EARTH'S ROTATION DEMONSTRATED.
A Fine Experiment in the Panthéon.

To the Editor.—The Anglo-Saxon Press, on the 23rd October, collectively tell us, that a great pendulum hung from the top of the Panthéon by the Astronomical Society of France, to give ocular demonstration by its oscillations of the rotation of the globe, was yesterday set in movement at an inaugural ceremony, presided over by M. Chaumié, Minister of Public Instruction.

The pendulum consisted of a ball, weighing about sixty pounds, attached to a wire about seventy yards long, and we are told by modern astronomers that the experiment conclusively proved, against the testimony of conscious human observation, the rotation of the earth.

But how can the motion of a pendulum suspended from the top of the Panthéon, when the Panthéon and the pendulum, are both attached to, and form a part of the earth, prove the earth's rotation? The experiment may, therefore, be classed with the common negations of nescience, and not as a demonstrated fact, in the realms of true scientific induction from observed natural phenomena.

Besides, we all of us know, that when our modern balloons ascend from the earth into the surrounding atmosphere, they all, after being one or more hours in the air, return to precisely the same spot from which they began their ascent, allowing of course for the active movement of the atmosphere at the time of their ascent. And as the propelling force of light actively moves the Radiometer when hermetically sealed in a glass globe, the same force of light is a sufficient scientific explanation of the comparatively inactive motion of the pendulum in the Panthéon at Paris.

October 23rd, 1902.

WM. M. DAVIDSON.

THE EARTH'S OBSERVATORY.

Earth theory? "The plane earth theory" is founded upon the fact that water is level; and one fact must agree with another fact. One fact cannot disprove another fact. It may present a difficulty in the explanation, or in the harmonizing of the two facts. This is quite another matter underlying the question of distance, it is the question of "degrees" not the shape of the Earth. And underlying the question of "degrees" is the question of star motions, and the motions of light.

It is for us to examine these questions, and see if popular conclusions thereon are correct; and not rush in the face of the fact that water is level and the earth therefore a plane. Mr. Middleton's map of distances may throw light on this subject. As to the midnight sun being seen south by Borghgevink, it may or it may not be a fact; the evidence does not seem very clear. Many Zetetics think it is not true, but a few, like "Zetetes," think it is possibly true, but that if true it does not alter the fact that water is Level.

I beg to refer you to the article by "Zetetes," in The Earth for April and May, 1902, entitled The Unknown South. The same writer has also shown that if the midnight sun be seen in the south it is inconsistent with the globular theory. If Mr. G. A. will write an article, trying to prove the Earth is a globe, and basing his proofs upon southern phenomena, we will insert it in The Earth, when no doubt some of our readers will reply to it.

N.B.—The Bible and the globular theory cannot both be true! One must fall!—Ed. T. E.
"He made the stars also," cannot but move us to admiration. How childlike the simplicity of the soul which could so venture to deal with the inexplicable and tremendous problem of the universe! How self-centred; and sure the faith which could so arrange the work of Infinite and Eternal forces to suit its own limited intelligence."

Evidently the authoress does not believe in the beginning of this world such as is revealed in the Bible; a book which has outlived thousands of novels or mere works of fiction, and which seems destined to outlive as many more, including even those of the writer under consideration.

But as it is the fashion at this period of the world's history to ignore Bible teaching by those who are ignorant of the elements contained in it, which, if understood, would fully justify its claims, we should not be surprised if Marie Corelli has imbibed the general scepticism regarding the Creation of the world by a Personal Creator, as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis by Moses the man of God.

But we must remember that the Lord Jesus fully endorses the teachings of Moses, and furthermore affirmed that unless we believe the writings of Moses we cannot believe His own words (John v. 41). We may disbelieve the words of Jesus as well as the writings of Moses if we are so conceited as to imagine we are enlightened enough to do so; but it is utterly inconsistent to profess to believe the teachings of Jesus while discrediting the writings of Moses. Scepticism and consistency don't seem to fraternize well together. In fact writers of fiction, and astronomers, ought to be consistent in their scepticism when they reject the inspired records.

According to such writers Moses, or whoever wrote the Book of Genesis, is simply "an old world narrator," and a "poet of no mean order," writing of course with a poet's license about a "sublime event." But if he really wrote about a "sublime event," then he was more than a good poet; he was a "narrator" of an actual event, an event which can be traced back from the present position and known motions of the heavenly bodies themselves.

Yet to a writer of fiction the first chapter of Genesis is merely a "so we are told" kind of story, written by a man who was moved simply by the "natural conceit of men" to think this world was of sufficient importance for God to make for it "two great lights." Lights merely intended to give light upon the earth.

It is evidently nothing to such a writer that an inspired apostle declared that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." It is a sorry statement to say that a man moved by God's Holy Spirit was moved merely by "the natural conceit of men." (2 Pet. i. 21). But it is evidently unknown to such a writer that God Himself spake on Sinai, saying: "For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day, wherefore Jehovah blessed the Sabbath Day and hallowed it."—Ex. xx. 11. But could we be surprised at this when she speaks of God as simply some "Everlasting Power of goodness and beauty called by that name"?

Yet we are inclined to ask, does power and goodness exist in anything but a personal being? Did "goodness" intelligently directed ever exist in mere atoms, or in the "mighty atom" from which this world is supposed to have originally sprung? All such mighty atoms that M. C. wrote in one of her former novels.

It is not long since we read of a young man in Somerset, the son of a clergyman, who after reading a novel entitled The Mighty Atom, went and did the same as one of the characters described in that book. The former had been lent to the young man by the Rector of M—. Although his mother objected, the very evening before his death he had been reading this book, by the same author as the one now under criticism. The young man had also imbibed certain sacerdotal teaching, which played with depraved force upon his mind so when his body was discovered, he was found dressed in a cassock which had belonged to his late father, with a "cross" attached to one of its loops, and hanging from a beam in his bedroom quite dead.

In the report of his death, which is before us, it is said that the coroner read a passage from The Mighty Atom, which describes the suicide of one of the characters by a similar means to that of the deceased. Mr. G. had remarked to his mother about the end of the lad in the novel before he retired on the night of his death.

However this may be, the writer of these works of fiction seems to make very light of suicide, for in the work now under criticism, she makes more than one of her heroes end his life in this criminal manner. We cannot help noticing
how different was Paul's advice to the Phillipian jailer:—
"Do thyself no harm;"—by which advice he acted, living
always to be of use to his fellow men. But then Paul and
the jailer believed in a personal God who made the world
and all that therein is.

If we are all nothing more than the descendants of a
"mighty atom," or any number of atoms fortuitously drawn
together by the so-called laws of attraction and gravitation,
why, what does it matter which way we go out of the world?
We do not assert that the writer of these fictions says that
it does not matter; but the evident tendency of such books
is to make light of self-murder, and even glorify the crime
by placing a sort of heroic mantle over the heroes who are
represented as committing it.

But coming back to the question of Creation. We may
say that we Zetetics prefer what she calls "the childlike
simplicity of soul," which takes the Word of God before the
word of man, and believes in a personal Creator who "in
six days made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in
them is." The stars also, as lights, and nothing more than
lights, to give light upon this only world.

Speaking personally, we have suffered pain through Marie
Corelli's novels, because we have feared their evil trend
might sow poison in the minds of those we deeply desire
shall only cultivate the love of truth.

