speaks of this, 'And He said to them, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven"', Lk 10:18. There is a debate as to when this occurred. The options are: 1) it occurred after the rebellion in heaven. 2) It occurred after the fall as part of the curse. 3) It occurred at the cross and Jesus was speaking prophetically of the future. 4) It occurred at the ascension on the coronation of Jesus. 5) However, it could also simply refer to the dethroning of Satan through the ministry of the seventy disciples.²⁵ The truth is that we just don't know. My view is that the best option is that it occurred after Satan led the rebellion of the angels in heaven; this is why he acted on the earth in the temptation of Eve.

Peter, Paul, Jude and John tell us that Satan is bound. Thus he does not have unrestricted access to the universe. John explains,

Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, having the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. He laid hold of the dragon, that serpent of old, who is *the* Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years; and he cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal on him, so that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years were finished. But after these things he must be released for a little while. Rev 20:1-3

The bottomless pit is clearly a spiritual dimension (demons are spirit beings) that is somehow tied to earth. The thousand years is the Gospel age from Adam, and especially the coming of Christ, to the end of time after the Second Coming. It is the period of the decree of salvation. A limit is placed on Satan's activity so that he can only work within God's decree and this limits his ability to deceive nations on earth. This was to stop a global empire being built before the time of God's plan at the end.

Again we must ask when this occurred and again there are debates. It seems to me that it must be part of the punishment that followed the satanic rebellion in heaven; this complies with 2 Pt 2:4. That it was before the cross is necessitated by the fact that no empire was allowed to gain global domination but had geographical and time limits. Certainly at the cross a further triumph over Satan and his demons occurred since we are told this (Col 2:15). However, this has to do with limiting Satan's ability to deceive people that the elect are allowed to hear the Gospel and believe it. The cross and ascension is the formal celebration of the kingship of Christ over the universe and this cements the triumph over Satan. However, even before this the Son was always Satan's master since he created him.

In 2 Pt 2:4 Peter says, 'For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment.' 'Hell' here is Tartarus, the Greek

²⁵ The imperfect active (I was beholding) could indicate this.

underworld. It is neither hell nor Hades. Peter uses a term understood as the place of demons tied in some manner to earth but he simply confines it to the earth (a place downwards from heaven; 1 Pt 5:8). It is not the same as the Greek underworld, which was under the earth. Neither is it hell, envisioned as under the earth in popular conception. Hell, as the Lake of Fire, prepared for those who received divine condemnation at the end, is not yet active (Rev 19:20, 20:10, 14, 15, 21:8). It is an eternal fire not an underworld tomb.²⁶ The wicked, currently in Hades, will be sent there but are presently in torment of expected judgment (Lk 16:23).

In 1 Pt 5:8 Peter tells us that the devil is walking on the earth seeking to devour people. Paul tells us that he is the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:1) working in men. Thus the realm of the devil is restricted to earth, because he is bound by God in chains, and cannot pass beyond the atmosphere. This is elementary stuff.

This is more than enough evidence to demonstrate that Satan is restricted to earth and therefore that sin is only present upon the earth and not the whole universe. Sin is where the devil is, 'He who sins is of the devil' (1 Jn 3:8).

Therefore, the whole universe was created pure; God could declare that it was 'very good'. However, at some point the earth was corrupted and sin became rampant throughout the world. The cause of this was the entrance of Satan upon the earth followed by the temptation of Adam and Eve, followed by the Fall. It was the Fall that resulted in the dominion of sin upon earth. Now Scripture tells us that the Fall did untold damage to the natural order and even to physical laws. So we need to examine this to some degree.

Though sin is not rampant in the universe, the Fall of man and the curse led to implications in the universe because creation was subjected by God to futility.

Scientific repercussions of all this

Having made a degree of analysis of creation, the Fall and the curse, I now wish to make some observations regarding current science. This understanding of creation challenges some deeply held modern axioms held by scientists and most Christians.

Introduction: the weakness of modern science

I am told that most universities do not teach a detailed history of the development of science because it would undermine the student's appreciation of the subject. The reason for this is that science is constantly changing. What is generally accepted as a 'scientific' fact one-day is discarded the next.

The history of science provides great strength to the inductive inference that, at any point in its history, that day's science will almost certainly be deemed false, if not laughable, within a century (often in much less time).²⁷

If the history of science "proves" anything, it is this certainty that theories change: a certainty of which the wise men of Antiquity and the Middle Ages were fully aware.²⁸

²⁶ Some centre the conception of hell as a mode or a state of consciousness; but Scripture always associates it with actual punishment and a specific place and time (after the end of the world).

²⁷ Douglas Jones; quoted in: *How firm is the ground you are standing on?* by Philip Stott.

Very few philosophers or scientists still think that scientific knowledge is, or can be, proven knowledge.²⁹

This could not be more true of the current science which seeks to explain the universe and its origin. Theory after theory is proposed which has no evidence whatsoever; often these theories contradict each other or contradict proven scientific laws. Thus we have the big bang, multiple universes, a clash between two parallel universes and so on.

Science is basically just formulae based on observations of nature. However, these are always performed on the basis of a world-view and these incomplete observations change when the world-view changes or when new information appears. The Bible, however, never changes and remains the only constant authoritative source of information.

For instance: scientists have made many bold pronouncements about the planets in our solar system, which are comparatively close to us. Space probes later gave us much closer observations of these planets and time after time what was previously accepted scientific fact had to be thrown away.

The Voyager probe demonstrated that ideas about Jupiter and its moons were far from true; even so NASA chief imager Brad Schaeffer averred, '*at least we will have no surprises with the rings of Saturn*'. This was because all the calculations showed that Saturn's rings had to be that way to be stable. Voyager's images were astounding; the rings were nothing like expected and should not be stable (or exist long) according to existing science – but they clearly were. Voyager shattered dozens of firmly held scientific theories about the planets. The previously accepted science, held for many years, was wiped away almost overnight.

The Hubble space telescope caused the same panic. The editor of the prestigious magazine *Nature*, Sir John Maddox, said of new observations compared with previous science, '*this result, the third in less than a year, makes nonsense of the standard model*'.³⁰ Note this: the long held theories of astrophysicists were called 'nonsense' by a respected writer on scientific issues.

The truth is that we do not even know for sure what stars are and how they are formed, or even how far away they are, or how does starlight travel, or even what is light? Is light a particle, a wave, both at the same time or something else? The truth is that no one knows; yet current theories about the universe depend upon choosing one of these. Current theories are all based on assumptions. Modern discoveries challenge all these, such as the decrease in the speed of light or the increasing density of the ether / plenum in far space.³¹

²⁸ Walter van der Kamp; 'The Whys and Wherefores of Geocentrism: part ii', *Bulletin of the Tychonian Society*, No. 51, p6.

²⁹ Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrove, eds.; *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge University Press, (1976) p92.

³⁰ *Nature* magazine, quoted in Philip Stott; *Scripture and Science*. Sir John Maddox, who served 22 years as the editor of *Nature*, was a trained physicist and served on a number of Royal Commissions.

³¹ 'Ether' (or 'luminiferous aether') is an archaic word for the highly elastic substance believed to permeate all space, including the interstices between the particles of matter, and to be the medium whose vibrations constituted light and other electromagnetic radiation. Essentially it is the substance of cosmic space. Einstein's theory of relativity removed this from physics. Some prefer to use the term 'plenum' taken from Max Planck's works [1858-1947, Nobel Prize winner, founder of Quantum physics]. Ether / plenum is the densest thing in the universe [density 10^{93} gm/cm³] and is what cosmic bodies hang on. The concept of the ether was abandoned when experiments proved that if it existed then the earth was central in the universe.

The model of current cosmology is founded upon the big bang, and expanding universe and is based upon mathematics centred upon Einstein's theory of relativity. It has not been observed or scientifically proved. In fact it postulates contradictions and inconsistencies, such as a centre everywhere and a boundary nowhere.³² We should note Professor Herbert Dingle's warning '*in the language of mathematics we can tell lies as well as truths, and within the scope of mathematics itself there is no possible way of telling one from the other.*'³³ We should note that many eminent scientists have criticised the big bang theory as 'nonsense'. It is not true science, despite it being perpetrated upon the population by the BBC continually. Modern cosmology is not genuine science; it is not foolish to disbelieve it.

Thus modern scientific hypotheses do not need to frighten believers. We should refuse to accept all scientific theories until they have been proven by verified observation or repeatable experiments. This is proper science and true science will always agree with the Bible.

Geocentricity

Geocentricity is the doctrine that the earth is the centre of the universe and solar system.³⁴ In Christian terms I would define it as follows:

- The earth is the centre of God's spiritual purpose expressed in his decrees.
- The earth is central in God's decree of the creation of the universe.
- The Bible affirms that the earth is actually central in the material universe. The cosmos hinges upon the earth.

Presumably all believers would agree with the first proposition. Most would also affirm the second proposition (only a small minority who believe in advanced, extra-terrestrial life forms would not). The challenging doctrine is the third proposition – but only because modern believers have been programmed by their secular education to be heliocentrists.

This notion was unchallenged for centuries, being held by believers and non-believers equally, until the time of Polish astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus [1473–1543]. He proposed³⁵ a model of the solar system in which the planets orbited in perfect circles around the sun and his work ultimately led to the overthrow of the established geocentric cosmology. Even so, a thousand years earlier the female Alexandrian thinker, Hypatia, had proposed that the orbits were elliptical, as now commonly accepted.³⁶ It is a mistake to think that the ancients were stupid.

