

SIR, — In the recent occultation of Jupiter, why was it occulted in the crescent or light part of the moon ONLY? for it was seen wending its way within the horns of the crescent, thus:—



so that it must have been seen through the mountains, craters, etc. etc., that is, the solid part of the moon, the shadow of the Earth notwithstanding—if the MOON is a solid globe of mountains, etc., how will the F.R.A.S. account for this phenomenon? I don't know—but I want to—though it doesn't much matter.

JNO. S.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to the Editor should be briefly and LEGIBLY written on one side of the paper only. They *must* be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, as a guarantee of good faith. Where replies are requested by post, the postage must be enclosed. The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents. All letters *must* be prepaid and addressed to

LEO CASTLE,

c/o MR J. WILLIAMS,

32, Bankside, LONDON, S.E

EDITORIAL NOTICES.

Please to ask for "The Earth—not a Globe—Review," at all Newsagents, Reading Rooms, and Railway Bookstalls. To be had direct from the Hon. Sec, post free, to any address in the postal union for 1s 6d per year, in advance.

All monies for the Society must be paid direct to the local Vice Secretaries, or direct to the Hon. Secretary and Treasurer, John Williams. Post Office Orders to be made payable at Sumner Street, S.E.

Our Map Fund is still open awaiting any further subscriptions, friends may be pleased to forward us.

Will friends who have received notification that their subscriptions are due, kindly forward the same to the Secretary at once, as he is greatly in want of funds to continue the Monthly issue.

May we request friends to remember, that in future, a large blue pencil mark—a cross—on the outside of the cover in which the "Review" is sent, signifies that your subscription is due.

The circumstances of our Secretary having been materially altered of late, his time being taken up all day, sometimes until 9 o'clock p.m., friends therefore must please excuse any delay that may occur in getting out the "Review," or replying to any correspondence they may forward him.

We are at the request of a few friends, bringing out an Index to the first eight Nos of the "Review." Will those who would like to have one, kindly communicate the fact to us, as we do not want to print more than will be required.

—THE— EARTH—NOT A GLOBE—REVIEW.



A Sectional View of the World as a Plane.

VOL. III. No. 6 (MONTHLY SERIES).

PRICE. 1D.

SEPTEMBER TO DECEMBER, 1896.

"UNIVERSAL GRAVITATION, A PURE ASSUMPTION."

BY LEO CASTLE.

No. VII.

The following extracts are taken from Blair's Grammar of Philosophy. (p. 382-391, &c.):—

"The power of mutual attraction SUPPOSES that each of the two bodies pushes the other on their opposite sides, where the actor is not present, consequently not in force; for a body does not move except in the direction in which it is impelled. Nor, by a false analogy, do bodies *draw* one another, for there is no drawing-tackle between them."

"The power of mutual *repulsion* implies that each body is in force in a direction contrary to that in which each is moving, for each moves its own way, yet by repulsion is required to act the other way, though *each is moving from the other*, this is a contradiction."

"The power of *gravitation* in its alleged phenomena, that of *falling* bodies, is deemed a variety of attraction, which is essentially absurd, as the Earth does *not* push falling bodies on their remote side towards its own centre!"

"The power of *universal gravitation* first *assumes* a power of attraction between the heavenly bodies, which, as attraction, is absurd; and to this absurdity it adds [by supposition.—Ed.] a force not displayed in the bodies as matter of fact, since they do not fall together."

"THE PRETENCES TO PROVE THESE FANCIES, BY APPEALS TO ARITHMETIC AND GEOMETRY, ARE GROSS IMPOSTURES AND ARTFUL MYSTIFICATIONS."

"THE PROOFS PRETENDED TO BE DERIVED FROM GEOMETRY ARE ESSENTIALLY IRRELEVANT. GEOMETRY IS THE SCIENCE OF QUANTITY IN THE ABSTRACT, AND INVENTS NOTHING WHATEVER ABOUT POWERS AND QUALITIES. JUST SO IN MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS; THE DATA MUST BE *ASSUMED*, AND THE RESULT DEPEND ON THE REASONABLENESS OF THE DATA, WHICH ARE QUITE INDEPENDENT OF THE MATHEMATICAL DEDUCTIONS."