We regard all M. C.'s novels, as far as we have read
them, as having an evil tendency in more ways than one,
but we know more of the book quoted in this article, and
The Sorrows of Satan than any others. These two, at least,
are decidedly calculated to sow entirely unscriptural and false
ideas of a pernicious nature; which are more particularly
liable to affect the young and the simple minded, because
the style of writing and the nature of the errors introduced
are more fascinating and alluring to the unwary.

Nevertheless, it seems to us that Marie Corelli, herself,
would be a bright light on the earth could she be led by
God's Spirit, through Jesus our dear Lord, to use her ability
in the cause of Righteousness and Truth, and in humble
obedience to the Will of the Creator. Otherwise she will
have misused her talent. The legend of a noted writer rises
before us:—"Fashola lived, and died, a king of men devoid
of pride, yet much beloved! Alas! his nature good had one
restriction, or contradiction—he wrote much fiction! The
aged, and the child, he most beguiled! his own child died,
a suicide—and, too, his fiction deep made spirits weep and
shriek, and moan, and groan. As midnight rang, this dirge
they sang,—"when man is said to be quite dead, his evil
lives,—so legend gives."

Yes, truly "the evil that men do lives after them," it therefore
beforeshows writers of fiction to remember this. Whether
such be writers of prose, or poetry—and this more particularly
for the sakes of the young.

All young people (of both sexes) should cultivate a
taste for true literature—both prose and poetry. And when
I say "poetry" I mean true poetry, i.e., poetry containing
Truth. For true poetry is ennobling. It raises the thoughts
above things which are merely mundane. The Holy Scriptu­
res afford evidence in themselves that the Creator deemed
poetry to be an energizing and vitalizing element or princi­
ple in our spiritual education.

Our Lord's miracles, and teaching, and life are the essence
of poetry—Divine poetry. The Bible is full of poetry; the
Psalms are charged with the highest poetic vein—and there
is nothing to be compared to them for poetic grandeur,
Truth, and loftiness of thought. Yet many people run off
with the idea that poetry must necessarily contain a fictitious
vein, and therefore they regard teaching expressed in poetic
language in the Bible as unreliable. But this is a fallacious
idea, as we may perceive even from a logical standpoint.

The Apostle Paul testified to the fact that the Athenian
poets were vessels of truth.

A noted writer has remarked that "the genius of Hebrew
admits of no poet's license," and we assert most assuredly
that the inspired genius of Holy Writ, from Genesis to
Revelations, admits of no untrue license; and our prayer is
ever to be prepared with God's help to defend the veracity
of the Bible at all costs.

The Holy Scriptures contain evidence within themselves
that they are the record of the expressed Will of God, and
that they are charged with supernatural Spirit, Power, and
Truth is proven not only on experimental, observational,
and realistic lines, but through the evidence of the facts of
Nature, and personal observation and experience. For “He that believeth hath a witness within himself.”

Referring in a personal sense once more to fiction, I feel compelled to openly confess that when it was stated in The Protestant Standard, quite recently, that I “also was a novelist,” I was not proud of that kindly meant puff up. And I am led now to state that the only story I ever wrote, viz: Adrian Galilio, was written because I was requested to do so, and I was promised considerable financial gain if I would produce a story. Since then I have received earnest requests to write more stories—and the publication secured—but I do not intend to do so. The works were to be devoid of either religion, theology, science, astronomy, or astrology; but I was asked to urge the necessary reformation of present laws, which unjustly inflict the consequences of parental sin upon their innocent offspring, who not only suffer substantial loss, but humiliation and degradation to their conscious minds and souls. Although men and women beget bodily offspring they do not beget the intelligent soul which inhabits those bodies. This is an indisputable point, for murderers and others of the vilest character have been the parents of saints, and visa versa; therefore evil doers should suffer for their transgressions, and they alone.

I am thankful, however, that my one story was written with a purpose, and it has not failed as it has been the means of leading some into lines of truth—and they have accepted the same through my story’s instrumentality.

Let us therefore beware of spending ourselves and our money for “that which is not bread,” and our “labour for that which satisfieth not.” But rather let us become wedded to the truth in a deeper sense, day by day, then shall our soul delight itself in fatness and in true freedom—Freedom from sin’s snare, and death’s sting.

“And the truth shall make you free.”

Gather the Truth unto thy heart,
Gather it night and morn,
Gather it gently, and crush it not,
As a flower of tender form.
And wherever thou seest it springing forth,
Let it adorn.

Gather the Truth, its lovely leaves
Of heavenly tint and hue,
If placed with care around thy brow,
will lend thee beauty true.
Its blossoms withstand the heat of day
By Morning Dew.

Gather the Truth—before it bow,
Where'er its source I pray;
Gather the ozone fragrance new
From its pure and heavenly ray.
Seek it wherever the Truth allow,
And seek away.

Gather the Truth—Jehovah’s Words,
Spoken on Sinai;
Gather with care and ignore them not,
Not pandeir unto a lie!
Christ Jesus e’er kept His Father’s Word,
And we should try.

God’s pardoning Mercy comes through Christ,
His blood can sin atone,
And we behold Creation’s Works
As by His Sabbath shown.
Gather the Truth in Christ, our Life,
In Him alone.

E. A. M. B.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

The Daily Mail of December 23rd, 1902, contains a representation of Mr. Marconi’s telegraphic installation at Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia—and also at Poldhu, Cornwall, England.
This sketch, as published in the newspaper, represents Mr. Marconi’s apparatus as set up on the flat earth, with its huge towers parallel to each other, on each side of the ocean, whilst the ocean itself is represented by the usual curvature of the globe!

Anything more grotesque in the way of drawing it would be difficult to conceive, and it is surely a fair criticism to say that the artist must have both felt and known that the design was totally false in all its bearings and future possible results!

Why, then, is a drawing of this nature published to the world at large, and in an English daily newspaper?

Mr. Marconi’s towers are said to be 215 feet high, and this altitude would certainly be very considerable on a flat earth, and with a view that the electric message might then pass safely over the intervening space without being influenced by the surface of the ocean, or by vessels which might happen to pass beneath the line of electricity.

The distance between the two stations is given as 2,270 nautical miles; but this, again, is much better stated in its truer character of statute miles—in that all miles on maps and in atlases are invariably statute miles, and neither nautical nor that other fallacy called geographical miles—and this fact of all miles in maps being statute miles is of itself one of the great proofs that the earth is flat, and that map makers recognize that such is the case.

The distance then between the two stations may be safely computed as 2,620 statute miles, but the ocean being drawn as if curved so this curvature will represent an immense height of water as rising between the two stations, and this height will amount to not less than 216 statute miles; and in the face of this immense tower of water we are actually expected to believe that Mr. Marconi’s parallel towers 215 feet high are sufficiently lofty to transmit a message over an eminence of 216 miles, and situated just half-way between his towers of such comparatively trifling elevation.

The towers, however, as drawn in the Daily Mail, together with a projecting staff—which may be meant as a flag-staff—are really drawn to be equal in height to the curvature of the ocean between! Therefore Marconi’s towers should each be 216 miles in height; and I ask, is the Professor prepared for this costly installation, and one which it is impossible to set up?

To return once again to the distance of 2,620 statute miles, and recording the elevation of curvature at Cape Breton itself, instead of half way between the stations, I find that the tower at Cape Breton should be 866 miles below the tower at Cornwall, when the latter position on the globe is kept—top up. And the position at Cornwall would be, in its turn, 866 miles below that at Cape Breton, when the latter station is kept top up on the globe.