The Copernican view, followed by Galileo and Kepler, is now universally held as true and taught in schools. Anyone thinking otherwise is lampooned and treated as a 'flat-earth' nutcase. However this gives Christians a problem since the Bible is definitely geocentric. However, the Copernican model of the universe has never been properly proved. There is no firm evidence for it that constitutes genuine proof, only theories that have satisfied scientists after Newton. Einstein's theories were thought to have finally confirmed it but

³² Even Einstein's theory is wobbling. It is inconsistent with the model required by Quantum Mechanics (as Stephen Hawking said, '*They cannot both be correct* [A Brief History of Time, Bantam Books, (1988) p12.]). Furthermore it is unprovable and its basic tenet is unobservable (that the earth moves).

³³ Quoted in Philip Stott, *Towards a Biblical Cosmology*.

³⁴ Stott defines it as a conceptual model of the form of the universe where: a) the earth is the centre of the universe; b) the earth is fixed (i.e., immobile) in space, and c) the earth is unique and special compared to all other heavenly bodies. Philip Stott; *What is geocentricity?* <http://www.geocentricity.com/>

³⁵ His work was published on the day he died.

³⁶ She also made the first astrolabe.

now Einstein himself is being questioned and his theories are also unproven. Tycho Brahe is an example of a scientist who did not follow the pack but believed in the Bible.

Furthermore, a geocentric view does not affect practical astronomical matters; the relative motion of the planets etc. are the same, but centred on earth and not the sun. Thus Archimedes [c.287–212 BC] could make the first computer, out of cogs and wheels, before the birth of Christ which accurately described the motion of the sun, moon and five planets in a small box. It even accurately predicted eclipses. Archimedes was geocentric. We will revisit this later.

Biblical geocentricity

Anyone reading the Bible thoroughly, over many years, notices that God's purposes in the universe are centred upon the earth. This is not just a theological argument, that salvation is centred on the earth or that the Son only appeared on the earth, but also there are many statements regarding astronomy that focus upon the centrality of the earth.

It is tempting, to some, to try to dismiss these texts as being figurative or illustrative of visual effects seen from earth. But two things need to be kept in mind. The first is that the simplest, common-sense meaning of Scripture is the correct one, unless there are verses elsewhere which override this. Simple statements of plain narrative cannot be dismissed as figurative unless this conflicts with Biblical doctrine established in other places. The second is that God does not lie. If God states that the sun moves, then the sun moves. If the earth moves around the sun (as modern science) and God appears to stop the sun in the sky, then his word would state that he commanded the earth to stop spinning or his word would be lying.

So, we read these texts naturally, and in context with others, it is my contention that they prove, unequivocally, that the Bible teaches geocentricism.

The creative order - the earth created before the sun

Firstly, Bible believers (caught in the propaganda of secular education) denying this have a very real problem; the earth was created some time before the sun existed. It is impossible for the sun to be the centre of God's creation in the solar system since the watery earth appeared on day one and the sun appeared on day four: 'I beheld the earth, and indeed it was without form, and void; and the heavens, they had no light' (Jer 4:23). There is no avoiding this without twisting the Bible completely. There is no help in going to the Hebrew text either since it completely agrees that the sun was created later.

Days without the sun

The earth experienced three normal days before the sun was created. These were 24-hour normal days with the light of day and a dark night. The universe then was geocentric and the days on earth needed no sun.

The plan of salvation

In the plan of salvation, which involves the bondage then release of creation as a corollary item, we have the following scenario:

- In creation week the earth took precedence in creation and the sun served the purposes of the earth. Geocentricity!
- At the end of salvation there will be no sun since the Lord himself is the light of the people of God. Geocentricity!
- Thus it seems entirely appropriate, just on the grounds of logic alone, that the intervening period of time (now) is also geocentric.

The heavens serve the earth

God explicitly states that the purpose of the sun, moon and stars was geocentric; ‘God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light on the earth’ (Gen 1:17).

The earth central to God’s purposes

The whole purpose of God’s decree was to create the elect, save them from sin, change them and call them to fellowship with him forever on a purified earth. There is no purpose in creation without this central feature. In order to do this God created man on the earth. So the central purpose of God was set upon the earth and not somewhere else. To modern scientists the earth is an insignificant planet, in a minor solar system, on the edge of an inconsequential galaxy. This conflicts with the purpose of God that the earth is central to his plan.

The angelic focus on earth

It is clear that angels watch over the affairs of men on the earth as interested spectators. They are particularly focused upon the actions of believers in the church and the progress of the Gospel (Eph 3:11; 1 Pt 1:12; Lk 15:10) and this is one reason why wrong behaviour in church is a great offence (1 Cor 11:10). Angels are geocentric in their observations.

The earth is immovable

For the pillars of the earth *are* the LORD's, and He has set the world upon them. 1 Sam 2:8

The world also is firmly established, it shall not be moved. 1 Chron 16:30

The earth ... I set up its pillars firmly. Ps 75:3

Surely the world is established, so that it cannot be moved. Ps 93:1

The LORD reigns; the world also is firmly established, it shall not be moved. Ps 96:10

You who laid the foundations of the earth, so *that* it should not be moved forever. Ps 104:5

You, LORD, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth. Heb 1:10

If God’s word says that the earth does not move, that it is immobile in space, then every heliocentrist denies God’s word. Thus it is a clear sin to affirm that the earth spins on its axis and revolves around the sun. This is incontrovertible. To try to fudge this issue by suggesting that these verses are merely fanciful metaphor would mean that you could not trust any verse in Scripture at all – where does that stop? These texts include historical narrative, doctrinal poetry and apostolic didactic argument. The figurative excuse cannot wash. God’s word demands geocentricity.

The earth may be shaken by God but it never moves from its place

I beheld the mountains, and indeed they trembled, and all the hills moved back and forth. Jer 4:24

The earth quakes before them. Joel 2:10

Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth [Heb. Lit. ‘land’] will move out of her place [Heb. lit. ‘shake’; i.e. earthquake], in the wrath of the LORD of hosts and in the day of His fierce anger. Isa 13:13

For thus says the LORD of hosts: ‘Once more (it *is* a little while) I will shake heaven and earth, the sea and dry land’. Hag 2:6

I will shake heaven and earth. Hag 2:21

Him who *speaks* from heaven, whose voice then shook the earth; but now He has promised, saying, ‘Yet once more I shake not only the earth, but also heaven.’ Heb 12:25-26

The Biblical motion of the sun and silence on earth's rotation

The Bible never mentions that the earth goes round the sun or rotates, despite giving detailed astronomical statements elsewhere; even affirming that the earth is circular at a time when the Gentile whole world thought it was flat (Isa 40:22).³⁷

God the LORD, Has spoken and called the earth from the rising of the sun to its going down. Ps 50:1 [Notice the centrality of 'calling out' the earth.]

Scripture repeatedly records that the sun went down or that it rose. It even says that it moves quickly: 'The sun also rises, and the sun goes down, and hastens to the place where it arose' (Eccles 1:5). To aver that this is just the appearance of things seen from earth one has to add to the plain obvious meaning of the verses, (eisegesis;³⁸ a sin). Further, to say that this is just the expression of the limited, simple understanding of primitive folk who were not as wise as modern educated people is, a) false, they were not primitive at all; and, b) this is the strategy of liberal critics of the Bible.

The sun standing still

The sun and moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of Your arrows they went, at the shining of Your glittering spear. Hab 3:11

He commands the sun, and it does not rise; He seals off the stars. Job 9:7

Then Joshua spoke to the LORD in the day when the LORD delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel: "Sun, stand still over Gibeon; And Moon, in the Valley of Aijalon." So the sun stood still, and the moon stopped, till the people had revenge Upon their enemies. *Is this not written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and did not hasten to go down* for about a whole day. And there has been no day like that, before it or after it, that the LORD heeded the voice of a man; for the LORD fought for Israel. Jos 10:12-14

References to alterations in the sun's movement can sometimes, perhaps, be explained as figurative language in the prophets; but the occasion in Gibeon is historical narrative and cannot be explained away as poetry. Note that it is the sun which is commanded to stand still, not the earth. This alone proves geocentricity. The sun stopped moving and stood still for a day, it then 'hastened' to continue its course. The passage clearly affirms that the sun and moon move round the earth.

The usual explanation of this is that the passage is not authentic or merely a myth; others try to rationalise it by suggesting it was an eclipse or a refraction optical illusion. These options are not open to the evangelical; the Hebrew text is clear in what it says.

Now I am not a geo-physicist but my understanding of the rotation of the earth is that if it suddenly stopped, the world would be full of natural disasters of a cataclysmic nature (such

³⁷ 'It is He who sits above the circle of the earth, and its inhabitants are like grasshoppers, Who stretches out the heavens like a curtain, and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in.' Some dismiss this by saying that 'circle' can also mean circuit, thus claiming the Bible is 'Flat Earth'. The Hebrew *chuwg* does have this alternative meaning but we have to use the best word to fit the context. All the best English Bible versions use 'circle' (or 'vault' NASB) because it is the best translation [e.g. KJV, NKJV, NASB, NAB, Young's Literal etc. even the Darby, RSV and NRSV]. We know that the earth is God's footstool, so God sitting above the circle of the earth makes sense. God sitting somewhere above a supposed heliocentric elliptical orbit in space makes no sense because that would imply him sitting above the sun, not the earth. In any case, 'the heavens' are introduced afterwards as a separate concept. Isaiah teaches that the earth is a sphere. See also: Job 26:10, 'He drew a circular horizon on the face of the waters, At the boundary of light and darkness'. Prov 8:27-28, 'When He prepared the heavens, I was there, when He drew a circle on the face of the deep, when He established the clouds above'.

