

CH. DAMIEN'S SYSTEM.
FRENCH IN THREE MONTHS!

REVISED EDITION, 1902.

We have much pleasure in recommending the above work.

The booklet contains the three thousand words, and idioms, which are most used in ordinary conversation; sufficient to enable you to talk French all your life; no fossil philological peculiarities, but French as it is actually spoken in France. Grammar underlies each group of examples, and we think this a cleverly condensed method of teaching the French language.

The Author of *French in Three Months* also gives Lessons in Conversational French to adults, at

128, CROMWELL ROAD, LONDON, S.W.;

AND

64, ROSSLYN HILL, HAMPSTEAD, N.W.

Friends of the Ed. of this Magazine can testify to his ability and agreeable way of teaching.

The Magnetic Nerve Invigorator Co.,

JONATHAN NICHOLSON,

22, Budge Row, Cannon Street,

LONDON, E.C.

Price of Appliances £1 1s., £2 2s., & £3 3s.

Instalments may be arranged.

THE EARTH.

VOL. III.

Nos. 37 & 38.

AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER.

CELESTIAL PHENOMENA.

The following article will form a reply to several enquirers.

"The heavens declare the glory of God." In spite of "the fool" having "said in his heart, there is no God," the above statement, which forms the opening words of the 19th Psalm, is an admirable fact, which can be grasped and appreciated by all classes and kinds of God-fearing men and women.

"And the firmament showeth His handiwork." These words are as true now as they were when they were written by the Sweet Psalmist of Israel hundreds of years ago.

The Psalmist goes on to say: "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge." Let us listen to the "speech" uttered, and profit by the "knowledge" shown daily.

"There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard," yet the heavens speak not in an unknown tongue, nor to any one nation, but the significance of what they declare may be understood by enlightened men of various nationalities; and without the gift or the cultivation of tongues.

"Their line (or rule) is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." This shows that the heavenly bodies have influence, power or "rule" all through the earth.

"In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun."

These statements harmonize with the statements made in the beginning of Inspired Writ, viz.: that the sun and moon are "two great lights" which were made by the Creator to give light upon the earth—and to rule over the day and over the night, and divide the light from the darkness—and also to be for signs and for seasons and for days and years."

The Book of Job is supposed by many students not only to be the oldest book in the Bible, but the oldest book in existence.

Different stars, and constellations are referred to and named in it by names which are familiar to us, and it is evident that the knowledge of pure astrology (which was originally one and the same thing as astronomy) has been handed down to us from the Creator, through Adam and Seth. Josephus informs us that to the antediluvians we are indebted for very much that is known on this subject.

He states that Adam was instructed by the Creator Himself who ordered Seth to write the rudiments of the knowledge regarding the heavenly bodies which He had imparted to Adam upon permanent tables of stone, which Josephus says he had himself seen.

And these tables included a tabulation of eclipses.

The path of the moon is like the path of the sun—a spiral—and when the moon's path crosses that of the sun, there is an eclipse, if both bodies are in conjunction.

We believe that knowledge relating to the stars as "signs" has to some extent ceased, or been perverted.

The sign of the "Star in the East" was understood by wise men, or Magi, when our Lord was born on earth (*Matt.* ii. 9). Since then we have no inspired record of men being guided by the stars; but it is quite possible that a deeper knowledge may be imparted to faithful followers of the Truth respecting God's Works in Creation.

When we study the Word of God, and consider the perfect order of the universe, we cannot help perceiving a perfect and divine precision underlying all visible things created; and an invisible power *behind* the scenes, directing and governing the whole. Even the weakest of sin-crippled human intellect can scarcely fail to see the Creator's care of, and provision for, His creatures, if they only study His Works. Our Lord told us that the hairs of our heads are numbered, as also are the stars in heaven above.

But in addition to this we have the sure testimony of Inspired Writ in *Isa.* xl. 26, wherein the prophet by power of the Holy Spirit says:

"Lift up your eyes on high, and see who hath created these, that bringeth out their host by number. He calleth them all by name; by the greatness of His might, and

for that He is strong in power, not one is lacking.' (R.V.)

The psalmist also states that "He telleth the number of the stars; He giveth them all their names."—*Ps.* cxlvii. 4 (R.V.)

The heavens are described in Scripture as "spread out as a canopy or tent"—and so do they appear.

The outstretched heavens above appear a "dome,"
To everyone on earth, where'er he roam.

In the beginning it appears that Draco was the Polar star, the change having taken place "owing to the slow recession of what is called the pole of the heavens. The same movement which has changed the relative positions of these two stars has also caused the constellation of the Southern Cross to become invisible in northern latitudes. The Southern Cross was just visible in the latitude of Jerusalem at the time of the first coming of our Lord. Since then, through the gradual recession of the Polar star, it has not been seen in Northern latitudes." See *The Witness of the Stars*, by Dr. E. W. Bullinger.*

The sun takes his course through the Heavens, passing through the twelve signs of the Zodiac, or about one sign for each month.

The sun's path through the constellations is called the ecliptic. But there is also an annual difference, because the sun does not come back exactly to the same spot in the sign when he commences the year, but a little behind. If the fixed stars daily revolved around the earth at exactly the same rate of speed as the sun (which they do not), and if the sun started at exactly the same place each succeeding year, the signs would correspond with the months, and calculations regarding star motions would be simplified.

The sun passes through the twelve signs every year, but in consequence of the slow precession of the equinoxes the sun commences the year in the same sign for centuries.

The celestial equator is the sun's path around the heavens, at the vernal or the autumnal equinox, and if it were possible to stand in the centre of this great circle, the stars and sun and moon would appear to move around without

* Published by Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode, Great New Street.

ever rising or setting. But both north and South of the equator the stars rise and set obliquely. On the equator they appear to rise and set at right angles to the spectator.

The points where the two great circles cross each other, or intersect, are called the equinoctial points and the slow and gradual movement of these points is termed the "precession of the equinoxes."

The relative speeds and various motions of the heavenly bodies are governed by their various heights and declinations. "The more rapidly a star or planet revolves, and the higher its distance from the earth, and the greater its distance from the centre of revolution, and vice versa, the more slowly a star goes around and above the earth, and the less is its height above the earth and the less its distance from the centre of revolution. Thus their velocities are proportionate to their heights, and to their distances from the North Centre." But to make their daily circles "Zetetes" states that: the whole of the "ether," or whatever other name we like to give to the subtle matter above our atmosphere which fills all the space between the earth's plane surface and the firmamental vault of heaven—and in which all the heavenly bodies are contained and move, the whole substance of this subtle fluid is in a state of flux, like a great stream continually going around the polar centres, and carrying all the heavenly bodies with it at various heights, according to their different densities, all being light and comparatively small bodies. But this flux is not like an ordinary stream where all the currents flow at the same general level and rate, nor is it like those streams which flow quicker in the middle and slower at the sides, but rather, in shape at least, it is something like the great Maelstrom, or whirlpool, off the coast of Norway; that is, like a great funnel with the tube or hole pointing downwards through which the mighty current flows into unknown subterranean, or submarine regions.

This explains also the action of the dipping needle.