"Newton, mistaking the cause of terrestrial weights, invented *universal weight*, disguising it by translation into *gravitation*; and then he was obliged to *invent* a second force, equally gratuitous and still more mysterious, to accommodate his first mistake to the phenomena of circular motion."

"Nature and geometry accord only in *mean* points. Every point is a mean in Nature, though it is not so in diagrams. Mistakes in this respect pervade Newton's *Principia*, and all the Scholastic Philosophy."

"Nothing can be more irrational than the hypothesis of a *FIXED* sun governing a *moving* system; nothing more trifling than the connection of the motions with the conic sections; nothing more absurd than a law for one of the bodies which does not obtain equally in the other, and, therefore, no appreciable law as to either; and nothing can be more incongruous than the hypothesis that the local generation of central force, as a necessary principle of aggregation in one planet, governs other distant bodies as a *universal* force!"

"The gratuitous theory of universal gravitation, which affords no data for any calculation, and demands concessions of faith about densities, &c., is utterly at variance with analogy."

(To be Continued.)

RIDICULOUS THEORIES.

"The theory that the sun is a great burning mass is as ridiculous as all scientific theories are."—Professor Bernstein.

"ASTRONOMY MADE EASY."

Such is the heading of a series of papers which appeared in *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper* from Aug. 9th to Oct. 4th, the writers being Sir Robert Ball, F.R.A.S.; Professor W. T. Lynn, B.A., F.R.A.S.; and Professor A. Fowler, F.R.A.S.

"Once, to every man and nation,
Comes the moment to decide:
In the strife of Truth and Falsehood,
For the good or evil side."

—Notes and Queries, June, 1896, p. 125.

It was our intention to write a series of letters in reply to those appearing in *Lloyd's Newspaper*, but, as the Editor of "*Lloyd's*" did not insert the following letter, which was written in reply to the first one that appeared, or even manly enough to acknowledge its reception, we determined not to send any more for the *W. P. B.*, but to place our refutation of the teaching of these gentlemen on record in our own Journal. And as copies are sent to the British Museum, the readers there will be able to see the thread-bare state of the so-called "*most exact of the sciences*," and the cowardice of the Editors of the so-called "*Public Press*," "*The Free Press*," &c.

THE TOTAL ECLIPSE OF THE SUN.

AUGUST 9TH, 1896.

To the Editor of *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*.

DEAR SIR,—The letter by Professor A. Fowler, F.R.A.S., appearing in your issue of August 9th, certainly does not make Astronomy easy, but exceedingly hard of belief! With your kind permission, and for the benefit of your numerous readers, I will prove this out, and in the interest of Good and Right and Truth, I trust you will insert this letter in your next issue.

First. Professor Fowler says, "the moon is a dark body." This, Sir, is not true! That is, if practical observation and undeniable facts are to be believed in preference to so-called "science teaching." Let us, then, with unbiased minds, test this statement by facts. (1.) If "the moon is a dark body," how was it that in the occultation of Jupiter by the moon (June 14th), Jupiter was seen through this "dark body," positively seen through the "mountains, craters, rivers, seas," etc., etc.? (2.) If "the moon is a dark body," therefore utterly devoid of any inherent light, how is it that, at a total eclipse of the moon, she is seen through the "earth's shadow" shining as brightly as ever? Surely a "dark body" cannot do that when its light-source is cut off. Impossible! (3.) If "the moon is a dark body," and only a reflector of sun light, where is the sense in calling it moonlight? (4.) If "the moon is a dark body," and a mere reflector of sunlight, why is it that the farther

she is away from the sun the brighter she shines? It is a demonstrable fact patent to anyone, that the farther away a reflector is from its light the duller is its reflection, while the nearer it is the brighter it shines. But the moon's light is less bright the nearer she is to the sun! Again, science, so-called, affirms that a reflector reflecting light reflects the heat of the light. Why, then, does the moon not reflect heat, seeing that modern astronomy asserts "the sun is the source of *all* heat and *light*?" This has been tested, and the test has irrefutably proved that the assertions made by teachers of modern theoretical astronomy are not founded in practical facts, but are the flimsy conjectures of their own making. The following extracts will suffice any honest enquirer:—

"The light of the moon, though concentrated by the most powerful burning-glass, is incapable of raising the temperature of the most delicate thermometer."—Dr. Noad, Lectures on Chemistry, p. 334.