³⁸ This means to add a meaning to a verse that is not there. It is what heretics do.

as oceanic floods spilling out of their basins). The sudden halting of rotation would probably kill almost all life. However, if the earth is not rotating at high speeds³⁹ but is stationary, and if instead the ether of space is swiftly spinning around the earth, all astronomical observations would be the same; all the relative motion of planets and stars would be the same. Thus, if this motion stopped (including the sun) there would be no catastrophic change to the earth upon the ether coming to a halt. There are also testimonies in global cultures about the sun stopping (a long day) or of a long night in antipodal cultures.⁴⁰

Heliocentrists have no explanation for this miracle of nature and thus most commentators do not even attempt one.

To make matters very clear, to maintain a secular, atheistic, heliocentrist position on this text a believer:

- Affirms that we cannot trust the plain words of Scripture.
- Suggests that when God says one thing he actually means something else.
- Would explain it as the earth suddenly stopping its rotation.
- Would ignore the fact that this sudden stopping of the earth would probably kill most human life on earth. The change in centrifugal force would create two large oceans at the poles and a large area of dry land at the equator. [Since the earth rotates, centrifugal force causes the planet to bulge along the equator. Without this, the water held in place at the equator would rush toward the poles; the oceans would initially move sideways at 1,600 km/hour, then towards the poles.] Tidal waves would rush over the continents and destroy virtually all surface life. In addition, the earth's magnetic field would probably vanish. Let alone that, all humans would fly off the surface (imagine the lurch when you suddenly apply brakes to a car). If the earth suddenly stopped spinning, everything on the surface at the equator would suddenly be moving at more than 1,600 km/hour sideways. The escape velocity of Earth is about 40,000 km/hour, so that isn't enough to fly off into space; but everything would fly off in a sideways trajectory. On top of all that, at the equator there would 1,000-mph winds. It is doubtful that many surface life forms would survive the ensuing carnage.

Let me affirm this most strongly, it is impossible to be a Bible-believing Christian and deny the simple facts reported in Joshua 10:12-14. The Spirit of God (not Joshua) stated, '**So the sun stood still, and the moon stopped ... So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and did not hasten to go down for about a whole day.**' If the Spirit of God says that the sun stopped moving, then it was previously moving and we must simply accept what God says. To twist this to mean something else makes us liberals and makes God a liar. If we can't accept this plain fact, how can we accept that the Red Sea was parted, or that fire fell from heaven to kill Nadab and Abihu, or that the earth swallowed up Korah, or that creation was in six days, or that Jesus' miracles were genuine or even that Jesus was raised from the dead?

The retreat of the sun

Scripture records one instance where the sun actually retreated on its orbit round earth: "**Behold, I will bring the shadow on the sundial, which has gone down with the sun on the sundial of Ahaz, ten degrees backward.**" **So the sun returned ten degrees on the dial by which it had gone down,**' (Isa 38:8). As a sign to Hezekiah, God made the sun reverse its course for a time. Again we see that the

³⁹ Supposedly 1,000 miles an hour at the equator.

⁴⁰ Such as long day in Chinese legend and a long night Native American Indian myths and South American tribes. A long day is also recorded in Egyptian history, noted by Herodotus. Since there are both long night and long day stories, this proves that it is not one story that migrated round the world but a reflection of the experience in a particular country.

sun is servant to what is going on in the earth. Also if it were the earth that was rotating and not the ether then the sudden stopping of this rotation, and the reverse spinning, would have also caused global devastation.

Most readers approach this as figurative speech; but the text plainly states that the sun returned (reversed). For the shadow to go backwards, either the sun had to reverse its motion or the earth had to stop spinning and reverse spin (which would destroy all life on earth). God authored these words and knows what happened. Therefore, if it were the earth reversing and not the sun, he would have said so. We have no right to re-write Scripture.

The stars move

The Bible states that stars ‘course’ [lit. ‘move on a highway’] through the heavens, ‘The stars from their courses fought against Sisera.’ (Jud 5:20). God ‘brings out’ [lit. ‘go out, go forth, proceed’] the stars, ‘Lift up your eyes on high, And see who has created these things, who brings out their host by number; He calls them all by name.’ (Isa 40:26). Constellations are ‘brought out’ in their season: ‘Can you bind the cluster of the Pleiades, Or loose the belt of Orion? Can you bring out Mazzaroth in its season? Or can you guide the Great Bear with its cubs? Do you know the ordinances of the heavens? Can you set their dominion over the earth?’ (Job 38:31-33).

The permanence of the earth and the termination of the existing sun and stars

The earth is stated to last forever: ‘The earth which He has established forever’, (Ps 78:69). ‘You who laid the foundations of the earth, so that it should not be moved forever’ (Ps 104:5). ‘One generation passes away, and another generation comes; but the earth abides forever’ (Eccles 1:4). However, the heavens and stars are said to fall, the sun fail to give its light and the heavens will be wrapped up like a scroll (Isa 13:10, 34:4; Ezek 32:7-8; Joel 2:31, 3:15; Ps 102:25-26; Matt 24:29; Mk 13:25; Rev 6:13).

The heavens are the work of Your hands. They will perish, but You remain; and they will all grow old like a garment; like a cloak You will fold them up, and they will be changed. Heb 1:9-12.

I looked when He opened the sixth seal, and behold, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became like blood. And the stars of heaven fell to the earth, as a fig tree drops its late figs when it is shaken by a mighty wind. Then the sky receded as a scroll when it is rolled up. Rev 6:12-14

The new heaven and earth

The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in which the heavens will pass away with a great noise, and the elements will melt with fervent heat; both the earth and the works that are in it will be burned up. 2 Pt 3:10

The heavens will be dissolved, being on fire, and the elements will melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells. 2 Pt 3:12-13

What we see in the various statements about the end is that as part of the terrible glory of the Lord when he comes again the sun, moon and stars are destroyed. The stars fall, the heavens quake, the sun disappears – there is apocalypse. The earth, as a sphere in space is not annihilated, but it is burned up in its present form.

All wicked men die, to be resurrected for judgment in a new immortal form with all humanity that ever existed. All resurrected men are presented before God, either on earth

or in some spiritual place, to give an account of their lives before God and be sentenced. Believers go to be with the Lord and the wicked are condemned to eternal hell, symbolised as a Lake of Fire in Revelation, situated in some distant part of God's universe or a spiritual dimension. This place is separated from God and his creation.

However, believers are repatriated upon a newly restored, renovated world where righteousness dwells. This is comparable to the Garden of Eden. On the earth, heaven and earth meet; men dwell directly with God, spiritual and material qualities merge; new physical laws will prevail centred in an direct energising by God. Thus we see the statements that there is no need of the sun any longer since God is the light of this community of holy people on earth.

There are a 'new heavens' but we cannot say for sure that it will be the same as the old heavens, which are said to have been 'worn out'.

Thus in this terrible scenario what remains constant in the material realm is the earth, even though it changes by being purified by fire. The material purposes of God in judgment, resurrection and re-creation are geocentric.

The place of Jesus' kingship

Jesus is said to be King of the Earth: 'Also I will make him My firstborn, The highest of the kings of the earth. My mercy I will keep for him forever, and My covenant shall stand firm with him.' (Ps 89:27-28). Now the King of the Universe would have his throne centred in the midst of that universe. Thus the earth is the centre of the cosmos.

The witness of Calvin

That this has always been an evangelical truth is affirmed by Calvin, even after the Copernican publication:

We indeed are not ignorant, that the circuit of the heavens is finite, and that the earth, like a little globe, is placed in the centre.⁴¹

The witness of Luther

Martin Luther pointed out that, '*Joshua commanded the sun to stand still and not the earth,*' since the earth was stationary (Josh 10:12).

The witness of the Fathers

Almost to a man the church fathers were geocentric, such as Athanasius and Ambrose.

We could continue in this vein but this is sufficient. Without any doubt, the Bible absolutely confirms that the earth is the centre of the universe.

Summary of Biblical arguments for geocentrism

- God's plan and purpose centres upon the earth.
- The creation of the universe facilitates God's plan, and thus centres on the earth.
- To achieve God's plan, the Son came to the earth alone.
- The curiosity of angels regarding God's plan is centred upon observing the earth.
- Creation week is geocentric.
- In creation week the earth appeared days before the sun was created. These were 24-hour days with a light day and a dark night.
- The new world at the end is geocentric and has no sun at all.
- Jesus is stated to be King of the Earth, despite also ruling all creation.

⁴¹ John Calvin; Argument prefacing *Commentary on Genesis*, p25, AGES CD.

- The Bible unequivocally states that the earth is fixed and does not move.
 - The Bible affirms that the sun moves.
 - The Bible affirms that the stars move.
 - The Bible states that the sun has stopped on one occasion and reversed its motion on another – at God’s command.
 - The sun and stars are said to cease at the end.
 - Note the negatives: the earth is never said to move round the sun. The earth is never said to spin. Nowhere is it suggested that day and night results from the earth rotating. Nowhere is it said that the seasons arise from the earth’s elliptical orbit round the sun.
- The vast majority of sound Bible commentators in history, including Calvin and Luther, were geocentrist.