A correspondent owns that "the sun *appears* to travel in a daily circle around the heavens, but this is only an optical delusion and that it is really the earth that is moving."

Now with all due respect to the one who makes the above statement; in reply to his query as to how we can disprove this. I should like to ask him and others of the same mind if they can prove that the apparent motion of the heavenly

bodies is not real. Experimental tests have been made to see if the earth has any motion, and no motion such as is assumed by the astronomers has ever been discovered. Why then should we not believe that the "apparent" motion of the heavenly bodies is real? We want something better than the unfounded assumptions of modern astronomers. We can see the heavenly bodies move, and being only comparatively small bodies of light revolving round and above the earth in the great ethereal stream, it is to us much more reasonable to believe that these "lights" are in motion circling over the earth, as they appear to do, than to believe that a ponderous body, like the earth, weighing millions upon millions of tons should be suspended in space like a feather; rushing away through "space" in its so-called orbit, and tumbling topsy turvey, carrying us all head over heels in its regular and periodical revolutions while tearing away forever round the sun! It is absurd and we cannot believe it.

This then is our reply for the present to correspondents who merely affirm that "although the sun appears to travel a daily circle it is only an optical delusion."

We have given proof that the delusion is on the other side. It has been proved in *The Earth*, by mathematical calculations as well as by the evidence of our senses, that the sun is neither large enough nor high enough to light all the earth at one time but only about one half of it. And this is not only owing to the comparatively small size of the sun, but as has been shown by "Zetetes," it is also owing to the fact that when the rays of the sun strike our atmosphere they are refracted, or bent out of a straight path; and when by perspective the sun goes sufficiently far off from any particular locality its rays are deflected by the atmosphere so that they do not reach the earth at all, and darkness ensues. This is a wise provision of the Creator that when darkness comes over the earth, the creatures of His power being only of limited strength may take their nightly repose and be refreshed with sleep. The sun still going his daily round lights up other parts of the earth far distant from us and comes round next morning to wake us with his bright and cheering rays. Thus again do the "heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

(to be continued.)

MAN'S PLACE IN THE UNIVERSE.

(continued from p. 210).

PART II.

We have hitherto been concerned chiefly with the ideal universe of the New Astronomy, for which we have found no adequate proof offered in fact. The heading of Mr. Wallace's paper would have been more harmonious with his subject had it been "Man's Place in the theoretical Universe of the Astronomer." But it is *Man's Place in THE Universe*; so that we have a right to expect *the* Universe of Fact and not a Universe of Fiction. This is a very different thing; yet the Fiction is generally assumed and the Fact quietly ignored, as though there were no question about it. Yet Mr. W. is credited in some departments of science as a keen observer of facts. Why then does he reason here on a hypothetical basis? If men will reason so, and start out on the basis of a fictitious universe, they are likely to go wrong, not only with respect to "Man's Place" therein, but also with respect to man's proper nature.

Those who look upon the Universe as a conglomeration of blind or evolutionary forces, unconsciously acting on matter, cannot offer man anything better than a final and a fatal dissolution. Their philosophy is a kind of physical fatalism, over the portals of which may be inscribed—"All hope abandon, ye who enter here." Grant Allen, writing of the so-called Laws of Nature, says:

"They take no heed of man or man's deserving,
Reck not what happy lives they make or mar,
Work out their fatal will unswerved, unswerving,
And know not what they are!"

What a dismal outlook for man on this hypothesis! But I am glad to note that Mr. W. does not seem to accept this blank outlook of physical fatalism. He says he takes "the view of those who believe in some intelligent Cause at the back of this universe, some creator or creators, some designer or designers."

This, while it renders hope possible for man, is not satisfactory. It is neither clear nor philosophical. We need

something for faith to rest upon better than "some Intelligent cause," even though it have a capital "I." We need an *Adequate Cause*; and that cause must be *One*, not a plurality, for the Universe is one. But Theosophy teaches that men may be their own "creators," their own saviours, and the "designers" of their own salvation and destiny; hence the plurals are deftly inserted in the above quotation. Here we have the "gods many and lords many" of the apostle's day. But as Paul says:—"To *us* (primitive Christians) there is but ONE GOD, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge."—1 *Cor.* viii. 6. This is the simple but grand creed of primitive Christianity, "howbeit there is not in every man this knowledge," and even Grant Allen, whom Mr. W. quotes, says:

"The purely monotheistic conception of a single supreme God, the Creator and upholder of all things, had been reached centuries before the birth of the Man Jesus. Christianity borrowed from Judaism this concept, and, humanly speaking, proceeded to spoil it by its addition of the Son and Holy Ghost."

Mr. Allen in his doctrine of Evolution fails to discriminate between a pure and primitive Christianity, which held to the grand conception of One only God who created the Universe, and a subsequent and corrupted form of Christianity which added on the pagan doctrine of a Trinity of three equal and co-eternal personal Gods. But, nevertheless, I commend to Mr. W.'s notice what Mr. Allen acknowledges is a "sublime" conception; and I submit that the prophets of Israel, the teachers who gave us this "magnificent concept"—even centuries before the birth of that unparalleled Man who claimed to be (not God, but) the Son of God—these teachers, I say, must be worthy of our respectful attention in regard to what they have to say, both of the Universe at large and man's little place in that Universe.

THE EARTH AS ADAPTED FOR LIFE.

Under this heading Mr. Wallace has made some good points to show that the earth alone is fit for human hab-

itation. But his frequent reference to the earth as a "planet," with other astronomical fictions detracts somewhat from their value. He discusses the adaptability of "other planets" for the *development* of organic life. It is of course with him "development"—evolution—for creation as revealed in the Bible is out of the question in his articles. Yet if there be anything tangible behind the "magnificent concept" of the Jewish teachers, Mr. W. must own that such Creation was not only possible but highly probable. However, we will briefly notice his reasons for thinking that the earth alone is adapted for life; and that the required conditions can be found "on no other planet."

These conditions refer to the presence of an atmosphere, suitable temperatures, and the presence and circulation of plenty of water. We need water, of course at a temperature somewhere between the freezing and boiling points; so that it would not do to be too far off the sun, like Neptune, or too near like Mercury.

If all the waters of the earth were frozen we should die; and if they approached boiling point it would be equally detrimental! The temperature of "space," we are told, is "about—273° C., while that of the sun is about 9,000° C." According to this it must be pretty warm near the sun, yet when we ascend a mountain, and so get nearer to that orb, we find it is colder. This reminds us of the assertion of the astronomer's that we are about three millions of miles nearer to the sun in winter than in summer; as though it were not always winter somewhere!

But to return to Mr. Wallace. He realizes what a combination of favourable conditions must exist "to preserve on the surface of a planet a degree of heat which shall never for any considerable time fall below 0° C., or rise above, say 75° C." And these narrow limits he proceeds to affirm "must be continuously maintained, not for hundreds or thousands only, but for millions, perhaps for *hundreds of millions of years.*" (Italics, his.) There you have it! "Hundreds of millions of years"! I should much like to see the *tabulation* of some of these "millions of years," with the events on the earth answering thereto; and some of the eclipses, or transits, in the heavens thrown in. How these "scientists" talk, and write of millions of miles, and millions of years! Of course it looks big and "scientific."