"The moon's rays, when concentrated, actually *reduce* the temperature upon a thermometer more than eight degrees."—*The Lancet*, March 14th, 1856.

(5.) How can a body the diameter of which is only 2,200 miles eclipse a body the diameter of which is 887,076 miles? Professor Fowler says "for the best results (from observations of solar eclipses) the instruments must be equatorially mounted, and provided with clockwork, so that they may exactly follow the sun in its movement across the sky."

Why, Mr. Editor, what, in the name of commonsense and logic, does the Professor mean? Is it possible that he—that you—that the readers of your paper—do not see that Professor Fowler contradicts Sir Isaac Newton, and utterly overthrows the fundamental proposition of Modern Astronomy, which, in the third book of the Principia, is thus expressed—"The Sun is the centre of the Solar System and IMMOVABLE." Surely an *immovable sun* that requires to be "followed in its movements across the sky" is a curiosity which can only be seen by the "learned scientists" of the "enlightened 19th century." The earth is at last tacitly acknowledged by Professor Fowler, F.R.A.S., to be *stationary*, and the sun a *moving* body in the heavens! This is the justification and verification of the Zetetic contention and teaching! To assert that a thing is immovable, and at the same time to assert that it moves, is not only illogical, but the utter stultification of language! Surely Professor Fowler, if the world is a globe revolving before an *immovable sun*, so forming day and night as we were taught at school, the only clockwork essential for observing an eclipse of the sun or moon is the axial motion of the globe. To sum up, Mr. Editor, Professor Fowler has proved, up to the hilt, that the earth is not a revolving "oblate spheroid," a globe, but a vast irregular plane, with the sun, moon, and stars moving in their appointed pathways, at very moderate

distances from the earth. It is also proved that the moon does not eclipse the sun, for the moon is evidently a transparent body. And when stars of the 7th magnitude have been seen through it, surely it is only a reasonable and logical conclusion, confirmed by many observations, that the moon is no more the cause of the eclipse of the sun than the earth is the cause of an eclipse of the moon.

The belief in these "old wives' fables" is caused by school cramming in our unsuspecting childhood, ere we were capable of independent and right reasoning. And as the majority grow up their minds are set like steel according to the unshapely mould in which the teachers cast them. The ductility, vivacity, and ambition of youth is utterly crushed out of our children, and we find them mentally dwarfed, biased, weak, passive, dependent, servile, misinformed, therefore readily disposed to believe whatever interested and scheming men, reputed "great" or "learned," are pleased to tell them, and consequently resists every presentation of truth. As for Professors, Editors, Teachers and Ministers, the question with them is not always "What is truth?" but more often, Which is popular? *i.e.*, Which will pay?

Yours respectfully,

LEO CASTLE.

ORANGE POLARITY.

"The orange was originally a berry, and its evolution has been going on for more than 1000 years."—*Science Siftings*, January 9th, 1892.

Professor—"Explain the cause of the polar flatness of the orange."

Student—"We *suppose* that the early rudimentary orange, being 'a berry,' was freely suspended by its stalk, rotated on its axis, and thereby acquired a bulging at its equator and flattening at its poles. The modification—according to the 'laws of evolution'—was found to be an improvement, consequently it was permanently retained by 'natural selection,' and now propagates its species according to the 'law' of the 'survival of the fittest' astronomer who wrote such nonsense."—*Balaam's Ass*.

"TRUTH IRRITATES THOSE WHOM IT ENLIGHTENS BUT DOES NOT CONVERT."

"Objects seen from a balloon always seem at least five times smaller than do the same sized objects when looked at horizontally from the earth at the same distance—say from one mile high and one mile along the earth's surface."—Airopaidia: by Thos. Baldwin, Esq., M.A.

THE LARGEST GLOBE ON EARTH.

