

# The Qur'ān, the Sunnah and Modern Astronomy: Some Observations on the Solar System Model Devised by Sun-Worshippers, Astrologers, Kabbalists and Magicians<sup>1</sup> and Defended by Atheists

Abu 'Iyaad

---

**Lincoln Barnett** (1909-1979CE) wrote in his book: "*The Universe and Dr. Einstein*" (with a forward by Einstein himself), "... for we cannot feel our motion through space; nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the earth actually is in motion."<sup>2</sup>

---

Bismillāh wal-Ḥamdulillāh. Much of modern astronomy and the theoretical physics invented to support it comprise a poison and a mind virus that have infected the intellects of Muslims, let alone a great portion of the rest of humanity. This is because it is built upon ideologically motivated unverified assumptions which cannot be empirically proven but only validated by creative maths-based theorisation. There is no empirical proof that the Earth moves and it is not even possible to detect or quantify any alleged motion of the Earth.<sup>3</sup> Anyone who claims

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as Pythagoras, Nicolaus Copernicus, Johannes Kepler, Galileo, Giordano Bruno, Isaac Newton and others.

<sup>2</sup> Camelot Press, UK, (1949), p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> The erroneous position of a great scholar such as Shaykh al-Albānī (رحمته الله)—who was of the view that modern scientists have arrived at certain, indisputable knowledge regarding these aspects of astronomy—has led

otherwise will have undisclosed, unproven and unverifiable assumptions as the starting point of his claim and his calculations.

**Bernard Cohen**, former Professor of the history of science at Harvard University, wrote: “There is no planetary observation by which we on Earth can prove that the Earth is moving in an orbit around the sun. Thus all Galileo’s discoveries with the telescope can be accommodated to the system invented by Tycho Brahe just before Galileo began his observations of the heavens. In this Tychonic system, the planets... move in orbits around the sun, while the sun moves in an orbit around the Earth in a year. Furthermore, the daily rotation of the heavens is communicated to the sun and planets, so that the Earth itself neither rotates nor revolves in an orbit.”<sup>4</sup>

**Lincoln Barnett** (1909-1979CE) in wrote in his book: “*The Universe and Dr. Einstein*” (with a forward by Einstein himself), “... for we cannot feel our motion through space; nor has any physical experiment ever proved that the earth actually is in motion.”<sup>5</sup> The claim of the earth being in motion is a by-product of assuming the Sun is the centre of a planetary system and is not something that has been empirically proven independently.

---

many Muslims to reject the established consensus of the Companions, Tābiīn and the Muslim scholars that the sun moves around the Earth.

<sup>4</sup> *Birth of a New Physics*, (Norton and Company, 1985), p. 78.

<sup>5</sup> Camelot Press, UK, (1949), p. 63.

Nor can it be. Any alleged measurement will always be based upon undisclosed, unverified assumptions.

**George Ellis** is a famous astronomer who authored books with Stephen Hawking. In a profile in *Scientific American* W.W. Gibbs quotes Ellis: “People need to be aware that there is a range of models that could explain the observations... For instance, I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its center, and you cannot disprove it based on observations... You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds... What I want to bring into the open is the fact that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide that.”<sup>6</sup>

Famous German physicist **Max Born** (1882-1970CE) wrote: “Thus we may return to Ptolemy’s point of view of a ‘motionless Earth.’ This would mean that we use a system of reference rigidly fixed to the Earth in which all stars are performing a rotational motion with the same angular velocity around the Earth’s axis...one has to show that the transformed metric can be regarded as produced according to Einstein’s field equations, by distant rotating masses. This has been done by Thirring. He calculated a field due to a rotating, hollow, thick-walled sphere and proved that inside the cavity it behaved as though there were centrifugal and other inertial forces usually attributed to absolute space. Thus from Einstein’s point of view,

---

<sup>6</sup> *Scientific American* 273(4):55, October 1995.

Ptolemy and Copernicus are equally right. What point of view is chosen is a matter of expediency.”<sup>7</sup>

In short, one can propose any model and devise appropriate mathematics for it along with any cumbersome workarounds and it would not be possible to disprove it based on mere observations. It is simply a matter of philosophical preference influenced by prior ideological conviction.