Possible arguments against geocentricity in Scripture

- **THE GEOCENTRIC STATEMENTS ARE FIGURATIVE AND NOT MEANT TO BE TAKEN LITERALLY.** Answer: some of the verses quoted (especially in the prophets) may be figurative and they may not be; they should be examined in their context. In any case, figurative parallelism is often used to undergird historical dogmatic statements.⁴² Only a very few verses are debatable, if any. However, most of the texts (even in poetry) are said plainly and are meant to be taken in the simplest, evident sense. Some of the verses are in historical narratives or didactic instruction and are certainly not figurative at all. If we cannot accept plain statements on this, then we cannot accept anything in Scripture at all. To deny geocentric verses as merely figurative, then we must also deny the history of creation week as figurative also.
- **THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL ARGUMENT: THE GEOCENTRIC VERSES ARE BASED UPON THE VISUAL EXPERIENCE OF THE OBSERVER AND ARE NOT SCIENTIFICALLY ACCURATE.** We have to remember who the author of Scripture is; it is God and not man. Books are written within the stylistic characteristics of the man but, by inspiration, what he says is the wisdom of God. Furthermore, it is not possible that God’s word could contain lies or errors. If it says that the sun moves, then the sun moves because God is the author of the actual words (verbal inspiration). If it says that the earth does not move, then it does not move because God says so.
- **THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC ARGUMENT: THE GEOCENTRIC VERSES ARE SIMPLIFIED STATEMENTS TO SUIT MAN’S EXPERIENCE ON EARTH.** This is virtually the same as the phenomenological argument with the same answer. If developed it denies verbal inspiration.
- **THE TEXTS ARE SIMPLY THE REFLECTION OF THE LIMITED ASTRONOMICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE WRITERS.** This is a liberal argument based upon the denial of verbal, infallible inspiration. It is not an argument available to Christians. The texts are God’s words. Furthermore, ancient geocentric astronomers were able to create accurate mechanisms to predict planetary and star movements, including eclipses. This is way beyond most moderns even with their additional information and technology.
- **THE HEBREW / GREEK ORIGINAL WORDS DO NOT CARRY THESE IMPLICATIONS.** Yes they do. In fact the grammar of the original texts strongly affirms geocentricity, especially in Gen 1-3.

The only argument that has any strength is the figurative one; but the sheer number of plain texts defending geocentricity denies this argument, especially readily understood

⁴² E.g. Ps 33:6, ‘By the word of the LORD the heavens were made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth’. The first part is a dogmatic statement, a reprise of Gen 1:3; the second part uses the figure of anthropomorphism (‘breath’ of God) to affirm it. This is Hebrew parallelism. Though there is some figurative speech, overall there is a simple doctrinal statement of fact.

texts like: Jos 10:12-14; 1 Chron 16:30; Job 9:7; Ps 93:1, 104:5; Eccles 1:4-5; Isa 38:8; Heb 1:10; and many more.

There is no avenue of escape for the heliocentrist if he wishes to be evangelical. A Christian can only be a heliocentrist by either denying the inspiration of the Bible or the plain sense of Scripture. If you do this in cosmology, why not do this in ethics and defend iniquity? In addition, all Christians affirm the Trinity as a cardinal doctrine, and yet most would be unable to mount a Biblical defence apart from one or two verses. This paper has given very many verses to support geocentricity.

The usual position of modern commentators

There is no doubt, whatsoever, that the Bible is geocentric. This is absolutely unavoidable, but we have to determine exactly what this means.

Now godly expositors, of all shades, usually agree that the Bible is geocentric, but what they cannot bring themselves to do is shake off their secular education and affirm physical geocentricity. If I give them the benefit of the doubt, I suppose that they just don't see it. Sometimes revelation has its time and suddenly everybody sees a truth hidden for a long time. This is what happened with the doctrine of justification by faith in the Reformation; until 1517 it had been largely hidden for a thousand years.

What most modern expositors do is to affirm geocentricity but then define it in a spiritual way. Thus geocentricity means that the earth is central to God's purposes in creation but, in actuality, the solar system is heliocentric because science demands this.

I will give just one example; that of Professor EJ Young, a brilliant exegete, and a very godly man, who was devoted to God's word.⁴³ He was a foremost writer on Genesis and said,

Genesis concentrates upon this earth. If we remember that, we shall see that we have no right to demand of Genesis what it does not claim to give us.

... Genesis is geo-centric. But there are two ways in which it might be geo-centric. It might be geo-centric in teaching something that was not in accordance with the facts. It might maintain, for instance, that the earth is the physical centre of the universe, and that the sun does actually rise and revolve about the earth. It does not do so. ... When the most advanced scientists of today talk about outer-space, shall we tell them they are geo-centric, ... and that we are not going to listen to them?⁴⁴ [He then defends (very weakly and briefly) that geocentrism applies to our viewpoint on earth.]

What Young does here, despite his standpoint against evolution, is to succumb to supposed science (that has no proof) that heliocentrism is an established fact. With no argument or proof, Young affirms that Genesis is geocentric but denies that this is physical (despite the obvious narrative that it is, and contrary to his own rules of exegesis) simply because scientists have told him that the sun, not the earth, is stationary. Oddly he affirms creationism against secular science, because of the Biblical record, but denies physical geocentricity because of secular scientific statements. This would be the position of most modern commentators. However, most historic commentators were geocentric, as we have seen.

What is sad is that the scientific proof for heliocentrism is actually lacking and that there is scientific evidence for geocentricism, but this is hidden away.

⁴³ Dr Young taught Old Testament studies at Westminster Theological seminary, Philadelphia, from 1936 until he died in 1968.

⁴⁴ *In the beginning*, Banner of Truth, (1976), p48-49.

Interim conclusion

I have always believed, since the early 1970s, that the earth is central to God's purposes and thus central in his creation.⁴⁵ However, it took me a while to realise that it was actually central in God's physical construction of the universe; that the components of the cosmos are centred upon earth.⁴⁶ I make my stand on geocentricity based upon the Biblical record. However, there is credible science and astronomical observations to back this up; Scripture is not in discord with true science. We will thus examine this scientific support and I am largely indebted to Malcolm Bowden's research on this.

Scientific geocentricity

Christians ought to be aware that schools, universities and the media generate propaganda to brainwash people into accepting anti-Christian ideas. This is mostly centred upon promoting evolutionary theory and affirming an old earth, but another example is the thesis that climate change is generated by man and not cyclical natural circumstances.⁴⁷ Geocentricity is but another example of this propaganda.

Geocentricity was held by everyone until Copernicus and Galileo, because it was Biblical;⁴⁸ although even these men professed Christianity. As science, which had largely been the result of Christian (and particularly Reformation) influences, became dominated by secular humanism in recent history, so the idea that the earth was central to God's purposes, and thus central in the cosmos, was denied; especially after Sir Isaac Newton [1642–1727].⁴⁹ This eventually led to the Theory of Relativity and the rejection of ether (the medium in space through which light passes) and the development of modern physics, Quantum Theory and all the rest. In fact, Relativity has only led to an increasing number of unproved hypotheses because new observations do not fit the science.

Philip Stott has also explained that modern physics is based upon an assumption, that '*the laws of science discovered here will be the same elsewhere - probably a good assumption if the earth is not in a special position, a bad one if it is. The whole of astrophysics depends critically on this assumption*'.⁵⁰ This is why unproved, unobserved theory after theory is required to prop up modern physics. Modern cosmology is based upon Einstein's theory; if there are problems with this then the whole caboodle is affected.

Three important scientific experiments have proved geocentricity but have been kept secret from science students in schools and universities. Highly qualified astrophysicists and physicists have stated that they have never heard of these experiments and upon reading the data have either been challenged or have actually reversed their opinion. One such case is physicist Jean-Marie Mousca. Scientists at CERN, on hearing a lecture on 'Geocentricity', sent the tape to Mousca to disprove it since they were unable to do so (and were reduced to tears). Mousca spent a considerable time checking the data to refute it. He could not. Later he met the speaker in Switzerland (Philip Stott) and thanked him saying that he now believed there was only one reference source that he could trust – that was the Bible. This is how strong the argument is for geocentricity.

⁴⁵ For instance, I wrote a paper in 2000 demonstrating that there are no extra-terrestrial life forms (aliens) in the universe since God is centred on man upon earth.

⁴⁶ I never had the many textual points laid out for me to see and had to slowly gather them. However, dear reader, you now have this information laid out for you and must make a decision.

⁴⁷ See my papers disproving man-made global warming.

⁴⁸ Christians, Jews and Muslims held to the geocentricity of the OT. Greeks were also geocentric but not from a reading of the OT.

⁴⁹ In his *Principia Mathematica* (1687), Newton gave a mathematical description of the laws of mechanics and gravitation, and applied these to planetary motion.

⁵⁰ Philip Stott; *Scripture and Science* paper, p2.

Just think about it for a second; is it logical to believe that the earth is spinning at a thousand miles an hour? I have never been able to understand this because it makes no sense. How wonderful then, to find that there is accredited science to demonstrate that it is not doing this; but this is restricted from schools.⁵¹ I mention these experiments very basically (this is not a science paper); thus readers wishing to see the technical details should consult the sources quoted later.

A known scientific experiment: the Michelson-Morley experiment

The object was to test that the velocity of the earth rotating round the sun was 30km/sec. In fact, it found that there was hardly any movement at all. This shocked scientists who sought to explain it away. Einstein's theories (based on mathematics) destroyed this data by removing the ether. It also posed huge problems for various scientific theories, but these were ignored and false evidence produced to support it.⁵²

Untaught scientific experiment 1: The Michelson-Gale experiment

[See: *Astrophysical Journal*, 1925, v61, p140-5.] This detected the ether passing the surface of the earth with an accuracy of 2% of the speed of the daily rotation of the earth! Therefore the ether is going round the stationary earth one rotation per day.

Untaught scientific experiment 2: Airy's experiment

[See: *Proc. Roy. Soc.*, London, v20 p35.] This demonstrated that it was the stars moving relative to a stationary earth and not the fast orbiting earth moving relative to the comparatively stationary stars.

Untaught scientific experiment 3: The Sagnac experiment

[See: *Comptes Rendu*, 1913, v157 p708-710 and 1410-3.] This proved that there is an ether that the light has to pass through and this completely destroys Einstein's theory of Relativity that says there is no ether. It is for this reason that this experiment is completely ignored by scientists.