It is proposed to erect in London a terrestrial globe having a *diameter of eighty-four feet*, and showing the earth's surface on a scale of about eight miles to the inch. At Paris, in 1889, a globe was exhibited, but this one will be double the diameter, and upon it every geographical feature of importance will be shown and named, as will also be every city or town having 5000 inhabitants, besides a large selection of others with a smaller population. The larger cities will be drawn to scale. *London* will cover a space *rather larger than that of a penny*.

The idea of the big globe just described is that of Mr T. Ruddiman Johnston, F.R.G.S., who has developed a process by which the globe can be constructed in two years. In the making of the globe *he hopes to have the views of all those having a special knowledge of any portion of the earth's surface*, and will confine his labours to systematising the information supplied, organising a staff, and guiding it towards the satisfactory completion of the globe. The President of the R.G.S. approves of this scheme, "Daily News," July 9th, 1896.

DEAR SIR—Having read in the *Daily News* of July 9th. that you have an idea of erecting in London, a "terrestrial globe," I write, seeing you "hope to have the views of all those having a special knowledge of any portion of the earth's surface," to inform you that a "globe," no matter to what scale it may be constructed, is not in any sense a representation of any portion of the earth's surface according to nature. This can be proved by practical investigation.

It is an undeniable and manifested fact in nature, that neither the Sun, Moon or Stars even disappear (set) *BELOW a tangent line*, no matter what height the phenomena be viewed from.

That one absolute fact alone Sir, is the utter annihilation of the teaching of Modern Astronomers and Geographers that we are living on a ten-motioned, Dutch-cheese-shaped sea-earth-globe.

Again, Sir, the science of hydrostatics absolutely refutes the teaching that the earth's surface is curved. To go no further, in the "English Mechanic," June 26th, 1896., we read :—

LEVEL OF THE SEA.

Since *any* given body of Water MUST HAVE A LEVEL SURFACE *id est* NO ONE PART HIGHER THAN ANOTHER*, and seeing that all our oceans (a few inland seas excepted) are connected together, it follows that *they* ARE ALL VIRTUALLY OF THE SAME LEVEL."

* This writer in the E.M. asserts that no one part of water can be higher than another. Is this *absolutely true*?

Is this not an unequivocal proof that the earth is a vast irregular plane?

If you can forward me *any* proof that the earth is a twirling globe I shall be very pleased to consider, and courteously reply to it.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours respectfully,

JNO. WILLIAMS, *Hon. Secy.*

Universal Zetetic Society,

32 Bankside, S.E.

T. Ruddiman Johnson, Esq., F.R.G.S., 24 Pall-Mall, S.W.

P.S.—One other question occurs to me to ask. Will your "big globe" when on view have axial, orbital, or in fact *any* of the *ten* motions it is said to possess?

Of course those who desire to truthfully represent nature in any of its parts, should not leave out any part or fact absolutely connected with it, or consequently a *misrepresentation* will be presented, and you, sir, would not be guilty of that I feel quite sure.

In the First Principles of Natural Philosophy, by W. T. Lynn, Esqr., B.A., F.R.A.S., we read the following :—

"The upper surface of a fluid at rest . . . is a horizontal plane, since otherwise, if a part of the surface were higher than the rest, those parts of the fluid which were under it would exert a greater pressure upon the surrounding parts than they received from them, so that motion would take place amongst the particles and continue until there were none at a higher level than the rest, that is, until the upper surface of the whole mass of fluid became a horizontal plane." Is this *absolutely true*?

Dr. Lardner in his "Natural Philosophy" says :—"A liquid surface when at rest will always assume the form of a horizontal or level plane." Is this absolutely true?

Now, gentlemen of the R.G.S., will you please tell us if Professor Alfred R. Wallace, F.R.G.S., Doctor M. W. B. Coulcher, and the late Editor of "The Field," Mr J. H. Walsh, said what was *absolutely true*, when they declared that the water midway between Old Bedford Bridge and Welney Bridge was *five feet* HIGHER than at the Bridges?

I take the pleasure of forwarding you a copy of our Journal for July, 1895.—JNO. W.

To the Editor of the Daily News.

DEAR SIR,—I see by your issue of July the 9th that T. Ruddiman Johnston, Esqr., F.R.G.S., hopes to have the views of *all those having a special knowledge of any portion of the earth's surface*, therefore I have forwarded him mine, and herewith send you a copy of my letter to him for insertion in your columns, for the subject is one of general public interest. With thanks in anticipation of insertion.—I remain,

Yours obliged,

JNO. WILLIAMS.