It is comforting, however, to know that *we* are (1) at a suitable distance from the sun, that its rays may "evaporate sufficient water to produce clouds, rain, and a system of river circulation." (2) That our "atmosphere is of sufficient extent and density;" and since this is supposed to be "dependent on the mass of a planet," Mars is "unsuitable" as a place to live in. We think so too, and we must, therefore, give up the expectation of any "message from Mars." We Zetetics say the same, as I have said before; and I am glad to find at least one scientist on the side of Zetetics as regards this planet. If Mars be unsuitable for life, as we think it is, it must be extreme folly to expect "messages" therefrom.

I am also glad to find that Mr. W. says:—"The want of a satellite (like our moon) may alone render Venus quite unsuitable for the development of high forms of life." It is, therefore, fortunate that we were not born on Venus. Let us hope we never shall be; though we may notice, in passing, it is again, and everywhere, "development," or evolution, which Mr. W. advocates. And this assumes "reincarnation." (4) The average depth of our ocean is further said to be correct, being "about thirteen times that of the land which rises above their level." These oceans are "level" then, which we think is a good point in our favour; and they help to keep up "uniform temperatures during the whole period ('millions of years') of the *development* of life upon the earth." We are further informed that "It is extremely improbable that this remarkable condition obtains in any *other* planet." We think so too, "extremely improbable"! (5) Lastly, we are assured that the inhabitants of this "planet," the earth, have a sufficient and "uninterrupted supply of atmospheric dust." How and why this is so is fully explained in Mr. W.'s *Wonderful Century*; but as I have not seen a copy of this wonderful work I cannot give Zetetics the explanation. But speaking locally, and for this season of the year—summer—I can assure my readers that in Leicester we do have an "uninterrupted supply of atmospheric dust"; and more, I think, than is needed for all sanitary purposes. How and why this is so I need not pause to explain; however, it is consoling to know that we are all well supplied in this respect; and this may account in some degree for the fact that unvaccinated Leicester not only has a low death rate but is more free

from small-pox than many other towns. Mr. Wallace tells us that plenty of dust, with "constant winds to distribute it," is "among the permanent essentials of a GLOBE fitted for the *development* of intellectual life." Under the circumstances this is about the best proof we have seen that the earth *is* a globe whirling through "space," and so causing plenty of dust to be flying about everywhere. This may further explain why the astronomers generally throw dust in our eyes when we seek for proof of the earth's sphericity.

ZETETES.

(to be continued.)

FLOODS AND FLATS.

Floods and Flats go together; and our month of June has just afforded us most abundant proof of the above aphorism in tremendous downpours of rain, which have converted whole villages into lakes, such that the roads have disappeared and the inhabitants have been driven to the necessity of getting about in boats.

This adds one more to the long list of proofs that the earth is at once flat and stationary. If you doubt this try and make a flood on a pile of cannon shot, and see how you get on. Or you may try the Great Wheel, placing an immense sponge bath at top in which you may even swim about; then let the wheel be turned just a trifle, and lo! away goes your lake at the top, and you may have a narrow escape from being swept down with the torrent of water out of your (till then) convenient swimming bath.

Perhaps you prefer to have your swimming bath at the bottom of the wheel. If so, we turn the wheel in the fashion of a grindstone, and once more the water, or flood, is thrown out at a tangent, and yourself with it, and you may have time to reflect why a grindstone disproves the rotation of the earth.

The earth, you observe, is said to rotate and carry the oceans round with it; but the grindstone throws it all off—and why? Simply because it cannot carry it round of course, and also because water is that sort of stuff which

cannot be carried round but insists on making its own flood there and then, on the instant, and in the exact compass and locality which suits it. Thus the grindstone shoots the water off at the bottom because it is water flood and *flat*, and *flatly* refuses to alter its flat shape to suit the grindstone, which is *round*.

You see flat and round deliberately fall out and the flat flood falls flat because it will *not* fall any other way, turn you the grindstone ever so wisely, so swiftly, so coaxingly, or any other way you please.

Just so with the earth. It cannot turn *and* carry the oceans round with it, because the oceans are flood water, and on the *outside* of it, like the water on the grindstone, or the swimming bath at the bottom of the great wheel, and of course the motion merely displaces the water or flood and causes it to seek a fresh abiding place. If the earth turned then the same would occur with the oceans—they also would be displaced, and would have to seek fresh abiding places.

The persistent rain of June has therefore done good work in affording ample proof by its numerous and more or less disastrous floods, that such floods must have local *flats* to rest upon, and that such flats—as meadows and miles of submerged country—must in their turn be stationary, and totally the reverse of parts of a spinning and rotating earth. No doubt the whole area of Great Britain has suffered from the heavy rainfall, and the inconvenient floods which have been caused by it, but certain localities are specially mentioned as heavily visited.

Royal Windsor always suffers severely on these occasions, and the races at Royal Ascot have also been seriously shorn of their splendour. It will, indeed, be strange if these visitations of rain and flood fail to exercise some correcting influence on the minds of those loyal residents in the Royal Borough who still persistently maintain the rotation, and globular shape of the earth, all of which is once more disproved by these very floods of the month of June, 1903.

Not only has England been the flat recipient of this continuous downpour, but the Continent has also made its lap for a few drops, whilst even New York has stood still with its umbrella on the stretch for fear it should be given the trouble to dust.

Then earthquakes have also been alternating with the

showers, as if to make the whole visitation the more impressive. Several sharp shocks of earthquake have been felt in Wales, and slight movements of the earth have been experienced even in England proper, all pointing to the same conclusion, viz. : that the earth must be stationary, or else the very slight shocks could not be felt at all. Those in Wales were not slight, but very marked indeed, and assumed quite a threatening aspect; whilst the lesson they teach is always one and the same, viz. : that the earth is fixed and stationary, but liable to be locally shaken—the faintest tremour of which can be detected, and its direction usually traced.

There are now certain instruments made which detect earthquakes—no matter how slight they may be—and it follows as an argument, on the planist side of the question, that these delicate instruments would be useless on a flashing and rotating globe. It is necessary for the earth to be stationary in order to permit such delicate instruments to act.

All this would be impossible on a Swing-about, swaying, and rotating globe.

St. Leonards-on-Sea.

E. MIDDLETON.

MORE ANTARCTICA.

In their reports, it is rather strange such giants of navigation, and close observers, as Captains Cook, Ross, Weddell, and others, do not mention having seen the sun at midnight during their voyages in the forbidding regions of the extreme south.

According to some recent hints in the press, such phenomena is stated as having been observed by the British Antarctic Expedition, though it is only mentioned by the way, without expatiation; if this is a fact, planists are quite prepared with good evidence against the globular theory (see "Zetetes" lucid remarks on this point in past numbers of *The Earth*), though they have not the slightest necessity to rely on the peculiar movements and appearance of the

heavenly bodies, to prove their case up to the hilt, irrespective of such phenomena.

In a notice on the relief ship of the expedition, *The Sphere* of May 30th, 1903, states: "The *Morning* got away only just in time, for on March 3rd she was jammed in newly formed ice. On March 5th, at 2 a.m., *the nights being dark*, she was surrounded by seventeen large icebergs and countless smaller ones. It was like steering a bicycle through a graveyard full of tombstones with your eyes shut."