**Albert Einstein** also acknowledged this, writing: “The struggle, so violent in the early days of science, between the views of Ptolemy and Copernicus would then be quite meaningless. Either coordinate system could be used with equal justification. The two sentences, ‘the sun is at rest and the earth moves,’ or ‘the sun moves and the earth is at rest,’ would simply mean two different conventions concerning two different coordinate systems.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Einstein's Theory of Relativity* (1965) p. 344, and in the earlier 1920 edition, “This gives us freedom to return to Ptolemy’s point of view of a ‘motionless earth.’ This would mean that we use a system of reference rigidly fixed to the earth... From Einstein’s higher point of vantage Ptolemy and Copernicus are equally right. Both view-points furnish the same physical laws, but with different numerical values... What point of view is chosen is not decided by principles but is a matter of expedience.” p. 277.

<sup>8</sup> In his book, *The Evolution of Physics* (Simon and Schuster, 1988), p. 212. This is why it is impossible to reject a geocentric universe, concepts accepted in modern science do not allow dismissal of geocentrism.

**Ernst Mach** (1838-1916CE), the Austrian physicist wrote: "...the motions of the universe are the same whether we adopt the Ptolemaic or the Copernican mode of view. Both views are, indeed, equally correct..."<sup>9</sup>

**Martin Gardner** (1914-2010), mathematician and popular science writer stated in his book on Einstein's relativity, "The ancient argument over whether the Earth rotates or the heavens revolve around it (as Aristotle taught) is seen to be no more than an argument over the simplest choice of a frame of reference. Obviously, the most convenient choice is the universe... Nothing except inconvenience prevents us from choosing the Earth as a fixed frame of reference... If we choose to make the Earth our fixed frame of reference, we do not even do violence to everyday speech. We say that the sun *rises* in the morning, *sets* in the evening; the Big Dipper *revolves* around the North Star. Which point of view is 'correct'? Do the heavens revolve or does the Earth rotate. The question is meaningless."<sup>10</sup>

In terms of practical application, in a 1979 *New Scientist* edition, a Royal Air Force navigation instructor posted the following response to a remark in an earlier edition:<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *The Science of Mechanics: A Critical and Historical Account of its Development*. Translated by T. J. Macormack, La Salle, Open Court Publishing, 1960, p. 232.

<sup>10</sup> *The Relativity Explosion*, (1976), pp. 86-87.

<sup>11</sup> *New Scientist*, 16 August 1979, Vol. 83 No. 1168 p. 543.

“Andrew Hill (‘Darwin Rules OK?’, 12 July, p 127) says ‘... even in the *Spectator*, we rarely find serious assertions that the Sun goes around the Earth’. One can of course believe anything one likes as long as the consequences of that belief are trivial. But when survival depends on belief, then it matters that belief corresponds to manifest reality. We therefore teach navigators that the stars are fixed to the Celestial Sphere, which is centered on a fixed Earth, and around which it rotates in accordance with laws clearly deducible from common-sense observation. The Sun and 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. If Andrew Hill will look in the *Journal of Navigation* he will find that the Earth-centered Universe is alive and well, whatever his readings of the *Spectator* may suggest.

Darcy Peddyhoff  
 Royal Air Force College  
 Cranwell, Lincolnshire, England.”

All land and sea based navigation in history has been founded upon the physically observed reality that the Earth is stationary and that the sun, moon and stars move around it in an East to West direction, anti-clockwise when looking towards the north pole. The star field takes 23 hours and 56 minutes, the sun

takes on average 24 hours and the moon takes 24 hours and 52 minutes. The sun takes around 182 days to travel from tropic to tropic and the moon takes around 14 days to do the same. All of this allows calculation of days, months, seasons and occurrence of eclipses. The “solar system” model is not required to do any of these calculations. Rather, ancient civilisations thousands of years ago—such as the Chaldeans—through detailed observations of cycles were able to predict eclipse timings for hundreds, if not thousands of years in advance. This is because eclipses recur in cycles of 18 years 11 days and 8 hours. Thus, no specific model is required to work them out. The Copernican solar system model is not used to calculate eclipses as it is not possible to do so.

Many of those who have bought into modern cosmology beliefs are unaware of the detailed history behind the development of these beliefs which originate with idolators, polytheists, occultists and sun-worshippers such as Pythagoras (495BC), Copernicus (1543CE) and the solar magician, Giordano Bruno (1600CE).

The claim of the earth being in motion (whether axial rotation or orbital motion) is a rejected opinion and is refuted from many angles through texts of the Quran and the Sunnah as well as through physical observation and basic reason. Whoever wishes for more details should refer to the writings of **Shaykh Hamud al-Tuwayjūrī** (رحمة الله) from close to 50 years ago who did a great job in refuting the cosmological beliefs of the

modern day astrologer-astronomers and occultists who use the tools of theoretical physics and mathematics to validate the imaginations of their minds and present them as indisputable facts. The ideas of an infinite universe, multiple suns, inhabitable planets and alien life forms were found with sun-worshipping magicians such as Giordano Bruno (1600CE) who championed sun-centric Copernicanism. These same beliefs are being foisted upon the world today through lies and deception in the name of science. It is nothing but pure speculation made to appear real and actual through mere maths equations.