And yet we are expected to believe that Mr. Marconi’s towers, each of an elevation of only 215 feet, are equal to the occasion of telegraphing, up hill in the one case, over a height of 866 miles; and also, as possibly, down hill in the other case—and round a corner to a drop of 866 miles.

Really, I may well ask, what are Mr. Marconi’s towers for? Why not keep the apparatus flush on the ground at once? Naturally the towers are imperative, and that is why they are built; and they prove, of course, that the earth is flat between the two stations, and throughout the distance of the 2,620 miles; and that neither the eminence of 216 miles of water, as in the centre, nor the discrepancy of levels, amounting to 866 miles in the whole distance and at either end, has any actual and veritable existence whatever.

And now, to return to the diagram once again, the towers on either side are shown to be parallel to each other, but instead of this upright position each tower should be at a smart angle to the other; for instance the one in Cornwall should lean to the right, whilst that at Cape Breton should lean to the left—outwards and away from each other.

This angular position of the towers is imperative on a globular diagram representing part of a globular earth, and of course all the impracticable difficulties hitherto exposed would become even more impracticable than before, and with the further effect that the message from the one tower would have no tendency to pass in the desired direction to the other tower, but would have a direct propensity to fly off into space and be hopelessly resolved, by the revolving globe, into nothingness, or electric force of no possible use for the purpose of telegraphy of the wireless order.

Mr. Marconi might be a thunder maker, but not a telegraphist. This clever electrician has furnished one of the strongest proofs that the earth is flat, and his system of wireless telegraphy, with its graphic parallel towers will no
doubt be an abiding feature and an encouraging proof that the earth is not the globe it has been thought to be, and is, in addition, stationary; without which latter state of repose and quietude it would indeed be difficult to perceive how wireless messages can or could be sent—especially over long distances.

The very long distances over which wireless messages have been sent are also standing and most convincing proofs that the earth is a stationary and extended plane, the ground plan of which has a general tendency to flatness, which fact is being widely accepted as the true shape of the earth and is becoming more and more certified.

F. E. MIDDLETON.

THE EARTH'S ROTATION.

The latter day educational curriculum of our English and Scottish Universities must be held responsible for the opinions enunciated by Mr. I. N. McLean. And I must be permitted to adhere to the opinion that the pendulum experiment, whether performed in the Pantheon at Rome; in the Science Museum at South Kensington, or in the Glasgow Cathedral, prove nothing but the pendulum's own motion, and not the rotation of the earth, and, therefore, these scientific experiments have to be classed with the common negations of nescience.

The erroneous opinions of ancient and modern astronomers tell us that the revolution of the earth in its annual orbit round the sun has the effect of causing the latter body seemingly to describe a complete revolution among the stars in the course of the year. If the plane, say our astronomers, of the apparent path had been parallel to the earth's equator, the days and nights would be equal all over the globe, and each place on the earth would have one constant season, the character of which would depend upon its geographical latitude. Instead of this coincidence of planes, the equator and ecliptic are mutually inclined to each other at 23½ degrees; consequently the sun is alternately seen above and below the equator by this amount, causing the phenomena of summer and winter; giving long days and summer to the northern hemisphere when the sun is north of the equator, and short days and winter when south of it.

And all this astronomical nescience is, as cause and effect, attributed to the revolution of the earth in its annual orbit round the sun, and not to the annual revolution of the sun around its own celestial orbit in the heavens, which we now scientifically propose to demonstrate from the reliable credenda of natural phenomena.

The great orb of light is visible, during the whole period of 24 hours, at the summer solstice, at the North Pole, or centre, and at the winter solstice it recedes southwards. And, therefore, the earth does not rotate, as universally proclaimed and affirmed by the revolution hypothesis, around the sun, or the sun around the earth, but around its own circular, or elliptical orbit in the heavens.

The sun, on December 31st, our shortest day, was at its extreme South.* From this position, since the creation of the world, the sun has annually advanced, cycle upon cycle, or ellipse upon ellipse, until it reaches the North pole on June 21st, our longest day, when the great orb of light will again return, by a similar process of retraction, to South regions.

It is, therefore, to the annual revolution of the sun around its own elliptical orbit in the heavens, that we are indebted for the varied seasons of the solar year, for spring, summer, autumn, and winter, and not, as now taught in the curriculum of our English and Scottish universities, to the revolution of the earth around the sun.

WM. M. DAVIDSON.

SPHEROIDIC DIAGRAPHIC INSANITY.

Many educated people are aware that Mr. Marconi, the ingenious telegraphist, has fitted up extensive operating stations, which are 2,500 miles apart, at Poldu in Cornwall and all this astronomical nescience is, as cause and effect, attributed to the revolution of the earth in its annual orbit round the sun, and not to the annual revolution of the sun around its own celestial orbit in the heavens, which we now scientifically propose to demonstrate from the reliable credenda of natural phenomena.

The great orb of light is visible, during the whole period of 24 hours, at the summer solstice, at the North Pole, or centre, and at the winter solstice it recedes southwards. And, therefore, the earth does not rotate, as universally proclaimed and affirmed by the revolution hypothesis, around the sun, or the sun around the earth, but around its own circular, or elliptical orbit in the heavens.

The sun, on December 31st, our shortest day, was at its extreme South.* From this position, since the creation of the world, the sun has annually advanced, cycle upon cycle, or ellipse upon ellipse, until it reaches the North pole on June 21st, our longest day, when the great orb of light will again return, by a similar process of retraction, to South regions.

It is, therefore, to the annual revolution of the sun around its own elliptical orbit in the heavens, that we are indebted for the varied seasons of the solar year, for spring, summer, autumn, and winter, and not, as now taught in the curriculum of our English and Scottish universities, to the revolution of the earth around the sun.

WM. M. DAVIDSON.

SPHEROIDIC DIAGRAPHIC INSANITY.

Many educated people are aware that Mr. Marconi, the ingenious telegraphist, has fitted up extensive operating stations, which are 2,500 miles apart, at Poldu in Cornwall

*Our esteemed friend, Mr. Fred. B. Hughes, of Woodville, South Australia, writing on Dec. 9th, 1902, says, "Our longest day here will be on Sunday, 28th Dec., when the sun rises at 5.4 a.m. and sets at 7.39 p.m."
and Glace Bay, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, between which messages are expected to be exchanged; but many perhaps did not see, or perhaps critically view, the contents of a weekly paper called The Sphere, dated November 22nd, 1902, in which on pp. 178-9, are some very curious diagrams, one of which shows a segment of a circle of about 25,000 miles, with accessories.

The operating towers, which in reality are only 200 feet high, by comparison with the 2,500 mile curve, are represented as being about 90 miles each in height,—which is rather good for a leaning tower. Two ships are also shown on the wonderful curve, which in comparison cannot be less than 90 miles each in length,—which is likewise good for a vessel with any number of funnels.

Regarding the wonderful curve, that is shown as being made up in the deepest part of a stupendous mountain of water, over 120 miles high, so that a 32-h.p. "Hornsby" oil engine, with Mather & Platt’s dynamos, do not appear unnecessarily powerful to project the current over such an immense impediment.