There evidently was not much midnight sun at this time as the nights were dark, and, owing to the ice, navigation was risky. Whether such a sight as a midnight sun was observed on previous dates the account did not state. Under any circumstances planists can with calmness wait for verified information on this point, as it is immaterial to their position, which must continue to strengthen with further reliable investigation.

Recently, the press has been informing the public "what the Antarctic discoverers have done;" whether this is worth the expense and risk involved is a questionable point. Zetetic philosophers know one thing such expeditions *cannot* do, with all their undoubted courage and splendid appliances, and that is, *prove the World a globe*.

Up to the present, the knowledge of the southern regions has advanced very little since the days of Captains Cook, Ross, and a few others, who had to tackle the work in ill equipped vessels, and with very crude appliances; but when trumpets sound, learned (?) societies dispute and clatter, and concentrated foods, with all the best apparatus, are provided *ad. lib.*, the thinking public expect a more enlightening budget of information than some already to hand, as for example: "Poplar, one of the ship's cats after being accidentally injured, was thrown overboard twice without the desired effect." "The Parry mountains not existing, are purely mythical;" *like the globular theory* (italics ours); "Mount Erebus was smoking splendidly." "We steamed 600 miles along the Great Barrier;" *if this had been continued, they should soon have arrived at Enderby Land, and round the bottom of a globe* (italics ours). "At 79 deg. 35 min. south the captain went up in a balloon, but could not see any land." "All the dogs died." "We wintered 400 miles further south than anyone has done up to the present, having reached 82 deg. 17 min. south." "Vince lost his life."

But many are hopeful, when Capt. Scott comes home, he will give the world something worth thinking on; always providing his notes are not allowed to be edited and garbled (like Capt. Cook's) by a D.D. or some other globe-biassed individual, in order to square them with their doomed theory.

If the world be a globe, a carefully logged circumnavigation in the extreme southern regions ought to be a very simple, rapid, and not over costly affair; the inner circle of the so-called scientific cult know this, and that such a test will smash their pet theory, and so bring upon them the universal contempt their position deserves. Any unbiassed person will at once see there is something radically wrong on looking at a school map or paste-board globe, and then consider that—on the authority of a southern ship-owner, and others—the actual logged distance of the direct westerly course from Hobart Town, Tasmania, to Durban, South Africa, is quite 9,000 miles along the 45 par. of south lat. Think of this!

Many consider that the government was quite justified in halting, before voting more extra funds for the present British Antarctic Expedition, as enough money has already been expended to prove the *main point*, if the business had been allowed to be carried out with the right motive, viz.: truth seeking. Again, many do not entirely agree with the usual *relieving business*, which so many past Arctic Expeditions resolved themselves into. No one wishes brave men to be lost for the sake of a little timely help, but too much reliance should not be placed on such methods. To say the least of it, it is not business-like for Jim to be rash, and rely on being relieved by Bill, and then the latter to rely on the assistance of another expedition under Jack.

From a National, and right stand-point, all that is really necessary at present is an exact logged circumnavigation at about 55° or 60° South. This would at once settle the fact, that the world is *not* a globe; after which the globe-professors could at *their own expense and risk*, make excursions to these southern regions, to get frozen in, geologize or fish through holes in the ice to their hearts' content; and the people would be well rid of them if they stopped there.

The circumnavigation suggested would no doubt be a big business; but not so big, fruitless, or costly, as that of being

frozen-in, and wintering so many miles nearer a non-existent spot or point—called the South Pole—than anyone else, beside risking health and losing life in the effort.

REGEDDA.

STELLAR MOTION.

Of all persons in the world Zetetics must not form *hypotheses*; or draw hasty conclusions; or build up any theories on what they observe. They are emphatically *seekers* while others are *reasoners*.

The primer of astronomy prepared by the late Richard Proctor for the London School Board commences with the words:

"Astronomy is a science whose facts are based upon reasoning."

Never was a truer word written as to what is called "modern astronomy."

Never was a falser statement recorded if it refers to any true "science."

Never was a sadder confession made by men who arrogate to themselves the title of *scientists*.

"Facts" are facts, and "reasoning" is reasoning. A "fact" is *a thing done*, which no reasoning in the world can ever affect or alter. "Reasoning" can be based on a fact; but a "fact" can never be based on reasoning.

Science is the Latin *Scientia* which means knowledge. It is *what we know*, apart from all reasoning. Hypothesis is the opposite of this, and is only *what we think*.

Zetetics must be careful to remember these elementary truths; and while they *seek* out facts, and observe them, and collect their *data*, they must not fall into the mistake of "astronomers" and substitute their reasoning about these facts for the facts themselves.

Euclid furnishes us with a useful guide as to the observation of facts, or rather as how we should deal with them and reason about them.

When it cannot be proved that one thing is equal to another, it has to be proved that the one cannot be greater,

and that it cannot be less than the other. Then the conclusion is that it must be the same in size.

So with an observed fact; say the disappearance of ships at sea. We must not say that it is caused by the globular shape of the earth, because that is only assuming the very thing that we are *seeking* to find out. It must be shown to us that such disappearance could not be caused in any other way. It has not been so shown, and therefore it proves nothing; and nothing is proved beyond the *fact* that ships do disappear. That is a fact.

Now we, who are *seeking* for truth, contend that the disappearance of ships at sea may be caused by other phenomena. It may be due to the laws of perspective. Or, there may be other causes of which we are ignorant.

One thing is clear, and that is, that such disappearance does not prove the rotundity of the earth, because it has not been proved that there is no other explanation to be given.

Or, take the tides. The fact as to the tides is observed by all. But that they are caused by gravitation is not proved; unless and until it is proved that nothing else could cause them.

Do not let us be drawn into the snare which besets astronomers. They are tethered by their hypotheses, and can never really discover anything, because whatever they observe it must be explained by their hypotheses. It is a case of *chose jugée*, with them; but that is contrary to the very foundation of real science.

Or, take *Eclipses*. We know *what we see* and nothing more. By a careful *observation* their cycles were known ages ago, many centuries before modern astronomy was dreamed of.

We know also, the popular explanation, that eclipses are caused by the motions of the earth and its shape; and therefore the conclusion is drawn that the earth is a globe. But this is the very thing which we are seeking to prove. It is quite true if that be the *only* explanation that can be given. But this is the very point in question.

Our position is that it has not yet been shown that this is the *only* reasoning that explains the phenomenon.

We should be just as illogical on our side if we said that eclipses *must* be caused by the revolution of a dark satellite.

That would, of course, cause the phenomenon, therefore we say this *may* be the cause. But, nevertheless, we admit that it is not proved. Eclipses do not *prove* that the earth has a dark satellite; but a dark satellite would cause eclipses; but this is no proof that such a satellite exists, or that eclipses are caused by it.

We are *Zetetics*, or *seekers*, and of all people in the world it is not for us to base our facts upon reasoning; but to observe our facts and collect our *data*, drawing no conclusions until we have them all. We must neither accept as proof from others, or state it as from ourselves that such and such must be the explanation of a fact, until all other explanations are exhausted and can be ruled out. Then we shall all be shut up to the only explanation that is left.