Any attempt to combine or reconcile between a moving sun being the cause of night and day—which is explicit in the texts—and modern astronomy in which the sun is stationary relative to earth is trying to reconcile between two opposites, between what is true and what is false. It is not possible.

This will lead people to confusion and trying to accommodate two opposing views at the same time or to make interpretations of texts that have no basis with the Companions and Tābi'īn. This could resemble the way of the Mutakallimīn who tried to merge Greek metaphysics and philosophy—which was the accepted science of the day—with the Qur'ān. This led to the appearance of the dīn of the Jahmites which necessitated the negation of Allāh's names, attributes and actions and eventually His actual existence when the reasoning behind their speculative theology was taken fully to its inevitable, natural



conclusion. They rejected or made ta'wīl of the verses of the attributes (ṣifāt) as a result of this speculative theology. All of this appeared among Muslims after the introduction of the mind virus of Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy and metaphysics and attempts to reconcile it with the Qur'ān.

Today, those who drink from the speculative cosmology of the atheists, astrologers and sun-worshippers will be forced to resort to baseless explanations and interpretations of texts. There are those who claim the Big Bang model is in the Qur'ān or that the universe is expanding based upon gross distortions of texts. This is because they have wrongly considered to be established certainties and realities what are no more than pure conjectures and fanciful imaginations of the mind.

Anyone who entertains Copernican astronomy should be challenged to provide their evidence for Earth's rotation being the cause of night and day, a view which clashes with the Quran and Sunnah. Rather, according to prominent non-Muslim scientists, it is not even physically possible to detect Earth's motion as has preceded. The Earth's motion has to be assumed first because the model chosen by Copernicus five centuries ago to suit the needs of astrology demands that the Earth must be in motion around the sun. The maths and physics only come afterwards through **reverse engineering** and this is how the "Solar System" has been devised. Ad hoc explanations were added to account for things like seasons, eclipse phenomena, variation in night and day and so on, to

make them work. In this manner, they arrived at a patched up, apparently coherent model. All contradictions are hidden or given explanations based upon assumptions which if applied to other aspects of the model, invalidate it.

There is no room for this erroneous view among Muslims and saying, “there are two views, there is a difference of opinion” is not acceptable, when evidence—revealed, sensory and rational—clearly invalidates the contrary view.

There is also psychology at play too, an inferiority complex. Many Muslims are suffering from a syndrome whereby they feel that it is shameful and humiliating to speak with the Quran and the Sunnah because these affairs—Copernicanism and Big Bang cosmology—are established certainties with non-Muslims due to their alleged superior science **in the affairs of the unseen**. And that if we speak with the dhāhir of the Quran and the Sunnah, we will be seen as backward and ignorant and it will lead people to question Islām, if not leave it.

A stationary Earth was the consensus of the Muslims and the People of the Book before Copernicus in the 15th century and also for a while after him. This consensus is mentioned by **Imām al-Qurṭubī** in his tafsīr. He (رحمته الله) said: “That which the Muslims and the People of the Book are upon is the statement of the Earth standing still at rest and its being stretched out (as

an expanse) and that any motion [it undergoes] is due only to an earthquake that affects it every now and then.”<sup>12</sup>

**Shaykh Muḥammad bin Ṣāliḥ al-Uthaymīn** (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said, “The alternation of the day and night is due to the Sun’s orbit around the Earth. Allāh subjected the Sun and the Moon for us, making them persistent [in their courses] and as two signs amongst the signs of Allāh indicating the perfection in His power and vastness in His mercy. Since Allāh the Exalted created them they both traverse in their orbits in accordance with the command of Allāh. They do not raise above, fall below or deviate to the right or left [from their orbits]. He determined phases for them [in their orbits] that you may count the years and measurement [of time]. Thus, by the variation in the phases of the moon we have [the variation] of the new moons and months. And by the variation in the phases of the Sun’s [orbit] we have the variation in seasons. When the Sun reaches the [position of the] furthest northern constellations, the day’s [gradual increase in] length ends and the midsummer season is reached. Then it begins to recede gradually until it returns to [the position of] the constellations [in the direction of] Yemen, and the [gradual] increase in the night’s length comes to an end and the midwinter season enters.”<sup>13</sup>

**Shaykh Hamūd al-Tuwayjurī** (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said: “Allāh the Exalted textually stated the motion of the sun in numerous places in His

<sup>12</sup> In his explanation of Sūrah ar-Ra’d (13:3).