Lastly, there are dashes shown to represent the electric current, which is being projected from the 90-mile high towers; some of these very wonderful current dashes, in comparison with the rest of the misleading monstrosity, are shown as flying hundreds of miles high, and certainly far from the influence of Mr. Marconi’s apparatus.

Altogether, The Sphere people have published to the world, through their highly imaginative artist, Percy Home, some most misleading illustrations for future generations to laugh and deride at.

We cannot for a moment think that Mr. Marconi would in any way endorse such foolish diagrams, which are put before the public, presumably to educate them—IN IGNORANCE—.

REGEDDA.

In reference to the above article, as also to that of Mr. Middleton (see p. 127), we must point out that even were the world a globe both "The Sphere" and the "Daily Mail" are wrong in their illustrations; both think anything is good enough for the British Public to swallow, provided it only be dubbed SCIENCE.—Ed.]

LECTURES BY LADY BLOUNT.

Since our last issue the Ed. has given lectures at the Shire Hall, Holt, Norfolk, on January 15th, 1903, for the Holt Mutual Improvement Society; at the Eccleston Hall, Berwick Street, London, on January 15th, for the Eccleston Social and Literary Society; and at the Shire Hall, Chelmsford, on January 20th. Also at Kingston, and Hampton Court.

These meetings were more than well attended, and the reports are far too numerous and lengthy to reprint, as many pages would be required to reproduce all that appeared in the daily and weekly papers. The following are from letters received from some of the gentlemen who reported at the different meetings.

"I am interested in the subject and should be pleased if you would forward me literature bearing upon the same."

"I perceived that many of your points in argument were solid, and unanswerable."

"Kindly send me The Earth regularly."

"Your lengthy lecture will certainly lead, in my opinion, to a better study of the Scriptures, and if it does this it will not have been given in vain."

The London Morning Leader makes reference to the above. The following is one paragraph taken from the "Sub Rosa" column:

"Nothing will induce me to oppose so effective an alliance as Moses and Lady Blount. I have always regarded Moses as a very distinguished man—not perfect perhaps, but distinctly superior to Aaron. And as to Lady Blount her sex and her title claim and receive my respect. If, therefore, these two agree on this point I do not mind owning that I shall in future regard the earth as a little more flat and a little less globular than I did before. Moreover, Lady Blount is the first teacher, so far as I am aware, to settle that matter about what it is that keeps the sea from spilling. Here is a valuable passage from the lecture: "She believed and the pianists hold that the earth and sea
are extended planes on which men and ships are securely kept by great and permanent mountains of ice which, as a demonstrated fact, surround the world on which we live and move and have our being. Seeing that we have such an ice surrounding, we ought to be satisfied. The whole world is a huge cold storage affair, and it is to be hoped that Mother Earth will never have to say, "I thawed so," or there will be a terrible mess.

We had intended to refrain from quoting other matter from the same source, as it contains a touch of vulgarity, but as we perceive that our esteemed correspondent, Mr. Xavier Field, makes reference to it, we give it, as follows:

"The other day I mourned that Ebenezer Breach had left no successor to bear aloft the banner of the Flat School of Philosophy—or perhaps I should say the School of Flat Philosophy. I now find I was wrong, for a report of a lecture delivered to the Holt Mutual Improvement Society, shows that she has stepped into the breach (and I here request readers to abstain from sending jokes about the plural form of the word.) Lady Blount is quite sound in the faith, and she sticks to Moses as adhesively as did Ebenezer. I have long since announced that I leave the matter an open question, my own view being that the world is not so flat as some suppose, nor as globular as others declare."

Regarding the Southern Circumference, an esteemed correspondent writes as follows:

"A correspondent says that it has been proved that longitudes narrow towards the South. I ask, how and when was it proved, and has the late expedition proved it? The earth may still be flat either way. It will not make a globe of it, though the answer is MOST important. I favour the smaller South Antarctic region—about 4,000 miles round, commonly called a South Pole. —a SMALL Antarctic region in preference to an outside ring of ice, which latter will still be there, but further away: MUCH FURTHER AWAY."

Under the above heading, S.L.H., of the Morning Leader, has been favouring his readers with a "skit" on our teaching anent the Plane Earth. The column we allude to is not written for those who take life seriously, and S.L.H. being the "funny man" of the staff is nothing unless jocular. Therefore, to use the words of a somewhat gruesome quotation, if possible he would

"Raise a laugh under the ribs of death."

By this we mean that nothing is too serious or sacred for this facile writer to offer some punningly satirical remarks upon. He means no spite towards anyone; but it is his business to be humorous, and his Morning Leader column must be filled with jokelets—"the more the merrier." Yet he must not run counter to accepted orthodox theories. Consequently, although he has a fine field for some genuine wit upon the absurd deductions of orthodox astronomers, who, whilst admitting that we cannot travel in a railway train 60 miles an hour and believe that the train is not moving, tell us that Mother Earth is whizzing through space at the rate of 65,000 miles an hour, besides doing a daily "turn over" (an amazing acrobatic feat); but as we intimated before, it is S.L.H.'s business to go with the times, and, if necessary to throw overboard the Bible, which says: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth" (Heb. i. 10); "The world also is established that it cannot be moved" (Ps. xci. 1, xcvi. 10). S.L.H. admits that Lady Blount is "quite sound in the faith." In the words of Shakespeare we say: "For this relief much thanks." S.L.H. goes on to say that Lady Blount "sticks to Moses as adhesively as did Ebenezer" (Breach); but why drag in Mr. Breach, who was a good man—"that, and nothing more"? It is true that Mr. Breach so recognized the truths proclaimed by Lady Blount as to frame her ladyship's letters in gold; but he was one of the class of individuals who would be safe as scholars though apt to make grotesque blunders as teachers, and, through lack of educational and mental training are liable to be made
tools of in the hands of those who wish to bring Plane Earth truths into ridicule. Mr. Breach meant no harm himself; but his mental calibre was such that he was unwittingly led away by those who desired to make the Zetetic Cosmogony and Plane Earth truths a laughing stock.

However, accepting and acting on the principle "that the weakest link of a chain is the strongest," our opponents drag in Mr. Breach as a Plane Earth teacher (when he was not an acknowledged teacher) and then proceed to show the absurdity of some of his disquisitions which were not necessarily accepted by Zetetics. Such a method of procedure, to say the least, is not "fair fighting."

What our God-given senses reveal to us we accept in preference to theories opposed to common sense, and to God's Word, which says: "The pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and He hath set the world upon them" (1 Sam. ii.8); "He hath founded the earth upon her bases that it should be removed" (Ps. civ. 5); "He hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods" (Ps. xxiv. 2); but so-called modern scientists and globular astronomers contradict the Word of the Living God, and they deny the Word of God through Moses, who was the mouthpiece of Deity. In this respect the creeds of our opponents may be plainly seen (to use the words of Lady Blount herself) and they evidently try to throw a slur upon what they intimate is our week position, namely: that a woman holds the place of being our most prominent defender; and here we would remind the writer in the Morning Leader that, if we mistake not, they have a lady on their staff; at any rate most of the leading daily papers requisition the services of ladies. The National Press Agency, the London Press Exchange, the Central News, the Press Association, and "Reuter," have ladies for their most valued contributors; so that, in this respect, S.L.H., is in the position of being "hoist with his own petard."

To proceed further would be to "slaughter the slain" and, to use a rather bucolic expression, "there is no sport in shooting dead ducks."

XAVIER FIELD.