Thus:

- There is ether; therefore, Einstein was wrong and the science flowing from it is wrong.
- The earth is not moving but is stationary within the ether.
- The ether moves around the earth.
- The stars are moving round the earth.

Notice that these experiments completely comply with Scriptural doctrine about the earth.

Furthermore, other scientists have demonstrated that another key factor of Einstein's theory of relativity (the constant speed of light) is proved wrong by actual experimentation. In fact, it can be demonstrated that the graph of the speed of light is curved showing a significant decrease up to modern times (the 1950s) when it slowed down to a more constant level. Thus, on at least two witnesses, Einstein was wrong; thus all modern science is affected. This is why nonsensical theory upon nonsensical theory has developed in the last 50 years, proposing item upon item that cannot be observed (e.g. dark matter, dark energy, dark flow, anti-matter, inflation, Higgs Boson etc.⁵³).

⁵¹ For more details on the following points see Bowden, op. cit.

⁵² It was explained away by three unverified propositions: '1 *The Earth is (self-evidently) in motion and revolves around the Sun.* 2 *That this is the case we cannot measurably demonstrate.* 3 *Hence absolute motion cannot be demonstrated.*' And so the failure was ignored by a false syllogism. The fact that it demonstrated that the earth was (more or less) motionless could not be sanctioned.

⁵³ For a brief explanation of some of these see my paper, *Recent Cosmology*.

None of this should be surprising. The education system and the science establishment pursue propaganda on pet subjects and persecute dissenters. Information contradicting pet subjects is restricted from the education system and academics teaching the wrong thing lose their grants or get expelled from posts. This is just the sheer truth of the matter. Thus anyone teaching creationism is first ridiculed, then restricted and finally expelled.

If these experiments accurately contradict Copernican theory then why are they not taught in schools as part of a balanced education? What is there to fear from true science?

Galaxies

200,000 galaxies have been mapped and these maps show several layers of galaxies centred upon the earth. Bowden shows a map of 33,500 of these. This shows strips of galaxies in long chains centred on the earth. This is contrary to what evolutionary science expects, which would be random distribution of galaxies. Furthermore, the thinning out of galaxies is also centred on the earth, the distribution weakens furthest from the earth.

This phenomenon has been called 'the fingers of God' because they line up in filaments pointing to earth. An article on the structure of the universe in Science magazine avoided this observation.⁵⁴

Redshift steps

Light from distant galaxies is redder the further you go from the earth, but it is not a smooth decrease. The redshift increases in distinct "steps" of wavelength. These steps are only apparent from the position of this earth. If an observer were to move a fairly small distance away from the earth, then these steps would become blurred and the redshifts would be more like a smooth curve. From his examination of the structure of the atom, Barry Setterfield has produced a paper explaining how these redshift steps could have arisen.⁵⁵

Varshni's 'shells' of quasars

Quasars⁵⁶ have been plotted from their distance from the earth. These maps show that they are grouped into what has been termed 'shells' with gaps between them, similar to the Redshift steps. This configuration would not be observed from a point distant from the earth.

Questions

How can the universe rotate so rapidly without disintegrating?

I quote from Bowden:

There is growing evidence that the aether has "Planck density" - it is extremely dense and the sun and planets are like corks in very dense water comparatively. This whole universe sweeps round the earth because otherwise it would collapse in on itself due to its density. The mechanics of this system forces the other planets etc. to describe ellipses in their orbit around the sun.

How do you account for Foucault's pendulum at the north pole or the bulge at the equator without a rotation of the earth?

I quote from Bowden:

Ernst Mach proposed that it is the weight of the stars circling the earth that drags Foucault pendulums around, creates Coriolis forces in the air that give the cyclones to

⁵⁴ See Tom Van Flandern; *Meta Research Bulletin* 9:48, 2000, citing; Science, 288:2121, 2000.

⁵⁵ Bowden, op. cit.

⁵⁶ Quasar: A massive and extremely remote celestial object, emitting exceptionally large amounts of energy, which typically has a starlike image in a telescope. It has been suggested that quasars contain massive black holes and may represent a stage in the evolution of some galaxies.

our weather etc. Barbour and Bertotti (Il Nuovo Cimento 32B(1):1-27, 11 March 1977) proved that a hollow sphere (the universe) rotating around a solid sphere inside (the earth) **produced exactly the same results of Coriolis forces, dragging of Foucault pendulums etc. that are put forward as "proofs" of heliocentricity!** This paper gives several other confirmations of the superiority of the geocentric model.⁵⁷

What about the calculations used by NASA to launch orbital spacecraft?

In the geocentric model, the relative positions of the planets and sun are the same, but the earth is stationary not the sun. In fact, NASA calculates spacecraft trajectory as if the earth were the centre of the solar system.

No navigator now lays out courses starting his calculations from a moving Earth. No astronomer points his precision telescope on the basis of computations involving the three or more motions of the Earth through star-studded space. Scientists and farmers alike describe the movements of their man-made contraptions, regardless of their size, not relative to the supposedly static stars, but relative to the fields and buildings founded on an Earth at rest. ... To quote an instructor at a Royal Air Force College: "We therefore teach navigators that the stars are fixed to the Celestial sphere, which is centred on a fixed Earth, and around which it rotates in accordance with laws clearly deductible from common sense observations. The Sun and the moon move across the inner surface of this sphere, and hence perforce go around the Earth. This means that students of navigation must unlearn a lot of the confused dogma they learned in school. Most of them find this remarkably easy, because dogma is *as may be*, but the real world is *as we perceive it to be*."⁵⁸

Why do man-made satellites not fall to the ground in a geocentric model?

This is due to the density and movement of the ether. Once forced into the ether by a massive amount of energy (rocket propulsion) they then hang in it like corks in a stream and move with it. [There are various complex arguments utilised in debating this subject.⁵⁹]

How can anything move if the ether / plenum is so dense?

It is similar to the massive air pressure and density of water in the ocean. In spite of these a swimmer can dive to considerable depths and move freely, despite the air pressure pushing down on him.

Geocentrists are surely just fools with a poor education?

This has been claimed by people on YouTube. However, while some amateurs have made some facile YouTube posts, the majority of spokesmen for the geocentric position are accomplished scientists and engineers. Most of them have a PhD. in a scientific subject; some are physicists, some are astronomers, some are chemists, some are mechanical engineers. Very detailed scientific arguments have been used in the defence of geocentricity and it is far from foolish. I do not claim to be a scientist and my reason for being a geocentrist is Biblical; but I am able to garner information from better-qualified scientific apologists to support the Biblical position.

⁵⁷ Bowden, op. cit.

⁵⁸ Walter van der Kamp; 'The Whys and Wherefores of Geocentrism', *Bulletin of the Tychoonian Society*, No. 49, p. 18.

⁵⁹ Geocentrist Gary North has rejected a stationary earth (*Geocentricity, Geostationism: The Flat Earth Temptation*, see also Dr. M. M Nieto, *Geocentrism: an Astrophysicist's Comments*). Martin Selbrede overturned these in: *Rebuttal of North and Nieto*. Note: 'Einstein taught that the centrifugal force on an object in the earth's rest frame (the condition satisfied by the hovering geosynchronous satellite) is inadmissible as evidence of the rotation of the earth, for in the earth's frame that force arises from "the average rotational effect of distant, detectable masses."' Martin Selbrede; *Rebuttal of North and Nieto* <http://www.geocentricity.com/>

Note that in 1980 the Tychoonian Society offered a \$1,000 (a significant amount of money then) ‘Reward for Scientific Proof Positive that the Earth Moves.’ It has not yet paid out.

Interim conclusion

Far from being facile, there is much scientific evidence to support geocentricity, even though it opposes certain scientific establishment pet theories (e.g. relativity). What is undeniable is that geocentricity is Biblical orthodoxy. Christians need to give this matter consideration.

For a full discussion of this subject by an eminently qualified person and author, see my acquaintance Malcolm Bowden’s, *True Science Agrees with the Bible*, Appendix 10. He also has a short video regarding this on YouTube and a website.⁶⁰ He is the main source for this section on science.

There are also several creationist speakers (with a scientific background) who teach this such as: Philip Stott BSc. MSc. (South Africa), Gerardus D. Bouw Ph.D of the Society of Biblical Astronomy (Cleveland), James M. Hansen (Cleveland), Martin Selbrade (Calif.). Barry Setterfield also explains the decrease in the speed of light, which alone destroys Einstein’s theories and much modern science. Several of these have been refused into Christian schools and colleges! Some of these men have approached famous creationist ministries (such as AIG) who have initially confirmed that they are in sympathy with geocentricity but have avoided publishing this, presumably for fear of losing scientific credibility.⁶¹ Later they became hostile to geocentricity and even refused to publish reactions to their papers on it.

Some works on geocentricity include: Dr. Gerardus Bouw, *Geocentricity*; Gary North, *Geocentricity, Geostationism: The Flat Earth Temptation*; Dr. John Byl, *Another Look at Galileo*; Philip Stott, *How Figurative is the Geocentricity Question?*; papers by Professor Harold L. Armstrong (a Founding Father of the *Creation Research Society*); and the works of Dr Walter van der Kamp (*Bulletin of the Tychoonian Society*). A balanced history of the effects of Copernicus and Galileo is found in Arthur Koestler, *The Sleepwalkers*.

Is this relevant?

It is odd that some Christians dispel this whole debate as irrelevant, pointless and insignificant to Biblical faith. Interestingly, many atheists have noted that the Bible’s position on this is very important, and thus seek to ridicule it. They have seen that geocentricity is central in the Bible and contradictory to modern science and thus they vilify it. Christians who fail to see that this is central to the Bible are actually being less observant than unbelievers are.

