

Geocentricity and the Catholic

P. Ellwanger

In the recent paper¹ of Dr. Smith the statement was made that "...all serious geocentrists are Tychonians." Catholic geocentrists should have no problem with that label, as it is synonymous with Biblical geocentrism.

In perspective, Danish astronomer Tycho de Brahe [1546-1601] based his system, as did Italian St Thomas Aquinas [1225-1274], on Greek astronomer-geographer, Ptolemy [2nd century A.D.], who in turn, based his system on Greek philosopher Aristotle [384-322 B.C.]. Polish astronomer-priest Nicolaus Copernicus [1473-1543] devised his Copernican system which was synonymously called Heliocentrism & later championed by Italian Galileo Galilei [1564-1642]. It was not until 1616 that the Church condemned Heliocentrism [Copernicanism].

In the 20th century the shifting sands of Scientism have since embraced a new paradigm called A-centrism, which is a totally incoherent cosmology accommodating any & all non-geocentric notions.

To paraphrase in simplest terms, there are two opposing cosmological systems.

- (1) Tychonian [Biblical]: Earth immobile [non-orbiting & non-rotating], planets rotate around Sun, & all [*en masse*] rotate daily around Earth.
- (2) Copernican [Heliocentricity]: Earth is a planet & [with all other planets] orbits around Sun & daily rotates on its own axis.

From time to time Copernican apologists come out with articles or books to propagandize that system or to cast aspersions on the Tychonian system, or both. An example of that may be seen in some excerpts from Margolis²:

In fact, from start to finish Tychonic astronomy was entirely parasitic on Copernican astronomy. Tycho's system worked just like the Copernican system, except that Earth stood still. There is no puzzle at all about why Tycho would entrust his great project of making new models of the planetary motions from his elaborately exact observations to a Copernican [Kepler]. There was no difference between Tychonic and Copernican astronomy, except at the end a Tychonic astronomer pretended that Earth stood still. Tycho certainly appeared to sincerely believe that. How many after him actually believed it has always been in doubt. After the Church forbade support of Copernicus in 1616, an adversary [Oratio Grassi] attacked Galileo for failing to support Tycho.

The author shows his ignorance [or deceit], since the Tychonian system is in direct opposition to the Copernican system, as previously pointed out. Grassi's frustrations over Galileo's failure to support Tycho were certainly justified. Reading on p. 88 from Margolis:

But for Copernicus, the material of the heavens and the physics of the heavens could hardly be different from what held here on Earth, since Earth was itself a heavenly body. Copernicus put Earth in the heavens, which made astronomy relevant rather than irrelevant to physics on Earth and (conspicuously for Kepler), the converse.

¹ "The Status of Geocentricity". Wolfgang Smith. 2002 {July issue of Sacred Web). Available from F & M Kramer, 1020 Raleigh Dr - #2303, Carrollton TX 75007, USA. origins@ev1.net

² *It Started with Copernicus: How Turning the World Inside Out Led to the Scientific Revolution*, Howard Margolis, McGraw-Hill, 2002, p.66.

Margolis falsely implies that Tycho, via his young student, Kepler, also placed Earth out among the “heavenly bodies”. Kepler’s Copernican identity was not discernible till after the death of his teacher, Tycho, who did no such thing as to “place Earth out among the heavenly bodies”.

We read of another of Margolis’ subtle obfuscations:

Characteristically, Grassi did not actually defend Tycho’s system. All he argued was that, with Ptolemy forced aside by “that out-thrust sword of Mars” and Copernicus forbidden, there was nothing else for a good Catholic to believe.

The observation of the comet that crossed the Aristotelian celestial spheres is alleged by Copernican popularizers-propagandists, such as Margolis, as contradicting and refuting Aristotle, but that has no relevance to geocentrism and the immobility of Earth. It merely means that comets are heavenly bodies that can travel across the spheres. If Aristotle was incorrect on this one point, it doesn’t have any direct bearing on the reasons for belief or disbelief that Earth is immobile and at the center of the cosmos.

The Copernican system became just as – if not more – complex than the Ptolemaic system that Copernicus rejected precisely because of its complexity. It has now, as “a-centric”, become as flexible [& as insufferably complex] as the evolutionary model – which is able to accommodate any new idea. A-centrism has become essentially meaningless as a coherent cosmology. Its unifying idea is evolutionary, both as to origin (Big Bang) and time scale (in billions of years).

Modern cosmology has developed to the point where it includes two concepts that are irreconcilable with the Catholic Faith. These two concepts are those of **infinity** and **eternity** attributed to the physical Universe. The modern scientist envisions a physical Universe actually infinite in space and eternal as to Time. Within this *infinite-eternal*, worlds come into being, as ours did, via the Big Bang, and pass away, as ours will, via Sun’s death. In this view of the Universe, Earth is but a speck in the periphery of one of millions or billions of galaxies.

Biblical, Ptolemaic, Tychonian cosmology, on the other hand, is finite, orderly and simple. Earth is immobile at the center of the universe and “the heavens [Sun of course included]” revolve, *en masse*, around Earth. The heavens are everything else in the cosmos except the fixed stars. Time of the cosmos, since Creation, is limited by some 10,000 years at most. The Universe began during Creation Week when Time also began, and all will come to an End at the Last Judgment when Time, too, will end.

This is the basic medieval system – Biblical, which is to say, divinely revealed. Catholics embrace this “model” in Faith – *de fide* – because it is the traditional view of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, never abrogated or condemned, but on the contrary, officially approved.³

For more on geocentrism and the Catholic, see *From the Beginning*,⁴ Vol I, on “The Six Days of Creation according to St. Thomas and the Fathers.”

2002 A.D.

³ “The Theological Status of Heliocentrism”. J. S. Daly. 1997 (available from source given in footnote #1).

⁴ *From the Beginning: Catholics & Protestants on the Modern Apostasy*. Volumes I & II. Paula Haigh. 2000 (available from source given in footnote #1).