[We are thankful that truth cannot be injured by weak or uneducated supporters, nor can untruths be established by educated men.—Ed.]

MORE WORLDS THAN ONE.

In the paper entitled Past and Future we notice, in the number for December, 1902, an article headed A Jewe World. The editor of the paper opens with a statement which we think he cannot prove. He says: "there are more worlds than one." He goes further and says: that "God has made" all these worlds to display His glorious attributes.

We should like to know from whence the editor obtained his information. He professes to believe the Bible; but the Bible gives no account of any other world than this which we inhabit. Where then does he get his information?

Not from the Bible, but from the opinions and speculations of the astronomers. On p. 19 of the same number he says: "some people discredit the immense distance and magnitude of the celestial orbs." Now as Zetetics are the people who discredit these "immense distances" the reference must be to us. We should like to ask the writer for his proof—either that the stars are worlds, or that they are situated at the "immense distances" assigned by the astronomers.

He offers no proof of star distances, and only a very flimsy one of the distance of the moon. He asserts that the moon must be 236,267 miles away from the earth; and says, "were the moon not so distant it would not be seen eclipsed on the same night by persons living all over the same hemisphere."

We are not prepared to admit that they do see every partial eclipse which takes place; for some eclipses are invisible in this country while visible elsewhere. So there goes assumption number two.

Then we have no proof that a total eclipse seen over half the surface of the earth "would not be seen" unless the moon were that distance away from us, to say nothing of the exact number of miles given. So here goes assumption number three.

Yet, after these three assumptions, we are further told: "this fact also assists us to judge of it (the moon's) size." But if the distance be not a fact, how can the assumed distance assist us to judge of the size of the moon, unless we judge distance by the size, and size by the distance? So here goes assumption number four.
We are assuredly informed, if the diameter of the moon was less than 2,160 miles, as stated, the moon would not appear equally large to us as it does at the same time to the residents of South Australia. We may, therefore, be satisfied with the astronomical measurements of the distances of the moon, and its size, and can use them as our standard yard measure.

But we Zetetics are not satisfied with astronomical measurements. There is not one of these measurements of the distances of celestial objects that is not primarily based upon the assumption that the earth is a rotating globe. And we deny this fundamental assumption, and have clearly and repeatedly shown its baseless character. Hence the dissatisfaction of Zetetics with the measurements of star distances, and the distances of the sun and moon at present in vogue. These distances have been altered time after time to suit the ever shifting requirements of hypothesis of modern astronomy.

If we want a pronounced knowledge of God, or His star strewn dominions we must not begin by contradicting the revelation which God has given us through the prophets unto Israel of His great Creative Works. Now God says that the sun and moon, "and the stars also," were made on the fourth day of Creation week.

There is one statement in the paragraph under consideration which we endorse. The statement is made that the stars "do not travel round the sun," and that they are "mere points of light." How then can they be worlds, when no telescope ever invented by men can make of them more than "mere points of light"? This fact proves unmistakably the truth of Gen. i., where God says that they are merely "lights" intended to "give light" upon the earth." And it "was so." And it is so; and no man in the world can prove it otherwise.

Let us give up these vain speculations, and learn to take God at His Word; or else be consistent in our unbelief and give up the Bible altogether.

The infidel who rejects the Bible in toto is more consistent than the professing Christian who accepts so-called "scientific" teachings in preference to the Bible's inspired statements.

With respect to star motions we quite agree that the stars do not revolve around the sun. They all revolve around and above the earth. The fixed stars revolve a little faster than the sun, which therefore loses one revolution in a year. This marks the solar year; and together with the fact that the sun moves in a spiral orbit, shows the reason why the sun is found in the different signs of the Zodiac during the twelve months of the year. The sun is left behind by the stars $30^\circ$ each month. The stars move in circular orbits around and above the earth, and the sun, moon, and planets in spiral or nearly circular orbits alternately contracting and expanding from a mean or middle circle called the equinoctial or celestial equator. So that we agree with the editor of Past and Future that the stars "do not revolve around the sun," but as "lights" merely revolve around and above the only earth, or world, which God intended them to enlighten.

Against the writer's general chronology we have not a word to say. He is doing good work, which we gladly acknowledge, in proving the Bible true chronologically; but as he is discarding its cosmogony he is not after all a true friend to the Bible. What should we think of a man who professed to defend us with a sword in one hand, if at the same time he himself gave us an occasional stab with a dagger held in the other? We should probably say, "save us from such friends."

---

ZETETIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

On the cover of The Earth there has appeared a map of the earth, not the world. Can any reader inform us what and when a ship or ships sailed due south from Cape Horn, Cape of Good Hope, India, and Honolulu; and did ice stay their progress as it does in sailing from Australia?—J.W.

What proof have we that "the dome of the heavens, or the firmament......is concave towards us," as stated on page 72, vol. iii.?—J.W.

The text in Amos, already named gives the heaven a vault, which means a dome, and elsewhere the same meaning is applied. It is not the globular teaching at all, because the
globe theory is: there is nothing but space over us, and all round. Therefore there can be no firmament vault in the globular system. If not a vault, what shape does J.W. think it to be?—Ed.]

Reply to query on Middleton's Plan of the Earth.—The querist appears to be a disputant pure and simple, and he fails to distinguish between a ground plan and a map. He then proceeds to remark that the plan of the earth is not that of the world. What rational difference he can perceive between a plan of the earth and a plan of the world passes my limit of understanding. He then wishes to know if ships have sailed due South from certain points such as Cape Horn, India, and the Cape of Good Hope? The reply to this is that ships sail on Commercial routes which pay their owners, but they do not sail on unremunerative routes, such as he names, except when sent out by some Government and for some especial purpose—such as the present Antarctic expeditions. The questioner next wishes to know if vessels which might sail due South from the points above named, would be stayed in their progress by ice—as on a wide barrier, in opposition to the more narrow and confined South Pole, which is met with by ships sailing due South from Australia as one station alone?

The reply is, that this point is what we all wish to know. The late Antarctic expeditions were sent out presumably to settle this point; and the result has not yet been formally reported upon, but it is said in Southampton that all the expeditions have failed, and this, I presume, means that a general barrier of ice has been found; and probably the precise truth on this point will come out eventually, and in the course of a few months.—E. E. Middleton.

A DEFENCE OF PHILOSOPHIC DOUBT:
By "Rectangle."

(continued from p. 111.)

"We are thus satisfied that the gifted author was not actually there, or he would have been melted in company with 'iron and all other metals.' This is a relief, and enables us to at once and for ever dispose of his wild theories as baseless assumptions. In a certain case before the magistrate, the culprit hardly liked to say that the witness against him was telling a lie, so he mildly said that the witness was 'handling the truth very carelessly.' When Mr. Laing has the impertinence to tell us what lies below the surface of the earth for a depth of 25 miles we are bound to say that he handles the truth in a careless and most reprehensible manner.

With the usual unqualified manner for which scientists have become famous, Mr. Laing goes on to say:

'Reasoning from these facts, ASSUMING the rate of change in the forms of life to have been the same formerly......Lyell has arrived at the conclusion that Geology requires a period of not less than 200,000,000 of years to account for the phenomena which it discloses.'