There is absolutely no doubt that the earth, and mankind upon it, is central to God’s decree and the creation of matter. I doubt any Christian would deny that. Therefore, we then have to ascertain as to whether the earth is actually and materially central in the physical universe as well. Admittedly this is harder to believe in the light of a secular education system, but the starting point has to be Scripture, not the propaganda of scientists. A study of Scripture on this matter is necessitated.

When such a study is performed, geocentricity in the material universe screams at you from page after page of the Bible. One is forced into the conclusion (as atheists have observed) that the Bible teaches geocentricity. The wonder of this is that, when a Christian

⁶⁰ <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/malcolmbowden/indexx.htm>

⁶¹ Originally they claimed to be too busy with combating evolution, but there has been plenty of time since to deal with the matter.

has reached this point, the greatness of God is imprinted in the human mind even more than before. The wonder of creation and the fulfilment of God's purposes on earth, lead one into greater and greater praise to such a great God.

Is this subject irrelevant? No! It is extremely important and a fundamental doctrine of creation. If we honour the Bible, we must grapple with this issue. Defending geocentrism is as important as affirming creationism against evolutionary theory and defending a young earth.

Conclusion

Essential principles of Biblical geocentricity:

- The Bible affirms geocentricity very strongly. Even unbelievers have noted this. To deny this is either to deny verbal inspiration or interpret various texts with human wisdom.
- The earth is the centre of God's purposes in salvation.
- Therefore, the earth is the centre of the cosmos since creation is part of the decree of salvation and is dependent upon the earth.
- The earth is not spinning round at 1,000 mph.
- The ether exists; this is denied by the Special Theory of Relativity.
- What is rotating is the ether of space and the cosmic bodies in it that we observe from earth (sun, moon and stars).
- These cosmic bodies were created to serve man on the earth. That is why the stars were formed into constellations.
- At least four genuine scientific experiments affirm geocentricity.
- Astronomical observations imply geocentricity.
- Modern secular science denies geocentricity and affirms heliocentricity; but, there is no clear scientific proof for heliocentricity.

There is absolutely no doubt that the Bible teaches geocentricity; thus Bible believers need to take this on board or at least give it serious consideration. Neither need Christians fear the scientific establishment since true science actually agrees with the Bible; there are sound experiments that back up the basic features of geocentricity.

What the Bible disagrees with are the findings of modern, secular, humanistic, atheistic, evolutionary science. As time goes on it becomes harder and harder for such scientists to stop their boat sinking since discoveries and observations keep contradicting the premises of their position. Thus the discoveries of cell and gene complexity demand a designer and an input of information from an external source; the understanding of the loss of genetic information caused by mutation removes the basic ingredient of natural selection. Each new proposal of modern physics, such as dark energy or dark matter, fails to fit emerging facts and requires further new theories. This is due to the reliance upon relativity and the supposition of a big bang origin of the universe. Any science flowing from this will ultimately be fallacious since it utterly contradicts Biblical revelation regarding creation.

It is not foolish to affirm geocentricity, just as it is not foolish to affirm a young earth and creation out of nothing.

None, but none among the fanciful assertions of the believers in Galileo's Sun-centred astronomical gospel has ever been proven. It is after Eve's seduction in the Garden of Eden the most monstrous deception ever foisted on mankind.⁶²

⁶² Walter van der Kamp; 'The Whys and Wherefores of Geocentrism', *Bulletin of the Tychoonian Society*, No. 49, p. 18.

Note the famous Danish astronomer, Tycho Brahe [1546–1601]. He built an observatory equipped with precision instruments, but despite demonstrating that comets follow sun-centred paths he adhered to a geocentric picture for the planets.

The 2nd law of thermodynamics

What is this?

This law, also known as entropy, is defined in a hundred ways but the essential position is as follows. In a closed system; that is one where there is no energy passing in or out, the thermal energy required for work will decrease over time. Entropy, defined as the degree of disorder or randomness in the system, will increase. A simple example is that without the input of energy in the form of cleaning, a house will gather dust. Or, without the input of energy to maintain a car, it will rust.

The New Oxford Dictionary defines entropy as: a thermodynamic quantity representing the unavailability of a system's thermal energy for conversion into mechanical work, often interpreted as the degree of disorder or randomness in the system. A gradual decline into disorder. It defines the second law as: heat does not of itself pass from a cooler to a hotter body. Another, equivalent, formulation of the second law is that the entropy of a closed system can only increase.

Another definition is: *'Every system, left to its own devices, always tends to move from order to disorder, its energy tending to be transformed into lower levels of availability (for work), ultimately becoming totally random and unavailable for work. ... Entropy is a measure of ... the amount of energy unavailable for work within a system or process,'*⁶³

Henry Morris says,

In any ordered system, open or closed, there exists a tendency for that system to decay to a state of disorder, which tendency can only be suspended or reversed by an external source of ordering energy directed by an informational program and transformed through an ingestion-storage-converter mechanism into the specific work required to build up the complex structure of that system. If either the information program or the converter mechanism is not available to that 'open' system, it will not increase in order, no matter how much external energy surrounds it. The system will decay in accordance with the Second Law of Thermodynamics.⁶⁴

To make sure that there is no confusion, a quote from famous writer Isaac Asimov:

Another way of stating the second law then is: 'The universe is constantly getting more disorderly!' Viewed that way, we can see the second law all about us. We have to work hard to straighten a room, but left to itself it becomes a mess again very quickly and very easily. Even if we never enter it, it becomes dusty and musty. How difficult to maintain houses, and machinery, and our bodies in perfect working order: how easy to let them deteriorate. In fact, all we have to do is nothing, and everything deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself -- and that is what the second law is all about.⁶⁵

⁶³ T. Wallace; *Thermodynamics vs. Evolutionism*, 2005-2007.

⁶⁴ Henry M. Morris, 'Entropy and Open Systems,' *Acts and Facts*, Vol. 5 (P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, California 92021: Institute for Creation Research, October 1976.

⁶⁵ *Smithsonian Institute Journal*, June 1970, p6.

And one by Andy McIntosh,

Entropy is effectively a measure of the disorder in that system. In overall terms, disorder increases, cars rust and machines wear out.⁶⁶

A final definition is from Christian Answers:

The 2nd Law of Thermodynamics describes basic principles familiar in everyday life. It is partially a universal law of decay; the ultimate cause of why everything ultimately falls apart and disintegrates over time. Material things are not eternal.⁶⁷

Entropy began at the Fall

The position of many creationists is that entropy was either very low before the fall or not existent.⁶⁸ The contrary means that God created a universe running down with decay, increasing randomness and disorder, a tendency to a lack of energy for work, and ending in heat death; this is heresy. My position is that entropy did not exist at all as it is contrary to God's perfection. God's newly created universe could not have a fundamental property of declining into disorder. If God said that it was 'very good' then entropy was not in place.

What we must not do is to start with current physics, which cannot have applied in a pre-Fall earth; we must start with Scripture. Furthermore, '*physics breaks down at a singularity, making it impossible to predict what lies on the other side*'.⁶⁹ Creation is one such singularity; the curse is another.

Creation had to be perfect because God said it was good and it had to express God's perfection. God was the source of power in the universe and had direct fellowship with it (such as talking to man directly). This reflects the direct contact God will have with the new creation at the end.⁷⁰ With God as the source of energy, personally and directly, current physical laws were either different or did not exist then at all.

Entropy, however you define it, implies a running down, a tendency to decay; even the Oxford dictionary says that it is a gradual decline into disorder. This is the result of sin and thus only appeared after the Fall. To suggest otherwise demands that God's creation was imperfect. God could not create a perfect world with disorder and decline in it. To say otherwise is blasphemy.

God is supra-natural, thus in a perfect creation he would sustain it in a supra-natural way. It would be likely that instead of entropy being the overall tendency in creation, it would be a building up as a result of no curse in nature, no bondage in nature, everything working to God's will and God's direct presence in the material world.

Creation and eternity

The original created world was the product of an eternal, self-existent God and was specifically planned to manifest and represent this God. Therefore it must have had the underlying quality of eternity in it. In fact, if Adam had not sinned he would have been

⁶⁶ Andrew McIntosh; *Mathematics*, AiG, January 1, 2001.

⁶⁷ *Second Law of Thermodynamics - Does this basic law of nature prevent Evolution?* <http://www.christiananswers.net/q-edn/edn-thermodynamics.html>

⁶⁸ Some dispute this such as Answers In Genesis. For their slender reasons see: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2010/11/02/second-law-of-thermodynamics>

⁶⁹ *New Scientist*, 1 Dec 2012, p32.

⁷⁰ Rev 22:5: 'There shall be no night there: They need no lamp nor light of the sun, for the Lord God gives them light.' Rev 21:22: 'The city had no need of the sun or of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God illuminated it. The Lamb is its light'. Isa 60:19-20: 'The sun shall no longer be your light by day, nor for brightness shall the moon give light to you; but the LORD will be to you an everlasting light, and your God your glory. Your sun shall no longer go down, nor shall your moon withdraw itself; for the LORD will be your everlasting light, and the days of your mourning shall be ended.'

immortal since only by sin came death. Thus Adam had immortal (eternal) qualities. Trees were created before the sun and thus did not rely on photosynthesis, thus they had supernatural (eternal qualities). In fact the earth was formed before the sun as well and also did not rely upon physical laws, as we know them today. By relying upon the power of God it too had eternal qualities. However, after the Fall and the curse, all these eternal qualities were removed and nature was subject to the bondage of the normal natural processes it now relies upon.

Since entropy is a material quality, then such a law would have no place where eternal conditions were in place. The second law describes observations made about the conditions in the current material universe; it has no place in an eternal cosmos, as was the condition before the Fall and the curse.

