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What all this means is that Christianity cannot close the Genesis account of creation like it could lose the doctrine of geocentrism and get along. The battle must be waged, for Christianity is fighting for its very life and Atheism is science’s natural ally. Atheism is the philosophy, both moral and ethical, most perfectly suited for a scientific civilization. If we work for the American Atheists today, Atheism will be ready to fill the void of Christianity’s demise when science and evolution triumph. Without a doubt humans and civilization are in sore need of the intellectual cleanness and mental health of Atheism.

from The Meaning of Evolution, Richard Bozarth, quoted in American Atheist, Sept 1978, p.30

Bozarth evidently believes that the battle over geocentricity was won long ago and that Christianity has managed to “get along” without it, but that the battle over creation is crucial to Christianity’s future and cannot be lost without dire consequences.

Creation may be the last pin standing and therefore essential to the faith for that reason, but it was not the first pin to go down. The first was geocentricity. There was certainly good reason for attacking it first.

Once the Bible could be proven wrong about the seemingly innocuous matter of the cosmic scenario, the groundwork would be laid for attacking the more sensitive issue of human origins via Evolutionism.

The geocentric/a-centric [formerly known as "heliocentric"] controversy is far more fundamental than the creation-evolution controversy. That this battle was lost long ago and Christianity has “gotten along” does not make up for the seriousness of it. If creation is lost, Christianity will learn how to “get along” with that, too – ask any theistic evolutionist. But then there won’t be any more legs to stand on and Christianity will fall flat.

Critics of the Bible focus first on geocentricity, and only when that is licked can they attack creation. See what L. Pearce Williams has to say in his Album of Science – The 19th Century, 1978, p.126:
One could play it safe by leaving aside basic and fundamental questions of the origin of the earth and of the geological results of the Noachian flood and still do respectable scientific work. The earth and its associated phenomena could be described without fear of offending anyone’s religious sensibilities. So the astronomical status of the earth could be viewed with some calm. The earth is a planet, no matter what else it might be, and there was no harm in illustrating the earth’s place in the solar system. The discovery of stellar parallax in 1838 proved to even the most religiously devout that the earth was not at the center of the universe and that the command in the Book of Joshua, “Sun, stand thou still.” Must have been meant as a metaphor. That it was the earth that rotated, and not the sun that went around the earth, was demonstrated conclusively by Foucault’s pendulum (1851). All very bland stuff, but the thin edge of the wedge in establishing the earth as just another natural object, devoid of any special importance in that respect.

What Williams here proclaims to be “demonstrated conclusively” is as far from the truth as similar claims for evolution. But for non-scientists, as the clergy and general laity, very intimidating language -- and obviously enough to make most of them compromise Holy Scripture and their Faith.

It is sadly tragic that so few creationists have yet grasped the significance of the modern geocentricity movement with its profound consequences on all of Christianity, including (and especially) young-earth-Creationism. How ironic that so many a-centrist creationists crassly condescend to geocentrist creationists in the very same way evolutionists condescend to all creationists.
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