To reason from facts and then to assume something which in its very essence is incapable of proof, is bad enough; but to mis-call fictions facts, and then to add on to them whatsoever assumption is necessary to maintain the result in keeping with the theory with which the start was made, is so atrocious that we are again forced to the conclusion that Geologists are lost in the fogs of their own creation, and cannot find their way through the millions of ages of their own imagination, to anything having the remotest bit of truth in it. Once more, and I have done with Mr. Laing and his Geology. He informs us in the work already referred to that:

'The law of gravity, which IS THE FOUNDATION OF MOST OF WHAT WE CALL THE NATURAL LAWS OF GEOLOGICAL ACTION has certainly prevailed, as will be shown later, through the enormous periods of geological time and far beyond this WE CAN DISCERN IT OPERATING in those astronomical changes by which cosmic matter has been condensed into nebulae, nebulae into suns throwing off planets, and planets throwing off satellites, as they cooled and contracted.'

The laws of geological action being based on a myth—
the law of gravitation—Geology itself may be "thrown off into space" without any ill effects being felt anywhere.

Geology is said to prove the extreme antiquity of the earth and of man. It is said that the sedimentary rocks are the result of the deposits from rivers, which rocks, on account of the slowness of their deposit and their great thickness have taken millions of years to form. It is further stated that in each series of rocks fossils have been found, proving that from the lower to the upper strata, the forms of life have been in the ascending scale, man being the highest and last species to be evolved.

The first of these assertions is contradicted by Lyell, who, in his *Students' Elements of Geology*, page 9, says:

"It is not true, as was formerly supposed, that all granite together with the crysalline or metamorphic strata, were first formed and thereafter entitled to be called 'primitive,' and that the aqueous and volcanic rocks were afterwards super-imposed, and should therefore rank as secondary in the order of time. This idea was adopted in the infancy of the science, when all formations, whether stratified or unstratified, earthy or crysalline, with or without fossz'ls, were alike regarded as of aqueous origin.'

On page 5, he further says:

"Fossil shells, such as now abound in the sea are met with far inland, both near the surface and at great depths below it. They occur at all heights above the level of the ocean, having been observed at elevations of more than 8,000 feet in in the Pyrenees, 10,000 feet in the Alps, 13,000 feet in the Andes, and above 18,000 feet in the Himalayas. Col. R. A. Strachey found oolite fossils 18,400 feet high in the Himalayas." (That is 18,400 feet above sea level).

Besides this, the rocks in question are homogeneous, and could not be formed as stated because the deposits of rivers are heterogeneous, and could not form homogeneous rocks. Thus the "deposit" theory, with its millions of ages, is quickly extinguished.

Then, if fossils, representing lower forms of life were embedded in rocks which took millions of years to form, how

...
sphericity of the earth.' Yet this is generally considered to be one of the best popular proofs of the globe theory. But I think 'Enquirer' falls into a very common error when he says: 'At length when the apparent horizon is overpassed by an outward-bound ship, its hull gradually disappears.' Now, according to the rules of perspective, objects below the level of the eye appear to rise to a point, or line, on a level with the eye as they recede; but they never appear to rise above it, or 'overpass' it, and then go down. The apparent horizon is always seen on a level with the eye of the spectator; therefore, if the hull of a vessel be below the line of sight when it starts on its outward-bound voyage, it will, as long as it is visible, remain below the horizon. It will never overpass the horizon, or be seen above or on it; but the hull will disappear before it quite reaches the vanishing point. As 'Enquirer' remarks: 'Such instances should be noted with exactness.' Last year, when I was staying at Brighton, I watched the disappearance of out-going hulls with this special point in view. I pointed out this fact to others, who acknowledged I was right. Vanished hulls can often be rendered visible again by means of a good telescope. This proves they have not gone down below and beyond the horizon.

In regard to the eclipse of the Moon having been occasionally observed while the Sun was also visible above the horizon, this we regard as a proof that the earth is not a globe. The fact can be explained without the aid of the globe theory. 'Enquirer' admits the fact, but he assumes that we must be ignorant of 'the elementary knowledge' he so kindly supplies. Like many others, he cannot argue in favour of the globe theory without innocently assuming the question at issue. For instance, he says, 'Atmospheric refraction raises a distant object 33°, an amount which exceeds the apparent diameter of the Moon or the Sun; and by consequence, both luminaries may be visible at one moment from one region of the earth's surface.' This reasoning quietly assumes one or both luminaries to be actually below the horizon, yet he admits that 'appearances are sometimes treacherous.' Although the Sun appears to be set, it does not follow that the body of the Sun is actually below the earth. Perspective and the earth's atmosphere are sufficient to account for the phenomena of sunset, without necessitating the belief that the orb has really gone below the horizon. Now, the assumption of the globularists that it is the earth's shadow which eclipses the Moon, requires the further assumption that either the Sun or the Moon is actually below the earth at the time of the eclipse of the Moon. Then, a third assumption is made to explain the fact that both Sun and eclipsed Moon are visible at one and the same moment (from the top of the earth); and this assumption, in order to fit with their theory is that 'atmospheric refraction raises a distant object.' The fallacy of any one of these several and subtle assumptions would be sufficient to vitiate the whole argument in support of the globe theory. If the earth were really a globe, it would be impossible to see from the same place, at the same time, two apparently and comparatively small orbs, in exact opposition on either side of the earth. It would take up too much space to show this by diagrams, or I would do so. One of the orbs would be at least 90° below the visible horizon, and our friends do not surely claim that atmospheric refraction can bring up a body 90° above that horizon. At another opportunity, I should like to deal with that greatest assumption of all, viz: Solar attraction or 'Gravitation,' without which the globular theory falls to the ground.

Leicester.

ZETETES.
why the moon’s attraction has no power to lift up any substance besides water, why there are no tides in lakes, ponds, and all shallow waters, and in fact why the rising of Tides should give the waters any other motion; because, if the moon’s attraction has the power to lift the waters up perpendicularly, it certainly must have power to prevent them from going off on an inclined plane; and consequently, if the Newtonian theory were true, the waters would still be as stagnant as if there were no tides at all (pp. 6 & 7)."

If high and low water are found to be determinable by certain ages of the moon, there is surely reason to suspect that there is as much necessary connexion between the earth and her satellite as between a mail coach and horses; but one day or other, steam may be found equivalent to the latter; in other words we mean that a chemical agency may enter into the modes of operation. It may be too subtle for experiment, but even admitting the inverse ratio (of which hereafter) of the square of the distance, the pretended and well known universal law, by which nature performs so many of her grand operations, it may still be philosophically presumed that gravity and attraction are not so much laws as properties of nature, and that the former are yet latent. We do not mean to say that the mathematics are not the roads in which nature travels; we only mean that chemical philosophy furnishes the means of motion at all. Geometry cannot be a principle of sufficient extent for such an universal law as that to which Sir Isaac Newton applies to it.