In any case, in creation week there were continual inputs of energy (in bursts of energy for initial creation; in further bursts in creating light, in stretching the heavens, in implanting genetic codes [more order] for living things etc.) so entropy was not present. It was more and more order and complexity in waves.

The new world

The new world is a refection of the past Edenic world, only more secure. Therefore, features of the new world will be similar to features of the Edenic world.

Men have new bodies in this world, similar to that of the resurrected Christ (1 Jn 3:3). This means that they can eat food, as the resurrected Christ ate fish and honeycomb (Lk 24:42-43). Surely no one can dare suggest that Christ, the resurrected firstborn of a new spiritual race, was subject to entropy? Nor can anyone dare to suggest that in this perfect new world, where heaven and earth are united in a supernatural way, that entropy exists? It is impossible for entropy to exist in a perfect spiritual world just as there is no entropy in heaven now. Entropy is incompatible with God's perfection. So, digestive systems will be different and not require the second law of thermodynamics.

The resurrected Christ also transported himself through walls to appear in a room with locked doors (Lk 24:36; Jn 20:26), perhaps some sort of teleportation or something else. This conforms to no known physical laws; in fact it contradicts many. Physical laws do not apply to a glorified man.

Again, Christ told Thomas to put his hand in his side (Jn 20:27). It is impossible for a human to survive this and to live with a spear wound that reached the heart (Jn 19:34).⁷¹ Again this contradicts very many biological laws, yet Christ did this with no qualms. Material laws of physics do not apply to him.

The perfect creation of God does not comply with physical laws. Those of a scientific disposition need to get hold of this or they will fall short of understanding God's word. The exhortation here is, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent' (1 Cor 1:19).

Solar changes

Scripture affirms that the earth abides forever (though it is purified after the return of the Lord) and man also abides forever (though not sinners). Thus there are always men upon the earth in some form.

⁷¹ For blood and water to come out of the spear wound, the pericardium had to be pierced.

However, Scripture also affirms in many places (such as those already cited) that the stars will fall, will fail to give light, the sun will be darkened and the heavens rolled up. This is not just figurative embellishment but observations of plain fact, such as the description by the Lord himself in narrative form. This means that physical laws as we observe them now will not be applicable. Currently, the earth cannot exist without the sun, but we have also seen that at the end it will do this because God is the light for the world.

All these serious changes demonstrate that many things occur outside of the imagination of modern science. Physical laws, as currently understood today, do not apply when there is such cosmic change going on. For instance, the behaviour of the sun has direct implications for the weather systems on the earth (to say nothing of ambient temperature) while the moon's gravity directly controls the tides of the world's oceans. Any change to the sun or moon would have devastating effects on the earth that would kill every inhabitant, but men exist on the earth (according to God's word) despite this. Known physical laws cannot apply in this situation.

The Second law of thermodynamics is a valid argument to affirm creationism

There are eminent creationist scientists that support this view; though it is true that some deny the validity of this argument. In my view the Christian has to start with Biblical revelation and not current science. Those few Creationists that deny this argument are too dependent upon secular reasoning.

For instance, some say that since entropy only works in a closed system the argument cannot be applied to earth since the sun is constantly inputting energy received on earth. What this fails to realise is that the closed system is not the earth, nor the solar system but the universe. Entropy is so damaging that if God did not constantly intervene, the universe would collapse. God's word tells us that it is only by his power that the universe stands.⁷² Entropy is held at bay by God indirectly intervening. Without this input of energy by God the universe would dissolve.

Since evolutionists do not believe that there is an external input of energy from outside the universe, then entropy (especially after billions of years) would have resulted in the death of the universe, not an apparent expansion of it.

Item	Observed fact	Evolutionary theory
The closed system of the universe.	The second law states that entropy as a whole is increasing; i.e. things are tending to break down, become less organised, less complex, more random - on a universal scale.	Things have been building up for billions of years both in the universe forming galaxies, solar systems etc, and upon the earth forming life and complexity.
The open system of the earth.	Raw solar energy alone does not decrease entropy—in fact, it increases	The sun gives energy to instigate the complexity of life.

⁷² 2 Pt 3:7; Col 1:17. 'Consist' essentially means 'to place together, and could be translated as 'to glue together'. Modern physicists do now know what holds all creation together; what keeps most molecules from flying apart. The 'glue' that holds the cosmos in place is the providence of God. In the human body, part of this 'glue' has been discovered to be laminins; cell-adhesion molecules which hold the cells together. Without these we would fall apart. The structure of a laminin molecule is IN THE FORM OF A CROSS! For a diagram (used in medical text-books) see 'Creation' journal, Vol 17, No. 9, Feb 2013, p1-3. Physicists propose the hypothetical 'dark matter' as the glue created by the big bang to stop galaxies flying apart. But this has not been observed or proved. The 'Standard Model', which involves the Higgs particle to give mass to all things, says nothing about dark matter or even gravity. In fact, there is a 'vast discrepancy between the Higgs actual mass and that predicted by quantum theory' [New Scientist, 10 Nov, 2012, p34]. In addition, the physicists at CERN have failed to find any of the particles predicted by 'Supersymmetry theory' (proposed to explain the universe) [New Scientist, 24 Nov, 2012, p12]. In other words, the models of physicists to explain creation are unproved, unobserved and frequently contradict each other.

	entropy, speeding up the natural processes that cause break-down, disorder, and disorganisation.	

Dr John Ross, not a supporter of creationism, affirms that:

There are no known violations of the second law of thermodynamics. Ordinarily the second law is stated for isolated [closed] systems, but the second law applies equally well to open systems ... there is somehow associated with the field of far-from equilibrium phenomena the notion that the second law of thermodynamics fails for such systems. It is important to make sure that this error does not perpetuate itself.⁷³

What is required to drive the increasing complexity of the biosphere, in the face of entropy, are two things. The first is a pre-set programme of directive information so that growth is properly organised and the second is an input of external energy. The first is found in the complicated design of the genome (genetic information)⁷⁴ and the second is the upholding of the universe by the direct energising of Christ.⁷⁵

Thus the reason that entropy is overruled on earth is due to the design of life by God and the steady input of energy from God's providence. Thus it is a valid argument against evolutionists to affirm that their theory contradicts the known law of entropy. In fact many, more sensible, evolutionary scientists have acknowledged this fact.

Now this is not the place to take apart the detailed arguments of evolutionists to defend their position; that has been done ably by others. Often the error is failing to differentiate between ordered systems and organised systems. *'Ordered systems are generated according to simple algorithms and therefore lack complexity, organised systems must be assembled element by element according to an external 'wiring diagram' with a high information content ... Organisation, then, is functional complexity and carries information. It is non-random by design or by selection, rather than by the a priori necessity of crystallographic "order.'*⁷⁶

Thus, for example, the six-sided crystalline symmetry of snowflakes are not proof of complexity arising from the disorder of randomly moving water-vapour molecules. This is nothing to do with increased information, organisation, complexity or reduced entropy. It reflects movements towards equilibrium, a lower energy level, using structures with minimal complexity and no function. They are not examples of matter forming itself into more organised or more complex structures.⁷⁷

A Nobel Prize winner agrees:

The point is that in a non-isolated [open] system there exists a possibility for formation of ordered, low-entropy structures at sufficiently low temperatures. This ordering principle is responsible for the appearance of ordered structures such as crystals as

⁷³ Dr. John Ross; Harvard scientist (evolutionist), *Chemical and Engineering News*, vol. 58, July 7, 1980, p. 40

⁷⁴ The DNA in all creatures contains all the necessary information to programme life and sustain healthy growth.

⁷⁵ Life forms have mechanisms for storing and using energy, whether photosynthesis in plants or human metabolism.

⁷⁶ Jeffrey S. Wicken; [an evolutionist] *The Generation of Complexity in Evolution: A Thermodynamic and Information-Theoretical Discussion*, *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 77 (April 1979), p349.

⁷⁷ Thanks to T. Wallace, *Thermodynamics vs. Evolutionism*, 2005-2007.

well as for the phenomena of phase transitions. Unfortunately this principle cannot explain the formation of biological structures.⁷⁸

The heat of the sun, in the open system of earth, is unable to make a dead plant or animal become alive again. All the physical systems are in place (cells etc.) but heat is insufficient energy to resurrect (though some evolutionists have suggested otherwise). The sun actually causes the organisation of the dead plant or animal to decrease (entropy increases); it decays faster and dissolves into simple components. Even in an open system the sun is not a sufficient energy source to create life from nothing; it cannot even resurrect a once existent life.

What is the difference then between a stick, which is dead, and an orchid which is alive? The difference is that the orchid has teleonomy in it. It is a machine which is capturing energy to increase order. Where you have life, you have teleonomy,⁷⁹ and then the Sun's energy can be taken and make the thing grow - increasing its order.⁸⁰

It is the information in living cells, the DNA, which enables plants and animals to capture heat, store it as energy and use it for work. This information was put there by a designer – God.

Without getting into more and more complex arguments, we can safely say that evolutionists cannot escape the simple fact that evolutionary theory flies in the face of the second law of thermodynamics.

Further support

Applying the second law of thermodynamics to various systems to refute evolutionary ideas is appropriate. [Dr. Tommy Mitchell; *The Second Law of Thermodynamics Began at the Fall, Arguments Christians Shouldn't Use*, AiG-U.S; 2 Nov., 2010.]

One reason why the universe cannot be infinitely old is because by the second law of thermodynamics all the stars would now have gone out. [David Rosevear; (chemical scientist; creationist) *Creation* magazine, Vol 17, No. 9 (Feb 2013), p10.]