As *Zetetics* we cannot be called upon to *explain* anything, we are *seekers*, and our very position protects us from any demand that we shall or must explain any phenomena.

About the earth we do know many facts. Its motion has never yet been proved! But proofs innumerable, from Geodesy to Ballooning, prove that it is so founded and established that it cannot be moved.

But when we "consider the heavens" the case is different. There we observe that everything is in motion. We observe that there is a great variety in these motions. There is the motion of the sun, and the motion of the moon; the motion of the planets. These latter are called *asteres planates*, or wandering stars, because they have a peculiar motion of their own. Astronomers speak of "apparent motion" and "real motion," but this is assuming the very thing that has to be proved. We say that we believe the "apparent" motion *is* the "real" motion, and we must believe this until the contrary be proved.

Then there is the motion of *Comets*; the motion of the fixed stars, rising in the east and setting in the west; others never rising and setting but revolving round a central star.

Do we know all about stellar motion yet? Have we all the *data*? Is there nothing more to be learned? May we say we have all the facts and may sit down and reason about them?

Take for instance the motion of the stars in what is called the South Pole. Our grievance is that we cannot get at the facts. One writer says that the stars there do not rise

and set, but that they revolve round a central point, as the stars revolve at the North Pole. Others, who are travellers, speak of the Southern Cross rising and setting.

What are the facts? This is the simple question that we as Zetetics, seek to find out.

The writer once enquired of a friend in the South, and begged him to watch the motions of the southern stars. He put our letter in the newspaper there, instead of observing for himself and for us; and the following answer was given:

“Of course, it cannot rise or set, because the earth is a globe, having a southern Pole.”

But this is the very thing we were seeking to find out, which is thus quietly assumed! And thus we are at present shut up to and shut out from that which we are *seeking* to find out.

Now, suppose, it shall be clearly shown that the stars in the extreme south do have a different motion, and do revolve round a common centre, as in the North. That would not prove either that the earth is a globe, or that it moves. It would only prove that certain stars have that peculiar motion, different from other stars. It would not prove anything as to the shape of the earth, unless and until it should be also shown that the stellar motion in question could not arise from any other cause.

This, of course, could not be shown.

We are anxious in this article to warn Zetetics not to fall into the snare of astronomers, and be so ready to come forward with their explanations. It is not for us to explain but to *seek*.

Our opponents are only too eager to get us to give our explanations of the phenomena, in order that they may deal with ours as easily as we deal with and expose the falsity of theirs.

Do not let us come down from our high platform.

Do not let us leave our impregnable position. Do not let us take off our strong armour and lay ourselves open to certain defeat.

Let us be content to examine their observations, and expose their false reasonings, while we continue our special work and *seek* after the truth.

WHAT SAITH AND TEACHETH THE HOLY SCRIPTURES CONCERNING THE EARTH AND THE SUN.

REFERENCES.

The Creator and Maker of the Earth, &c.—Whom? Of the earth,—God: *Gen.* i. 9, 10; *Isa.* xlv. 12; *Ps.* cxv. 15. Of the sun and moon,—God: *Gen.* i. 16.

As the potter knoweth what shape he mouldeth his clay, so knoweth God, what shape He maketh the earth.

THE EARTH.

Its Shape is: ‘circle’—*Isa.* xl. 22; ‘ends’—*Isa.* xl. 28, xli. 5, xlii. 10, *Job* xxviii. 24, xxxviii. 13, *Deut.* xiii. 17, *Ps.* xlvi. 10, lxix. 13, cxxxv. 7, *Zech.* ix. 13; ‘four corners’—*Isa.* xiii. 12, *Ezek.* vii. 2, *Rev.* vii. 1; ‘spread forth the earth’—*Ps.* cxxxvi. 6; ‘stretched out the heavens as a curtain’ (*Ps.* civ. 3) and spreadeth them out as a *tent*—*Isa.* xl. 22; ‘the heavens and stretched them forth, ... spread abroad the earth’—*Isa.* xlii. 5, xlv. 24, *Ps.* civ. 2, *Jer.* li. 15.

A globe, ball, or sphere has NO ‘ends,’ being all round alike; nor ‘corners,’ only quarters without corners; neither can it be *spread* out. Nor ‘the heavens which are above the earth,’—*Ps.* ciii.; ‘heaven, ... the earth beneath,’—*Ex.* xx. 4; be stretched out as a curtain, or spread out like a tent. Having an ‘end,’—*Ps.* xix. 6; *Isa.* xlii. 5. If the earth was either a globe, ball, or sphere, the heavens would *surround* it with *no* end, instead of being stretched or spread *above* it *with* end.

A. H. WEST.

Owing to various causes many interesting items, including letters, accounts of meetings, lectures, &c., are unavoidably held over, and will be dealt with in our next issue.

The three questions submitted by Mr. H. Lock, and which the Ed. would have particularly wished to answered, will also be replied to in our next number.

DOES THE EARTH ROTATE?

I have received a June copy of *Past and Future*, edited by Mr. J. B. Dimpleby. In it the editor has a reply to my article in the June issue of *The Earth*, headed "The Rotation of the Earth, and How to Observe It."

Mr. Dimpleby refers to *The Earth* as "a monthly in support of a flat and motionless earth." He says that he has no wish "to engage in controversy with a class of persons who love the Word of God." I can say that I reciprocate the kindly feeling intimated in this remark; but I would remind Mr. Dimpleby again, as I have said before, that my motto is "Principles not men." I have no feeling against Mr. Dimpleby personally; nor have I any personal feeling against any man, whether it be the Pope of Rome, Mr. Pigott Brigham Young, or Dr. Teed (Koresh), because I differ from their religious beliefs—mere individual men, I judge not, nor condemn in my mind—I dare not do so. But doctrines false, and practices absurd—these I must not only *condemn*, but, with every force I can summon to my aid, I must fight against them, and strive to crush them.

We think that Mr. Dimpleby is unwittingly doing the Bible considerable damage in the minds of men with regard to Cosmogony. But I repeat again, that my contention is against his errors and inconsistency as a writer on Bible subjects, and not against him personally.

In answering my article which appeared in *The Earth* we should have thought Mr. Dimpleby would have given his readers more proof of supposed motions. I offered him space in *The Earth* if he could give me one good proof of the earth's axial or orbital motion. He has not accepted that offer. Dare he make me a similar offer, to publish in his paper an argument against the earth's supposed motions? I shall see.

We have admitted matter in *The Earth* from his supporters, would he admit in *Past and Future* matter from myself and my supporters? If his position be true, and unimpeachable, he should not be afraid of it being discussed fairly and openly. Because if he is right he could show it; and if I and my supporters are right in believing in a motionless earth, then he is doing a grievous wrong in supporting the

editor of *The Clarion*, and infidel science as taught in the globular theory of the earth.

Mr. Dimpleby owns that the astronomy of the Chronological Observatory cannot easily disprove my position, and that of all Zetetics, viz.: that God "hath founded the earth on its bases that it cannot be removed;" and therefore it is motionless. But, nevertheless, Mr. Dimpleby thinks that the "British Chronological Association can do it on the question of time."