The Editor of the "Daily News" did not insert our Secretary's letter. We suppose he was afraid lest the eyes of the public should be opened, and the fraud imposed upon them in their unsuspecting childhood should be made manifest! A so-called science that has to hide itself in silence is certainly not worth much, if anything at all.

"The reptile Press of Europe,
That sell their tainted wares,
Have earned their dirty wages—
And much our England cares!
Shall we renounce our birthright
To lay the tyrant low,
Because the men whom money buys
Gnash teeth, and mutter "No?"

The following is a copy of a note sent by a friend.

HON. SIR,—Seeing the notice of your proposed model (Theoretical) Globe, and that many opinions by public men have been tendered on the usefulness or otherwise of the object, I thought it good to remind you, there is a large body of thinkers represented by the "Universal Zetetic Society," who will gladly welcome the appearing of the Model, on account of the rare opportunity it will afford them of publicly exposing and bringing into disrepute the "Premiss of *all* Theoretical-Elementary-Science" (so-called).—Yours faithfully,

H. H. D'ARCHY ADAMS.

RUDDIMAN JOHNSTON, ESQ., F.R.G.S.,
24 Pall Mall, S.W.

P.S.—I enclose a small brochure, etc., on the Zetetic side for your perusal and future reference.

THE EARTH'S ROTUNDITY.

To the Editor of the "Morning Herald."

Will you kindly oblige two of your young readers by informing them in how many ways has the earth been proved to be round (a globe)?

LAUREL, June 15.

M. B. T.

[In three ways—by experimenting along straight stretches of water, where a point midway between the beginning and the end was found not to be in the same horizontal plane with points at the beginning and the end: by the fact that at sea the upper sails of an approaching vessel are seen first, and not the hull and by the shadow of the earth on the moon, when the latter is eclipsed, the shadow being round.]

FLAT-EARTH PHILOSOPHY.

To the Editor of the "Morning Herald."

Your remarks in to-day's issue anent "The Earth's Rotundity" are utterly misleading. They will help the cause of a "Plane Earth" in every thoughtful mind. Why not go to the top of the curve and look in all directions? Your observer is uniformly on the one side of the top of the earth! (2) Do you mean to say that a ship of, say 100 feet elevation, can be seen coming *up* or going *down* over a globe 25,000 miles in circumference? Has perspective nothing to do with it? (3). And as to the shadow of the earth on the moon, why, the moon has many times been eclipsed before sunset!

No, sir; the globular theorists have not a leg to stand upon.

WILLIAM CARPENTER.

THE GULF STREAM.

To the Editor of the "Morning Herald."

Can you inform a reader of your paper whether there is a scientific explanation of the cause of the Gulf Stream.

[There are several theories to account for the Gulf Stream. One is that the motion of the earth causes the water, which is more mobile than the land, to pile up, as it were, in the Caribbean Sea, from which it flows out around the Florida peninsula, the motion of the earth keeping the current near the Atlantic Coast. The Gulf Stream has been a fruitful subject of speculation and there are many theories as to its cause.]

CAUSE OF THE GULF STREAM.

To the Editor of the "Morning Herald."

Without for a moment presuming to know the cause of the Gulf Stream, one thing, at least, must be eliminated from the whole business

of *theoring* in the matter, and this is that the earth's "axial rotation" or "orbital revolution" can have anything whatever to do with the phenomenon, and this for the reason that the scientists have *no evidence that the earth is a globe*, and, therefore, cannot speak of "the motion of the earth."

BALTIMORE, June 21.

WILLIAM CARPENTER.

Consequently they know nothing whatever about *the cause* of the Gulf Stream!—ED. E.R.

PROFESSOR W. CARPENTER DEAD.

"Prof. William Carpenter died at his home, 1316 N. Central Avenue. Since coming to Baltimore, sixteen years ago, Mr. Carpenter has written much and lectured often on the subject of "the Earth not a Globe." He was accustomed to travel around to talk about it, and when people would not buy his 100 Proofs that the Earth is not a Globe, he would present them with copies in order that they might not be deprived of the opportunity of learning that the astronomy now being taught is all *upside down*. He was always thoroughly in earnest, patient and diffuse in his method of presenting his views, and angered only when people refused to give him a hearing. He was often to be found in front of John Hopkins' University, the City Schools and schools in other cities, waiting to talk to the students as they came out upon his special subject.