We think that experiments to disprove it may be made with the air pump. The chemical attraction of cohesion is undoubted; that forms density, and were the centre of the earth a vacuum, all bodies must tend to it. Capt. Forman shows (pp. 47-48) that the famous law of the square of the distance is unsound; and the nearer a falling body approaches to the earth, the greater may be the weight of the superincumbent atmosphere. No man can lift his hand off an exhausted receiver; and every inch of this earth is pressed down by a column of air thirty miles high. We do not say we have unravelled this sphinx’s riddle, nor are we able to do so. We only believe chemical agency to be of much more universal operation in the laws of Nature than Geometry; and that experiments concerning the real cause of gravity and attraction may be usefully made with the air pump, magnet, and thermometer. To use Capt. Forman’s arguments (pp. 16-17), in other views of the subject, it is hard to conjecture how propellant and stationary, centripetal and centrifugal properties can be made to act in unison, and yet the Newtonian theory of gravity implies as much, if we suppose the earth to act like a magnet by properties inherent in se; any air rises in water; and hydrogen gas rises in air merely because the respective substances are lighter in bulk than the quantity of either of the respective fluids of the same dimensions. The gravity or attraction of the earth has nothing to do with these familiar phenomena, but it ought if the attraction was magnetic and universal. We are told that the contact of lunar rays ripens fruits, and accelerates the growth of vegetables, (see Alexander Wilson’s Observations on the Influence of Climate on Animal and Vegetable Bodies, ch. VI.); and if so, we do not see, a priori, why there may not be a chemical action of the moon in reference to the Tides, and why Capt. Forman’s theory should not command a fair investigation. As to water vibrating and rising, there can be but three causes of it; oscillation of the containing body, agitation by heat, or removal of super-incumbent pressure.

Here we must take our leave of Capt. Forman, who deserves infinite praise for the gentlemanly manner with which he treats his opponents.
the question with me? Excepting our planet, Creation's whole cluster 's as empty as you and your volume, Sir D. Says Brewster to Whewell, you've just got your gruel, So Mr. Professor, you'd best sleep upon it. Says Whewell to David, go get your head shaved, Unless you're afraid of the bees in your bonnet. — From Punch, Oct. 28th, 1854. Sent by Dr. E. Haughton; on the differences of scientists about elementary questions, re Dr. W. Whewell, F.R.S., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Sir David Brewster who wrote a book against Whewell's Plurality of Worlds.

PLANETARY AND SPHERICAL MAPS.

To the Editor of The Earth.—Madam, Your correspondent, Mr. Fred. B. Hughes, writing from Woodville, South Australia, says that "the book and map duly and safely arrived, for which, and your trouble and kindness many thanks. Will you allow me to say that with the map I am not at all pleased. I have never been further away from Australia than New Zealand, but with these two countries I am well acquainted, and the shapes given on this plan are not at all accurate; for instance, our overland telegraph line from Adelaide to Port Darwin is a little under 2,000 miles in length, and runs nearly due North and South while Cape Cuvier on the West and Port Curtis on the east coast are separated by about 3,000 miles, or one and a half times as great from east to west as it is from north and south, whereas the map makes Sharkes Bay on the west coast to be three and a half times as far as Moreton Bay on the east as Adelaide, in the south, is from Port Darwin in the north; that is if Port Darwin is 2,000 miles from Adelaide, which we know to be the case because we have a measured telegraph line, then Sharkes Bay on the West Coast is 7,000 miles from Moreton Bay on the east coast which we know is not the case, in fact we know that it is not anything like 7,000 miles from Moreton Bay to Sharkes Bay even travelling round the coast by steamer, so that the shape of the Map must be wrong."

No doubt that in the flat-earth map, the longitudinal dimensions of the earth become enormously exaggerated. Taking the equator to be 25,000 miles round we shall find, on this scheme, that the more distant icy regions of the south entirely surround the map by a barrier of about 60,000 miles in circumference.

And we may, therefore, be permitted to point out that the great geographical error arises from the impossibility of depicting on a flat-earth map the longitudinal distances from the North Pole otherwise than by their gradual widening as they approach the outer circumference of the earth. Just as reversely, on a spherical globe or map, the longitudinal distances are widest at the centre and become gradually narrower as they approach the north and south polar regions. And, therefore, the spherical map and the flat-earth map are alike geographically inaccurate as a reliable measure of one degree, or of the 360 degrees which actually represent the well known circumference of the earth. And the navigating officers of His Majesty's Navy, and the navigating officers of our more numerous mercantile marine, would certainly have lost an innumerable number of valuable ships had they attempted to navigate the various oceans of the earth on the pictorially artificial maps of the flat-earth and spherical theorems.

We are not aware that the surface of the land of the earth has, at any time, been accurately measured. But this important statement cannot be made in regard to the water surfaces of the earth. Every sea has been thoroughly explored, and its dimensions accurately measured as indicated in our Admiralty Charts. And it is upon the reliable authority of Admiralty Charts that His Majesty's Navy and our Mercantile Marine are safely navigated, their positions being daily and accurately ascertained by the altitude of the sun in the heavens at 12 noon, calculated on the chronological basis of Greenwich mean time, and the reliable determinations of the mariner's sextant.

Yours faithfully, WM. M. DAVIDSON.
SONNET TO A FRIEND:—Christmas, 1902.

As closes now the so-called Old Year's end—
For December (the last month) is the last—
How fleeting are the Wings of Time which flutter past—
In Friendship's Name a greeting line I send.

Oh! may our thoughts be turned from transient things
Before in one eternal "now" we rest
With Him whose truths alike we have confessed,
And Time itself shall rest and close its wings.

But while years roll may we too ponder far
Together labour for the Right and Good,
As our Great Master did, and said we should,
And wait and watch for His bright morning star;
Thus shall our friendship in the Truth abound,
And to God's praise and glory yet be found.

“ZETETES.”

TO THE ED. OF THE EARTH.

My lady, allow me to write; I have said it;
Your paper, The Earth, which you so ably edit
Reflects on you very considerable credit,
Because as I say, The path you have chosen but few dare to tread it.

The world may reproach us, we heed not its censure.
The Scriptures, though critics so-called are deriding.

The Earth, she says, is not round; it does not career round the sun;
The Scriptures, though critics so-called are deriding.

The pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and He hath set the world upon them.
And there are a hundred other texts which Lady Blount offers to show that the earth is immovable and Modern Science is an impudent hussy for ventures to deny it.

Some of Lady Blount's reasons for believing the earth is a plane and not a globe were very amusing. It was said that vessels had sailed round the globe east or west, but nobody had gone round north or south; and how, therefore, could the roundness of the earth be "proved"? It was also said that the sun was also vastly bigger than the earth, and that from that great luminary we derived light and warmth. But would anyone make a lamp bigger than the room which it was designed to light? Absurd! The sun and moon were set in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth and to rule over the day and over the night. But it is impossible to do more here than indicate the general character of the arguments. The humour of the evening was complete when Major Rasch, M.P., who was present, was unexpectedly called upon to second a vote of thanks to the fair 'pliastic.' Lady Blount, he said, amid peals of merriment, might congratulate herself upon being outside Springfield Gaol, for he had heard Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, in that very building, sentence a man who believed the earth was flat to 12 months' hard labour. The meeting, which had been packed to overflowing,—many being unable to find even standing room,—was then brought to a close. —The Essex Weekly News.

[The above, and also a long report of the meeting upon another page, appeared in The Essex Weekly News.]

"A COUNTERFEIT OF TRUTH" should be the words in place of "An Impudent Hussy," in the extract quoted above; the latter is an expression we should never use. To our dear friends Mr. and Mrs. Clare, and Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, of Chelmsford, we are deeply indebted for their kindness and aid. We are receiving numerous enquiries which are very encouraging.—Ed. T.E.