But we fail to see what the question of time has to do with the shape of the earth, and the motions of the sun, moon, and planets. These motions are the same whatever theory we hold about the shape of the earth. Mr. Dimpleby should know this. In fact he does know it, for he admitted as much in the year 1897 A.D. (5895½ A.M.), when he published the ninth edition of his book of *Past Time*. On page 129 of this book he says that to whatever system of astronomy is believed it would not affect the question on Chronology.

Under the head, *Three Systems of Astronomy*, he says:

"Although there are three systems, none of them affect astronomical Chronology, which can be claimed by each. The first is held at the observatories, namely, that the earth is spherical, rotating on an axis, and travelling round a *stationary* sun in 365¼ days."

He then refers to the Zetetic system, and to a third system which teaches that the earth is a globe immovable with the sun revolving around it. Now if these three systems of astronomy make no difference as to the question of Chronology, why does Mr. Dimpleby try to persuade his readers that his chronology disproves a motionless earth? He says:

"The disproval of a motionless earth cannot be so well determined by the old system of astronomy at the Greenwich observatory, built upon a subsidiary Christian era. It is a natural and scientific system taught by the British Chronological and Astronomical Association, and which is the same astronomy as that of the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians, that lucidly settles the controversy by proving that the earth both rotates and has an annual motion round the sun. Unfortunately the old (?) school of Astronomy invented at the Greenwich Observatory has had no knowledge of the astronomical period of 649 years used by the ancients."

If Mr. Dimpleby has any evidence that "lucidly settles" this controversy we should be glad if he would produce it. He says that, "there are two zodiacs, one annually made by

the earth travelling round the ecliptic of 360° , and the other, a large one made by the apparent motion of the sun on a circle of 648 years." This is a novel and interesting way of trying to prove the motion of the earth, to say nothing of the "apparent motion of the sun," which of course he thinks is not real, making a second Zodiac! If our readers, or his readers can see herein a proof of the earth's motions they must have keener perception than we have.

However, we give them the proofs for what they are worth.

The editor of *Past and Future* further says, that the Egyptians believed in a "revolving earth," as they called it; but he has not quoted any Egyptian writer giving this as his belief. We doubt if he can do so. But even if he can, surely merely "belief" is not evidence of fact? But Mr. Dimbleby says we have "strong evidence of this by the way in which every 30 years they (the Egyptians) celebrated by a festival the entering of the earth into another of the twelve signs of the Zodiac."

And, he adds: "these astronomical festivals will not coincide with the *apparent* solar zodiac in which the sun seems to move." (Italics ours).

This seems a strange way of proving the earth's motions!

We should like very much to attend any festival where we might see the "entrance of the earth into another of the twelve signs," whether of the "ecliptic zodiac" or that other solar one which he says is only "apparent." However "apparent" it may be to Mr. Dimbleby he has failed to make this proof apparent to us.

Mr. Dimbleby makes this further assertion respecting the Egyptians:

"Their numerous records of this motion of the earth round the ecliptic is a most conclusive proof that they believed in a moving earth, and the fact that these records are always numerically correct from the date of Creation is evidence that the early Egyptians obtained their knowledge from the Adamic line of patriarchs."

Now we challenge Mr. Dimbleby to give us from Egyptian heraldry one instance of a "record" of the earth's motion round the Ecliptic. I do not think he can give us one; and that, moreover, he has drawn on some fancy for what he thinks is evidence. He first assumes the question at issue and then gives it as "proof" of what he wants us to believe.

But we do not believe it. And even if the Egyptians "believed" in a moving earth, I should still want reliable proof of the motion. That is, we should want proofs that are not opposed to the evidence of our senses, nor in discord with the Bible.

But Mr. Dimbleby has not even given his readers proof of the "belief" of the Egyptians, much less of the motions of the earth, as is proved by the system of the great Ptolemy. The Ptolemaic system taught that the earth was not only motionless, but the centre of the universe, the sun and stars revolving around it. So that we challenge Mr. Dimbleby's assertions on every point. Moreover, if he would take it kindly, as it is kindly meant, we should advise him to take up some book on logic, and study it well; he would then be likely not only to keep the premise of his "proofs" more clear from the *petitio principii*, which now so frequently vitiates his arguments, but also save himself from spending the rest of his valuable life in building upon a "sandy" and false basis of pagan Scripture contradicting origin.

The globular theory undoubtedly is a cleverly constructed platform for showing off mathematical calculations, but if we value the truth we shall gladly make any and every sacrifice for its sake.

"STRETCHED OUT UPON THE WATERS."

By E. H. RICHES, LL.D., F.R.A.S.,
Member of the "London Mathematical Society,"
late Cantab, etc.

(continued from p. 223.)

We will now pass on to the consideration of the well-known illustration in support of the rotundity of the earth, namely: observing a ship sailing directly towards the horizon. As has been stated, at a certain distance from the observer, the hull of the ship will gradually disappear from his view; and when that is quite out of sight, it will be observed that the masts will also disappear in a similar way.

Now, it will readily be perceived that the *mode* of disappearance would happen in the event of the surface, on which the ship is sailing, being an arc—in fact, in no other way could the ship disappear; but by a short consideration of the case, we may be led to question whether or not this same mode of disappearance of the ship might occur if the surface on which the ship is sailing be a PLANE,

The following fact has been noted, namely: that a ship lost to view under the circumstances just mentioned, has been seen after its disappearance by the observer using a powerful telescope. The whole of the ship has thus been brought back to sight. Might one argue from this, that the ship was lost to sight *because* it was so far advanced along the convex arc that the surface of the water came between the ship and the sight of the observer? Those who maintain that this experiment is a proof of the rotundity of the earth, would tell us so. If it is, what is to be said to the ship's being brought back to view again by means of the telescope?

Optics tell us that any object travelling from us (as the ship in the above instance) would disappear in a similar way, in the case of the surface between us and the object being a *plane*. If an observer standing at the end of a long street observe the rows of gas lamps on either side, and their apparent diminution of size as the distance increases, he will see that those *nearly* lost to view in the extreme distance will present to him nothing but their tops, the lower portions being quite lost to view. If a train be watched closely as it travels from an observer, the wheels and lower parts of the carriages will disappear before the top of the train will do so.

Briefly, then, the following fact may be stated, namely: that the *lower part* of any object travelling away toward's the observer's horizon, will disappear first, and the top part will be last in view. This holds good on water as on land, and so must in necessity hold in the case of a ship at sea hastening towards the horizon, which does appear in the exact manner described. A question thus suggests itself, namely: Is the mode of disappearance of the ship at the horizon any proof of the rotundity of the earth?

Mr. Glaisher, whose name is so well in connection with balloon ascents for purposes of scientific discovery, has

affirmed that even at the greatest distance from the earth to which he has gone, he always found that "the horizon appeared on a level with the car;" and in the *London Journal* of July, 1857, the following interesting reference to balloon ascents may be found: "The chief peculiarity of the view from a balloon at a considerable elevation, was the altitude of the horizon, which remained practically on a level with the elevation of two miles, causing the surface of the earth to appear *concave* instead of *convex*, and to recede during the rapid ascent, whilst the horizon and the balloon seemed to be stationary."