No exception has ever been found to these two laws, but strangely, evolution seems to contradict the second law. It is as if the universe is like a clock that has been wound up, and is now running down but the evolutionists claim that their particular clock is "winding up", i.e. life is getting better and more complicated! This is in complete contradiction to the general scheme of things occurring in the universe. [Malcolm Bowden; (Civil and Structural Engineer; creationist), *True Science Agrees with the Bible*, Sovereign Pub. (1991) p141.]

Evolutionist theory faces a problem in the second law, since the law is plainly understood to indicate (as does empirical observation) that things tend towards disorder, simplicity, randomness, and disorganisation, while the theory insists that precisely the opposite has been taking place since the universe began. Beginning with

⁷⁸ Ilya Prigogine; I. Prigogine, G. Nicolis and A. Babloyants, *Physics Today* 25(11):23 (1972). See also C.B. Thaxton, W.L. Bradley, and R.L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1984, p119-120.

⁷⁹ Teleonomy: Information stored within a living thing. Teleonomy involves the concept of something having a design and purpose. Non-teleonomy is 'directionlessness,' having no project. The teleonomy of a living thing is somehow stored within its genes. Teleonomy can use energy and matter to produce order and complexity.

⁸⁰ Arthur E. Wilder-Smith; in Willem J.J. Glashouwer and Paul S. Taylor, *The Origin of the Universe* (PO Box 200, Gilbert AZ 85299 USA: Eden Films and Standard Media, 1983.

the “Big Bang” and the self-formation and expansion of space and matter, the evolutionist scenario declares that every structure, system, and relationship—down to every atom, molecule, and beyond—is the result of a loosely-defined, spontaneous self-assembly process of increasing organisation and complexity, and a direct contradiction (i.e., theorised violation) of the second law. [T. Wallace; (creationist) *Thermodynamics vs. Evolutionism*, 2005-2007.]

We have repeatedly emphasised the fundamental problems posed for the biologist by the fact of life’s complex organisation. We have seen that organisation requires work for its maintenance and that the universal quest for food is in part to provide the energy needed for this work. But the simple expenditure of energy is not sufficient to develop and maintain order. A bull in a china shop performs work but he neither creates nor maintains organisation. The work needed is particular work; it must follow specifications; it requires information on how to proceed. [G.G. Simpson and W.S. Beck, (evolutionists) *Life: An Introduction to Biology*, Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York, 1965, p. 465.]

Closely related to the apparent ‘paradox’ of ongoing uphill processes in nonliving systems is the apparent ‘paradox’ of spontaneous self-organisation in nature. It is one thing for an internally organised, open system to foster uphill processes by tapping downhill ones, but how did the required internal organisation come about in the first place? Indeed the so-called dissipative structures that produce uphill processes are highly organised (low entropy) molecular ensembles, especially when compared to the dispersed arrays from which they assembled. Hence, the question of how they could originate by natural processes has proved a challenging one. [J.W. Patterson, (evolutionist) *Scientists Confront Creationism*, L:R: Godfrey, Ed., W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 1983, p110]

Of all the statements that have been made with respect to theories on the origin of life, the statement that the Second Law of Thermodynamics poses no problem for an evolutionary origin of life is the most absurd... The operation of natural processes on which the Second Law of Thermodynamics is based is alone sufficient, therefore, to preclude the spontaneous evolutionary origin of the immense biological order required for the origin of life. [Duane Gish; (Ph.D. in biochemistry from University of California at Berkeley; creationist), ‘A Consistent Christian-Scientific View of the Origin of Life’, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (March 1979), p199, 186.]

The Second Law of Thermodynamics was apparently not in effect before the fall---the universe was previously self-renewing, ... Our once orderly, perfect universe is running apart, losing its order and splendour and becoming inexorably more chaotic with the passage of time. There was quite possibly no radioactive decay before the fall due to a greatly stability of certain atomic nuclei which are now unstable or marginally stable. Radioactive decay may be a consequence of the fall. [Lambert Dolphin; (retired research physicist) *The Ruin of Creation*, (1992. rev. 2009).]

In The Uniqueness of Creation Week a speculative model of how the entropy of the universe may have varied during creation week, and after the fall of the angels and man, was presented for discussion and illustrative purposes. Entropy measures for us not only the energy in a system available for doing useful work, but also the degree of order in the universe. Creation of the high degree of order found in living things implies a large decrease in entropy which in fact has been estimated by calculation (Ref. 5)⁸¹ Thus, entropy during creation week was evidently decreased by two processes: (1) God created matter and energy and filled energy reservoirs, and (2) order was brought

⁸¹ Thaxton, Charles B., Bradley, Walter L., and Olsen, Roger L.; *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1984.

out of disorder by the artistic craftsmanship of God who is the Wise Master Builder, (Proverbs 8:22-31). The universe apparently had its lowest entropy on the Seventh Day and we could expect this level to be constant thereafter had evil not entered into the universe. Evil did enter in, resulting in death for man and nature alike. [Lambert Dolphin; (retired research physicist) *The Ruin of Creation*, (1992. rev. 2009).]

He created the universe, (visible and invisible), in a time period of six days. During this interval the usual laws of physics were not in effect. ... The Second Law of Thermodynamics states that "entropy always increases" (in a fallen universe). ... Prior to the fall of the angels (who govern the universe under God), the Second Law was evidently not in effect, i.e., the physical universe was apparently not degenerative, or it was self-renewing. Apart from God's intervention the present universe is running down and becoming more and more disorderly. ... [After the Fall] The "Old" Creation is now "ruined" and hopelessly flawed. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is in effect, and from now on, "Entropy always increases." [Lambert Dolphin; (retired research physicist) *The Uniqueness of Creation Week*, (1992. rev. 2003).]

The Bible is quite clear that one or more major disruptions in the Laws of physics have occurred in the history of the universe. These are in some way associated with (a) the fall of the chief angel, Lucifer and his hosts who partially are responsible for the management of the forces of nature, (b) the fall of man and a decrease of sustaining power into the universe from the spiritual realm at that time, and (3) another major disruption in nature at the time of the Flood of Noah. Modern cosmology assumes uniform conditions and immutable laws of physics from the present moment extending backwards in time to the beginning of time, $t = 0$. [Lambert Dolphin; (retired research physicist) *The Uniqueness of Creation Week*, (1992. rev. 2003).]

See also:

Henry M. Morris; *The Biblical Basis for Modern Science*, Baker Book House, (1984), p185-215.

Arthur E. Wilder-Smith; *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, Harold Shaw Publishers, (1968).

'Creationist Interpretations of Chemical Organisation in Time and Space,' *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (March 1986), p157-158.

Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley, and Roger L. Olsen; *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, Philosophical Library, (1984).

Emmett L. Williams; editor, *Thermodynamics and the Development of Order*, Creation Research Society Books, (1981) p91-110.

Harold S. Slusher; *The Origin of the Universe*, revised edition, Institute for Creation Research, (1980), p3-10.

Tracy Waters; 'A Reply to John Patterson's Scientific Arguments,' *Origins Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1986), p8-9.

Jerry Kelley; 'Thermodynamics and Probability,' *Origins Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1986), p11-13. 'On the Nature of Order,' *Origins Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1986), p14-15.

Dudley J. Benton; 'Thermodynamics, Snowflakes, and Zygotes,' *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (September 1986), p86.

Harold L. Armstrong; 'Evolutionistic Defence Against Thermodynamics Disproved,' *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (March 1980), p226-227, 206, and Vol. 17, No. 1 (June 1980), p72-73, 59.

Lessons from this

We need to always begin and end our arguments with God, theology and Scripture. Basing arguments on 'A' level science, secular reasoning, philosophy and human ideas, without recourse to Scripture, is catastrophic. Using secular science to back up Scriptural truth is fine and a normal part of apologetics; however, basing presuppositions upon modern science and then reading them back into creation, or forward into glory, is foolish. God's word must come first. People would be wise to consider Osiander's advice:

Now when from time to time there are offered for one and the same motion different hypotheses ... the astronomer will accept above all others the one which is easiest to grasp. The philosopher will perhaps seek the semblance of the truth. But neither of them will understand or state anything certain unless it has been divinely revealed to him. ... So far as hypotheses are concerned, let no one expect anything certain from astronomy which cannot furnish it, lest he accept as the truth ideas conceived for another purpose and depart from this study a greater fool than when he entered it.⁸²

We must seek to make better deductions from Scripture; try to see what is behind a thing. For instance, Paul develops a whole doctrine from seeing that 'seed' in the promise to Abraham is plural and not singular. We must learn to study better. Most people read Genesis one and fail to really understand what is being said.

When we come to the doctrine of creation and the Fall there is a rich vein to study and some difficult concepts to take on board, but the result of this is spiritually enlarging. Believers should take more time to actually study what Scripture says about creation and the Fall in great detail since it is fundamental to everything that follows. It is utterly foolish to be ignorant about creation. Genesis is the seed plot of the entire Bible; it is vital that believers spend time thoroughly understanding it.

Such study can only lead to a greater understanding of God, a desire to worship even more and to ponder the richness of what will be given to us in the future.

Some of the conclusions in this paper will be challenging to some; however, I urge those challenged to come to Scripture with an open mind, study the texts given and pray for God to enlarge them. Unless they can come up with good reasons to dismiss the plain reading of these verses, they are exhorted to simply believe them as they stand.

May God be glorified in his word and the teaching of it.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version © Thomas Nelson 1982

Paul Fahy Copyright © 2013
Understanding Ministries
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

⁸² Andreas Osiander [a German Reformer, 1498-1552] quoted in Arthur Koestler; *The Sleepwalkers*, Grosset and Dunlap, (1963) p565-566.