<sup>13</sup> Refer to *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā* of the Shaykh (6/193).

Book. He textually stated that it swims in an orbit. He also textually stated that He brings it from the East. He also textually stated its طلوع [approach (as it appears to rise)], its تزاور [passing by], its دلك and غروب [setting towards West]. The Exalted said: **'He has subjected for you the sun and moon in constant motion (دائبين), and subjected for you the night and the day.'** (14:33). And الدأب is constant motion as has been textually stated by the leading scholars of the [Arabic] language and its meaning has been affirmed by the people of tafsīr. In these verses is clear proof that the sun is in motion and orbits the earth so as to enable the livelihood of people and their beneficial interests.”<sup>14</sup>

Whoever denies the motion of the sun which is related to the phenomena of night and day and claims—as do the astrologer-astronomers, sun-worshippers, occultists and magicians in their various forms and guises—that the sun is stationary has fallen into major kufr.

**Shaykh Bin Baz** (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said: “As for the one who said that the Earth [moves] in orbit and the Sun also moves, his saying is lighter than the one who speaks with the stationary Sun. However, this in itself is a clear error and opposes the preceding verses, sensory perception and outward reality. It is an avenue to the saying that the Sun does not move. Allāh has already made clear in the aforementioned verses that He placed the mountains in the Earth so that it does not move with

---

<sup>14</sup> Dhayl al-Sawā'iq (1390, p. 66).

them and [the word] *mayd* means movement (*ḥarakah*), shaking (*iḍṭirāb*) and motion (*dawrān*) as the scholars of exegesis and imāms of the [Arabic] language have textually stated. In the takfīr of the one who speaks with this saying there is some observation to be made because the evidences relayed regarding the stationary Earth and its rest and the absence of its orbit are not as clear as the evidences relayed regarding the motion of the sun and the absence of its rest. It is also because those who affirm the orbital motion of the Earth present doubts which obligate the avoidance of [ascribing] disbelief to the one who spoke with that. But there is no doubt about the disbelief of the one who rejects the orbital motion of the Sun due to the clear definitive evidences regarding it”<sup>15</sup>

**Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān** said: “There is no doubt with us or with the Believers regarding that, that the Earth is stationary and that the Sun orbits around it, as do the stars and the other celestial bodies (*aflāk*), that they orbit the Earth. There is no doubt about this. This is what is evidenced in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah.”<sup>16</sup>

**Shaykh Muqbil bin Hādī** (رحمته الله) said: “As for [the question of] whether the Earth is in motion, this is an affair for which neither the Book nor the Sunnah have brought [evidence]. Rather, the one who speaks with it is closer to disbelief because he

---

<sup>15</sup> *Al-Adillah al-Naqliyyah wal-Hissiyah ‘alā Jaryān al-Shams wa Sukūn al-Ard.* (1402H),

<sup>16</sup> See [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NH\\_NQisXTRE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NH_NQisXTRE)

ascribed [something to] Allāh without knowledge and also he rejected what is observed...”<sup>17</sup>

**Shaykh ‘Ubayd al-Jābirī** was asked, “Is the belief that the Earth revolves around the Sun as claimed by the astronomers considered disbelief?” He replied, “I say: That which the Qur’ān and the Sunnah have indicated is that the Sun is what moves and the Earth is stationary. From the evidences that the Earth is stationary and the Sun is the one that moves is the authentic tradition which is that Joshua bin Nūn (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ), the successor of Moses and Ḥārūn (عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَامُ), he was the inheritor of Prophethood after them. He approached Bayt al-Maqdis whilst the Sun was approaching its setting-place in the West. He said, “Indeed you are commanded and I am commanded, O Allāh restrain it for us.” So Allāh restrained the Sun [in its place] until that prophet (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ) entered Bayt al-Maqdis and Allāh granted him victory over it.<sup>18</sup> If the Earth had been the one that moves, then the address of this prophet to the Sun would have been vain, and the prophets are immune from error [in such matters]. This saying that the Sun is stationary is rejection (*takdhīb*) of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. It is a theory of disbelief and most of the astronomers are ignoramuses.”<sup>19</sup>

Finally, there is no person who attempts to validate Copernican astronomy except that after being subjected to critical analysis

---

<sup>17</sup> Refer to <https://youtube.com/watch?v=Ymd4PiAqkuk> for the audio.