This curious fact of the *concave* appearance of the surface of the earth, as seen from a balloon at an altitude of two miles, is worthy of note, and appears to be difficult of solution when considered by one unacquainted with optics. How is it that a sphere or globe of large dimensions when viewed in space at a distance of two miles or less, loses its natural form and assumes that of a concave surface to the eye of the observer? It seems natural to suppose that the earth being of the form of a globe, its surface as viewed from a balloon would appear just the opposite (namely: *convex*) from what has been affirmed unanimously by all aeronauts. Philosophy tells us, that the surface of the earth (land and water) is the opposite to a *plane*, namely: that it is convex; still it can be seen that it is possible to bring forward arguments in favour of the earth's surface being a plane, and also that those arguments generally supposed to support the theory of the earth's rotundity are really no arguments in its favour but decidedly against it. It is not my intention to consider any more of the experiments that have been made than I have, but will simply leave my brief and somewhat rough explanatory statements of the same to the consideration of the reader.

In the face of modern philosophy it would be a bold thing for one to say that the theory of Newton's disciples is a mistake, and to affirm that there *is* enough proof to show that the surface of the earth is a *plane*, and that there is no proof whatever of its being a globe. If one were bold enough to advance such a theory men would smile, and the chances are that the man who did advance the same would be ridiculed. Only those who have studied astronomy can tell into what a vast sea of hazy doubt one is often plunged;

and results so bewildering are arrived at, that one is almost led to doubt any known theory whatever.

On page 392, volume ii. of *Extracts from the Works of John Wesley*, may be found the following: "The more I consider them, the more I doubt of all systems of astronomy. I doubt whether we can with certainty know either the distance or magnitude of any star in the firmament; else why do astronomers so immensely differ, even with regard to the distance of the sun from the earth? some affirming it to be only 3, and others 90 millions of miles."

This extract is of some interest, in that Wesley was well up in the astronomy of his day; and methinks he but echoes the sentiments of many even of the present day. The word "speculation" might fairly be applied to many portions of the Newtonian philosophy. To use plain language, it may be said that, after all, the earth may *not* be a globe.

All communications and enquiries respecting this Magazine and the teaching it upholds, and all questions and matter for insertion, should be addressed to E.A.M.B., 11, Gloucester Road, Kingston Hill.

"THE EARTH'S" OBSERVATORY.

The Ed. does not necessarily endorse statements made under the headings of "The Earth's Observatory," Letters, etc., unless signed Ed. The Earth.

In the *Illustrated London News* of June 27th and July 4th, there are some beautiful photo views in connection with the *Discovery* expedition by Lieut. Shackleton, with description of the southern regions, showing the course of the *Discovery*, with a map on the globular system—adapted from *Ross' Quadrant of the Antarctic*. The account bears out all that Zetetics have advanced, but the map is misleading, viz.: on the 4th Feb., 1902, the *Discovery* was, according to the map in longitude 165 West, and on the 9th the vessel had sailed and got icebound in longitude 167 East, (What latitude were they in? And in what direction did they travel in getting from long. 165 W to long. 167 E? —Ed.) a difference of 28 degrees, and which on the Plane Earth would be at the least 72 miles to a degree, or 2,000 miles, which would be impossible for a sailing vessel to accomplish anywhere on the ocean. But if this earth is a globe there would be about 18 miles to a degree, or 500 miles, which could be accomplished. (Utterly impossible to travel 500 miles in icebound seas, such as they were in.—Ed.)

"THE ROMANCE OF SCIENCE."

A Lecture delivered at the Congress Hall, Clapton, by Lady E. A. M. Blount. Reported by Jonathan Nicholson, Editor of *Vitality and Health Culture*.

The Congress Hall is a magnificent building seating some 6,000 people; on rare occasions it is filled, such as a visit from General Booth or some of the leading lights of the Salvation Army. To see it so well attended on a week-night, as it was upon the visit of Lady Blount, means that the lecturer or her subject had created a sensation, for usually Salvationists are exceptionally conservative upon unknown matters.

The meeting had been well boomed by Major Orsborn and his able staff of officers, so that it was most gratifying to them to see so appreciative an audience. The opening song, accompanied by the Congress Hall Brass Band, breathed out hopes of salvation to every soul in the building; this was followed by prayer, and then her ladyship was introduced (receiving a magnificent reception).

To Salvationists the globosity contravention is gibberish. They have been taught at school the earth is a globe, and have never given it a thought otherwise than that it is a flying mass, so that the lecture given quite knocked them off their legs, opening a new line of thought.

Her ladyship took in the situation at a glance; she saw she had a mixed audience. There rubbing shoulders, were the most up-to-date men and women of the day, anxious to get all they could from the subject, while the honest brown faces of the daily toiler listened with rapt attention and took it all in.

The subject is an interesting one to those who *think*. The Salvationist is taught the need of *thinking* for himself and not to depend upon the brains of others. Perhaps this had something to do with her ladyship's magnetic influence upon the whole of that vast assembly; any way she was a success in every sense of the word.

Lady Blount speaking to the following effect, said:

The magnificence of the Works of God contained in the whole universe afford inexhaustible pleasure and profit when the surveyor is in harmony with, and controlled by, a prayerful desire for truth and knowledge.

But our knowledge of God's Creative Works should be in harmony with God's own account of His Creation as given in His Inspired Word.

Misrepresentation of God's Creative Works, and the facts of Nature having been ignored by so-called "scientists," (her true principles attacked and derided,) has been the cause of thousands of men and women, possessed of more than ordinary mental capacities giving up the teaching of the Holy Scriptures and thus losing the great benefit which they might have derived from the teaching of God's revealed Word.

Science-mongers have, in order to give their Scripture-contradicting science a footing, been compelled to deny the Word of the living God, and this not only verbally, but they have done so frequently in their written works!

Prayerful study of Nature, and all visible phenomena, guided by Holy Writ will of necessity raise the human mind to thoughts of the Creator, and increasing faith in Him and in His Word will lead to a higher condition "as seeing Him who is visible."

The lecturer dwelt long upon the absurdity of the whirling globe theory, and showed that not only is it opposed to the teaching of the Bible but that it unreasonably contradicts the facts of Nature. For instance, the "miraculous" power of gravitation is simply a fabulous conception, invented to pull all and everything to a supposed centre by a force supposed to be equal to the quantity of matter in a body, without any known cause:

This power of such fame,

"Gravitation" by name,

Pounded down on the atoms whilst strewing;

But further back gaze

O'er eternity's maze,

What *before* was good gravity doing.

Pagan, scripture-contradicting "science" is flooding the world, and we are derided for not accepting the imaginary gravity device upon the bare word and assumption of such men as Sir Isaac Newton, and crediting him with knowing more than the Creator Himself.

True science, founded upon fact and reason, of course exists, but much now presented to us as true science, including the Nebula hypothesis, is simply that which is described in the Scriptures as, "science falsely so-called."

After giving the history, nature, and origin of the globe theory; and several proofs that water is level, and speaking of the (so-called) "centrifugal" motion of the earth, which according to astronomers makes the earth fly away from the sun, and the "centripetal" or *centre seeking*, which they say "tends towards the sun, the lecturer pointed out that these opposing forces would tend to nullify each other.