His death was due to a stroke of apoplexy on Sunday, August 30th. A widow, two sons, and three daughters survive him."—*The Sun*, Baltimore, Sept. 2nd, 1896.

On another page will be found (so far as we know) his last communication to a newspaper.

IN MEMORIAM.

It is with profound regret that we announce the death of our esteemed and invaluable friend,
WILLIAM CARPENTER.
 Born at Greenwich, 1830. Died at Baltimore, U.S.A., at 9 o'clock A.M., Sept. 1st, 1896, aged 66 years.

We knew, and lov'd thee,
 We well knew thy worth.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to the Editor should be briefly and LEGIBLY written on one side of the paper only. They *must* be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, as a guarantee of good faith. Where replies are requested by post, the postage must be enclosed. The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents. All letters *must* be prepaid and addressed to

"EXCALIBUR,"

c/o Mr. J. WILLIAMS,

32, Bankside, LONDON, S.E.

C. HARPUR asks—"If the moon is a semi-transparent crystalline body, *why* does it so completely obscure the sun when it eclipses the sun?" We commend to him the careful perusal of "Astronomy made Easy." Evidently your eyesight is affected, as many of us have stood on Old Bedford Canal Bridge and seen Welney Bridge and objects far beyond it. This also accounts for your not being able to see the steeple of St. Botolph Parish Church at the stated distance. Thanks for your reply to the questions asked Mr. Redfern Kelly, F.R.A.S. You have rushed in where he dare not tread, thus fulfilling the old adage!

REV. D. NIELD.—Thanks for the *Islington Gazette*. Whatever "literalists" may teach, we are not aware that any Zetetic would be so foolish as to assert that when Christ said "I am the door of the sheep," He meant he was a literal door of wood, painted and varnished, with a handle, lock, key, and brass knocker on. Such an interpretation is akin to blasphemy, and deserves the righteous contempt of every Christian. We should like to know what such Scriptures has to do with either a globular or plane earth. But why quote Psalm xix. 4-6. Is it true, *literally true*, that the sun "does not get to an end, it does not stop when it gets to the West, but *continues its race*, making its circuit." Then, the sun does actually move? Joshua was right, then, when he, in the power of inspiration, said, "Sun, stand thou still." Sir Isaac Newton, then, has led the world to believe a lie, has he not? He, in *The Principia*, says the sun is "IMMOVABLE." Surely it is against all reason and logic to assert that an IMMOVABLE object *moves*. Sir W. Herschel, by his "discovery of the MOTION OF THE SUN towards the constellation Hercules," shook the very foundation of Modern Astronomy, and thereby proved that the pretty pictures of "concentric circles" are utterly untrue, being merely conjectures to bolster up foregone conclusions deduced from purely speculative premises.

TO OUR READERS.

DEAR FRIENDS,—We regret to state that our efforts to issue this Journal Monthly has not met with the response of our friends as it should have done, therefore in future it will be issued once a Quarter. A New Cover will be selected, and it will be conducted by "EXCALIBUR." Price 3d. post free. It will not necessarily be issued on the First or Second Months of the Quarter—that will depend upon the funds in hand.

With our next issue we shall enclose to those whose Subscriptions are due a printed notice to that effect, and we trust that our friends will remit at their earliest moment, as our funds are very low. Those who do NOT respond to the "Second Notice," we must consider as having withdrawn from the Society. Therefore, if you cannot send the full amount of your Subscription, send what you can. See 2 Cor. viii. 12.

CONTENTS OF OUR LETTER BOX.

Halifax.