<sup>18</sup> This is related by al-Bukhārī (no. 3124) and Muslim (no. 1747).

<sup>19</sup> Refer to <http://ar.miraath.net/fatwah/5091>.

he will come back empty-handed and will have nothing left but **unproven assumptions** in his pockets despite the deceptive glitter of all the physics and maths built upon them. The theoretical and mathematical coherence or even elegance of a model does not equate to actual physical reality because models can be reverse engineered to fit all observations. This is recognised by the smartest of the physicists and astronomers and is stated by them, and they say that whatever model you choose comes back down to your ideology as has been cited from George Ellis earlier. Because of this, there are statements from prominent scientists and historians of science that there is no difference between a heliocentric or geocentric model, its just a **matter of preference** which is heavily influenced by prior convictions and ideology. **Stephen Hawking** wrote: “So which is real, the Ptolemaic or the Copernican system? Although it is not uncommon for people to say that Copernicus proved Ptolemy wrong, that is not true. As in the case of our normal view versus that of the goldfish, one can use either picture as a model of the universe, for our observations of the heavens can be explained by assuming either the earth or the sun to be at rest.”<sup>20</sup>

◆ **So when it is the case that even the most famous, non-Muslim, atheist scientists are acknowledging that the claim of a heliocentric (Copernican) model being an established factual reality is not true and that it is purely a matter of preference and of one’s prior ideology as to**

---

<sup>20</sup> Stephen Hawking. *The Grand Design*, Bantam (2011) pages 41-42.

**whether you place the sun in the centre or the Earth, then why are Muslims siding with sun-worshippers, astrologers, occultists, kabbalists, magicians and other misguided wandering strayers over and above the explicit revealed texts and the concensus of the Muslims? Allāh ul-Musta‘ān!**

The Quran and Sunnah are explicit that the sun is in motion (as is the moon) and that they both orbit a fixed, motionless earth. These motions give rise to the phenomena of the night and day, time measurement (the day through the sun and the month through the moon) and they facilitate sustenance and activity (in the day) and rest (at night). Hence, this is not about models or ideology, it is the knowledge of Allāh, the Mighty and Majestic who said:

أَلَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ خَلَقَ وَهُوَ اللَّطِيفُ الْخَبِيرُ

**Should He not know who created? And He is the Most Kind and all-Aware. (67:14).**

Hence, it is not permissible for any Muslim to put the ramblings, speculations and outright lies of the astrologers, occultists, sun-worshippers and sorcerers ahead of the speech of Allāh (سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى), because this amounts to belief in tāghūt and takdhīb of Allāh (سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى). It is belief in tāghūt as alluded to by Shaykh al-Tuwayjurī in his writings on modern astronomy because these people claim knowledge of the affairs of the unseen in Allāh’s creation through their speculations and ramblings. There is no difference between fortune-tellers who claim



knowledge of the unseen and the modern day scientists who claim knowledge of the secrets of the universe through their lies, fabrications and inventions. One receives the whisperings of the shayāṭīn first and then brings out his glass ball to deceive his audience and the other also receives whisperings and then brings out his mathemagics to deceive his audience.<sup>21</sup>

Abu Iyaad

---

<sup>21</sup> The empirical science of the 19th century in which great developments were made in the field of physics was replaced by the speculative, conjectural science of the 20th century in which theory validated by maths was used to determine the nature of physical reality. This is because all experiments designed to detect Earth's motion and its effect upon physical processes on Earth (such as propagation of light) failed to demonstrate any motion. This was a huge crisis in physics and astronomy at the end of the 19th century and there were only two alternatives. To accept that the Earth is stationary or to rewrite physics and everything that had thus far been empirically determined and understood regarding the phenomena of electricity, light and magnetism and the nature of time, space and matter. Rejecting the first out of ideological reasons—because it would mean the invalidation of Copernican dogma—the second option was chosen, and this is what led to the empirical physics of the 19th century being replaced with the theoretical, thought-experiment, imaginary physics of the 20th century. One must distinguish between **inductive theory** which has an actual basis in reality as it involves generalisations based on actual experience and **inventive theory** which is the pure invention of the mind, it is nothing but abstraction validated by maths. The first—though imperfect—leads to a good approximation of reality over time and will tend to be correct conceptually, physically (in the real world) and mathematically. There will be coherence in all of these areas. The second leads to fiction and make-believe and will be correct mathematically only. That is, it will be correct only on the paper it is written and not in physical reality.

**@abuiyaadsp**

14/04/1439 (1.36)