Lady Blount gave a number of practical proofs against the veracity of the globular theory. She stated that from a vessel midway between Kingston Pier and Holyhead, which are 60 miles apart, lighthouses can be seen which would be many feet below the horizon, after deducting the height of the lighthouses and the height of the observer, and therefore could not be seen if the earth was a globe. Also, the sun rising and setting at sea always shows a straight line, as if a piece was cut off the bottom of it, but if the earth were a globe the line would be somewhat of a crescent shape—"This is a good proof that the earth is not a globe," said the lecturer, because it is the same when the sun's diameter is magnified with a powerful telescope. This caused an objector, at a recent meeting, who said the curvature was too small to be seen with the naked eye, to collapse, as it is patent to all that a good telescope would magnify the curvature and thus make it visible if it were there.

Lack of space prevents giving in detail all that was brought forward regarding ships at sea, the laws of perspective, mathematics, etc. But regarding the latter the lecturer said: "Mathematics are of excellent use when employed about their proper objects, under the control of a logical mind; but they were never intended to rob those of highest mental capacities of common sense, for the purpose of filling the less gifted and uncultured mind with wonder."

But many learned men seem to be deficient in true logic, as was Professor Yule Oldham who stated that there was a six feet rise in three miles from the place where you stand. A six feet rise on a ball is a fallacy! *It should be a six feet fall.*

Pythagoras had been the first to introduce the sea and earth globe theory into Europe, after a long sojourn in the East, and the general introduction of these false ideas had been the cause of the rise of modern scepticism and infidelity. Men, such as the Ed. of *The Clarion*, now exist who through the influence of modern science (which they regard as being infallible) dare to make such assertions as the following:—"I will show that the ancient Jewish God, Jehovah, was utterly incapable of conceiving a scheme of creation so magnificent as science has revealed. For it is to human labour, and to human science, and not to divine inspiration that we are indebted to the expansion and elevation of our ideas of the universe, and its Creator."—Ed. of *The Clarion*.

So the sceptic thinks that the universe of the Bible and its Creator are far too inferior for him, therefore he invents, as he thinks, a greater universe, and so makes himself a greater Creator.

But I will quote no more of such blasphemy. Let us pray that the one who penned it may yet learn that—

"Man shall not live alone by bread,
But by each word that God has said."

OBJECTIONS BY OPPONENTS TO STATEMENTS IN
THE EARTH, No.s 35 & 36.

P. 230-231: V. A. Wraight didn't spin his bowl long enough. P. 236, para. 7: "Zenith stars would set in the plane of the observer's position." Rather obscure; but anyhow, one has only to experiment with a globe and candle to find that the what the stars *would* do on the globular theory is just what they *do* do.

Reply to above.—We think that you fail to see clearly on this subject, because some of our leading Zetetics have *proved* most satisfactorily that if a globe revolving in front of stars, sun, and moon, was a fact, they would undoubtedly rise and set in the plane of the observer. They could not do otherwise.

P. 238: "All objects below the eye-line vanish into the eye-line." No, they don't. Stand on a cliff top when the eye-line is level with the mast-head of a ship. As the ship recedes the masts do *not* vanish first. I have pointed this out about ten times; no Zetetic has answered it yet.

Reply.—Again it seems you are in a fog. The mast-head is on a level with the eye you say. Then how can it vanish into the eye-line? Will you kindly give me the elevation of your eye, and that of the object, or objects, you look at above sea level?

Explain how the phases of the moon are accounted for on the plane-earth theory; and also about the eclipses.

Reply.—No man living can give a positive explanation of the cause of the phases and eclipses of the moon; but we suggest the following. The moon's *phases* may be caused by the illuminated part of the moon being turned away from us and towards the sun, so that we cannot see the whole of the illuminated face of the moon. When we only see half the moon's illuminated face we say it is the first quarter, referring principally to the quarters of the month. Eclipses may be caused by some semi-transparent dark body passing between us and the moon. But what that body is, whether gaseous or solid no one can tell. It is certainly not the shadow of the earth, as popularly supposed. As the lights are above the earth, the earth's shadow (if it has one) cannot possibly fall upwards.

I have found *The Earth* very interesting and instructive hitherto but it is becoming more so. Thanking you much for your last communication, and its valued contents.
A. W.

All your writings interest me immensely, and I feel so refreshed after reading them.
HERMANN WARZAWIAK.

I was present at your large meeting in the park, and I regarded it as a wonderful sight to behold thousands of men so thrillingly interested with the truth as to stand for near two hours without a sign of weariness. You also held the deep attention of your audience, of about 1,000 at the Congress Hall. They seemed spell-bound!

CH. DAMIEN'S SYSTEM.
FRENCH IN THREE MONTHS!

REVISED EDITION, 1902.

We have much pleasure in recommending the above work.

The booklet contains the three thousand words, and idioms, which are most used in ordinary conversation; sufficient to enable you to talk French all your life; no fossil philological peculiarities, but French as it is actually spoken in France. Grammar underlies each group of examples, and we think this a cleverly condensed method of teaching the French language.

The Author of *French in Three Months* also gives Lessons in Conversational French to adults, at

128, CROMWELL ROAD, LONDON, S.W.;

AND

64, ROSSLYN HILL, HAMPSTEAD, N.W.

Friends of the Ed. of this Magazine can testify to his ability and agreeable way of teaching.

The Magnetic Nerve Invigorator Co.,

JONATHAN NICHOLSON,

22, Budge Row, Cannon Street,

LONDON, E.C.

Price of Appliances £1 1s., £2 2s., & £3 3s.

Instalments may be arranged.

THE EARTH.

VOL. III,

NOS. 39 & 40.

OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER.

CELESTIAL PHENOMENA.

By Lady Blount.

(continued from p. 245).

THE MIDNIGHT SUN—N. AND S.

“The Sun and Moon Stood Still.”—*Hab.* iii. 11.

The sun's motion is not only a fact according to the Holy Scriptures, but also a fact which is self-evident to our senses without any artificial aid. Tully says that the sun is called *Sol* because it is the “only” heavenly body of that magnitude, and because when it rises it puts out all the other orbs and “only” appears itself. Both common sense and experience verify this statement, which is in accord with the first chapters of Genesis, wherein we read: “God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day.”

It seems an undeniable fact that the midnight sun is seen in the southern hemisphere (so-called), for we have it on no mean authority, viz.: the Perth, W.A., Astronomer Royal, the testimony of the crew of the *Belgica*, and the whole exploring party on board the *Discovery*, that it is thus seen in the South as it is in the North.

Mr. Ernest Cook states in the last letter which I received from him, that, “the midnight sun ought to be seen in the middle of summer (December).....at all places south of latitude 66½ S. As a matter of fact there is no known habitable land in the Antarctic regions, so we hear nothing about it, but I read only a few days ago an account of the exploring vessel, the *Discovery*, I think it is called, wherein it was stated that the crew played cards on deck at midnight with the sun shining down upon them on Christmas Eve.”

This corresponds precisely with the accounts which we received here in England. In more than one report it