DEAR LEO CASTLE,—I am glad to hear of the American experiments proving "Parallax" right, as they must of necessity for truth is unchangeable and P. was certainly right in his determination of Earth's position and water level, *i.e.* horizontal. I can't help but feel regret that our old friend and champion, Carpenter, has passed from our midst. I shall ever respect his memory as one who loved the truth as he found it in the word of God and in Nature. Let him have a place in our next issue, and our sympathies as a society deeply expressed to the bereaved widow and family. He was a practical, consistent, constant and enthusiastic Zetetic. Would to God there were thousands like him. [Here, here, Ed.] Kindest regards, from all to all, hoping soon to see you.—Yours as ever,

JOHN SMITH.

The American experiments referred to will appear in our columns as soon as possible.—ED.

DEAR SIR,—I was indeed most sorry to hear of Mr Carpenter's death. We were early friends of the Zetetic cause, and it never had a more sterling or a cuter critic than he. His book "Common Sense" on Astronomy as a piece of negative criticism has never had, and probably never will have, an equal much less a superior. JAMES NAYLOR.

DEAR SIR,—I sincerely hope the *Earth Review* will continue to appear monthly. The quotations in the Articles on Gravitation are very valuable. The letters, "declined with thanks," &c., are also very interesting. Newspaper editors are

evidently afraid to assist in the exposure of the forlorn condition of modern astronomy by publishing them. How much longer are our great "Scientists" going to keep up the farce of pretending to be united in opposing all anti-Newtonian views? "Parallax" refers to the "smouldering scepticism" which they have induced in the hearts of Christian and Jewish believers, but it may well be perhaps that, although not condensed to their opponents, or even to each other, this same "smouldering scepticism" actually exists deep down in THEIR OWN HEART. The damaging admissions and confessions made by some of the more candid and honest amongst those who are considered to be in the front rank of "Science," which the *Review* so usefully brings to the notice of the public from time to time, indicate the dry rot of long standing which (because mostly hidden from, and therefore not suspected by, the latter) works silently and inevitably to the coming great revolution in science which is probably nearer than any have imagined, when this lying and monstrous system of astronomy, impudently labelled "the most exact of the sciences," will collapse all along the line—suddenly, and without remedy! The sneers and defiance hurled by them at those who maintain the Planeist truths are thus by no means to be considered as the measure of failure of the work of the Zetetic Society in undermining the astronomical "articles" of Newtonian "faith." How often does seeming failure and defeat turn out to be victory—*absolute and complete*—AFTER ALL!

JOHN BRADLEY.

EDITORIAL NOTICES.

Please to ask for "The Earth—not a Globe—Review," at all Newsagents, Reading Rooms, and Railway Bookstalls. To be had direct from the Hon. Sec., post free, to any address in the postal union for 1s per year, in advance.

All monies for the Society must be paid direct to the local Vice Secretaries, or direct to the Hon. Secretary and Treasurer, John Williams. Post Office Orders to be made payable at Sumner Street, S. E.

—THE—
EARTH—NOT A GLOBE—REVIEW.

SIX MILES.



"Parallax" proving the Surface of Water to be Horizontal.

Vol. IV.

Jan. - March / 1894.

HORIZONTALITY DISPROVES CONVEXITY.

The *practical demonstrations* of "Parallax," the founder of Zetetic Astronomy, were no hole and corner doings. Many similar experiments have been made by others over canals, rivers, seas, etc., in various parts of the world, and all confirm the fact, the surface of all standing water, or water at rest, is horizontal.

ERGO.

The world is *not* a rotating globe and we living on the outside held on by "gravitation," neither is it an "hollow sphere" and we live inside of it on a concave surface.

The various systems of theoretical science, viewed either from a common sense, a practical, or a Scriptural standpoint of criticism, prove themselves by their own self-stultifications and contradictions to be utterly untrue! And the only object of exponents appears to be nothing more or less than self-aggrandizement. Their silence when challenged for proofs of their theories proves the fallaciousness of their teaching and their consciousness of the fact.

Preachers, lecturers, and all intelligent and practical men in the world should be interested in this discussion. Ignorance of real facts is a disgrace to our pretended civilization and a slur upon our Christianity, and can only be obliterated by an honest and candid yielding through practical investigations to the claims of the voice of God in Nature. This mode, and this alone, will, or can strictly accord with and confirm the utterances of Holy Writ, proving thereby that the God of Nature is the God of the Bible, and that they are the voice of the Lord our God speaking unto us, and teaching us His Truth.