"SEEKING CONVERTS."—Lady Blount came to Chelmsford on Tuesday seeking converts to her theory that the world is as flat as a pancake, and not a 'rotating, revolving globe.' Her ladyship is an enthusiast on the subject, believing that the Bible teaches the true science, while all else is false and based upon groundless hypothesis. In her real she can, with evident satisfaction to herself and surprise at the obfuscation of others, combat and explain merrily the errors and blunders of the scientists, she has a habit of smiling in the most attractive manner imaginable. Nobody could help liking her. But how terribly severe she was on the poor misguided men of science! They have been under the tutelage of the Evil One! There's no other way of explaining their "scientific nonsense," as her Ladyship called it. Lady Blount takes her stand upon the Bible, and whenever science does not agree with Holy Writ, science has to give way. The earth, she says, is not round; it does not career round the sun; it is flat and immovable. 'The pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and He hath set the world upon them.' And there are a hundred other texts which Lady Blount offers to show that the earth is immovable and Modern Science is an impudent hussy for ventures to deny it.

When I think how even Men of Science themselves had been in one eternal "now" we rest, With Him whose truths alike we have confessed, And Time itself shall rest and close its wings.

"ZETETES."
of the works Zetetic Cosmogony and The Earth, together with several other papers which she sent for His Majesty the Emperor's acceptance.

To the Lady Blount.

The Atonement.

"SOLD UNDER SIN."—Rom. vii. 14.

Through Jesus Christ we also "joy in God," Because "The Atonement" we have now received ; No human righteousness could innate joy afford ; Peace comes through Christ, in whom we have believed, And when upon "the Lamb of God" our sins are laid, The Reconciliation's sealed ; the debt is paid. [Rom. v. 13.]

Divinely charged with mystery God's Plan, Before the world's foundation it was sealed,— As through the sin of one Man, Redemption was revealed, And "in due time," behold ! the Son of God, He purchased our Salvation with His blood. [Rom. v. 6.]

Before the world we now behold was formed, Proud Lucifer in heav'n dared to rebel, And he, who once with pow'r and beauty dorn'd, Became corrupt, and from his high place fell ! Then Jesus spake the words in our record, "Lo ! I will come to do Thy will, O Lord." [Heb.x.7 & 8; Ps.xl.]

He came. And what reception was there given To Him—endued with power supreme, and wise ?— Even the Christ of God and cause, a Man from heaven, To bear our sorrows, and our sins to hide, His love was patient, and for love He died, While sinners cried "Let Him be crucified !" [John i. 11.]

The pow'r of the Atonement will unfold, When God confirms each promise in His Word, Yet all His "purposes" unknown, or told, In Christ are seen, or through God's Spirit heard. God "works in a mysterious way" we see, Yet He unveils in part His Mystery ! [Eph iii.11; 1 Tim.iii.16.]

The German Ambassador presents his compliments to Lady Blount, and begs to thank her for the copy of the works Zetetic Cosmogony and The Earth, together with several other papers which she sent for His Majesty the Emperor's acceptance.

[The report of the proceedings also appeared in another column.]
I stood on the cliff at Cromer the other day and gazed over the vast expanse of ocean stretch as far as the eye could see, and it seemed to be a task to speak. I do not know what to think! Will you explain the reason for this appearance? I do not think it matters much now whether we live on a "vast plain" as Longfellow puts it, or on a "whirling globe." If we are grounded on the Rock, I do like your verses; they are so pithy; my daughter is also pleased with them. Whether we accept the Theory or not, pardon me for saying we are very much fascinated with your personality; I shall never forget you.

With sincere and admiring affection, may I sign myself, your devoted friend.

S. BARNINGHAM (Mrs.)

We are very grateful for the numerous encouraging and appreciative letters (similar to the above, and printed by request) received from ladies who have attended our lectures. It will not be out of place here to make the following remarks:—The kind expressions in the foregoing letter are greatly appreciated. It is written by a lady of prepossessing appearance and demeanour; but as she favours the teaching of Swedenborg she is impeded from accepting the Cosmogony upheld by us. Swedenborg's teaching regarding the shape and nature of the earth and universe has been adopted (with a few additions) by "Koresh" of Chicago, U.S.A., which he styles the Cellular Cosmogony. We are thankful to note that the kind encouragement hitherto received from our own sex is increasing; this is as it should be, for Woman having been endowed with mental capacities and placed upon the earth by the Creator, has an undoubted right to study and consider the nature and proportions of her God bestowed environment.

The Editoress of "The Earth." Perth Observatory, Oct. 30th, 1902.

Madam,—Somebody has been so good as to send me a copy of The Earth, No. 27 & 28, wherein a letter of mine to Dr. Langton is reproduced. Please allow me to express my regret at the general tone of that communication. I, writing it, had no idea whatever that it would be so utilized. It frequently happens that in private correspondence or conversation one uses somewhat extravagant terms, and I should never officially or publicly speak in such a manner of opinion hotly held by people whose views differ from my own.

Nor should I attempt to publicly criticise your theories, with the nature of which I am so imperfectly acquainted.

Please, and make one point clear. I started that letter to Dr. Langton with the intention of shewing that the author of The Midnight Sun, in criticising the modern astronomical theories, had first of all misrepresented them, and so it was necessary for me to indicate where, according to these theories, the sun's direction should appear on his diagram. As soon as this correction was made the critics argument vanished. I notice that after clearing up this point I proceeded to attack the pianists' theories, and have thus laid myself open to the same mistake as was made by the author of The Midnight Sun, viz. criticising a theory about which I admittedly know next to nothing. Once again, then, kindly remember that my letter has been published without my consent and was not written for publicity. I may have totally misinterpreted herein the pianists' theories; indeed I cannot help feeling that I must have done so.

Yours faithfully, W. ERNEST COOKE.

We have received the above letter from Mr. Ernest Cooke, of the Perth Observatory, W. Australia, which perhaps calls for a few remarks.

We are glad our friend has written in so kind and courteous a spirit, which we trust we can reciprocate. Though the first letter necessarily called forth some strong remarks from our friend and correspondent "Zetetes," we are sure he has not the slightest ill will personally to anyone who holds the globular theory, much less to a gentleman in the position of Mr. Cooke. But we feel it is our duty to expose that which we believe to be error; and of such a subtle nature that it is turning the minds of the people from the Bible as a revelation from God to man.

In publishing Mr. Cooke's letter we hope we did him no injustice when we simply allowed him to speak for his own side,—a privilege which we should be glad of in any scientific publication. Our only desire is to have and to set forth the truth in this great question of the Creation and shape of the earth on which we live. If, therefore, our astronomical friend and critic cares to write further in defence of the globular theory we shall be pleased to admit his arguments, in The Earth, when no doubt our correspondent "Zetetes" will further examine them in the same courteous spirit which we are now pleased to note in the above letter. We do not ask him to say anything more than he likes about the "plane theory," as he calls it, as he owns he does not understand it; but we invite him to defend his own side with which he is no doubt perfectly familiar. The question underlying the controversy is of course the primary one, namely, Is the earth a whirling globe? If Mr. Cooke will attempt to prove that it is, we shall be pleased further to publish his arguments that the question may be thoroughly and fairly discussed. We cannot offer anything more fair.—Ed. of The Earth.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Answer to E. R. B.—If we are inclined to believe that the earth stands like a great eminence founded in the water, motionless, but like a great hill—What objection have you to this? There are instruments which can tell the exact pressure of the atmosphere, and these instruments therefore show how the height of a mountain. They show how high a traveller goes up a mountain; but they do not show anything which supports this idea.

The following are the questions which I handed in to Mr. Johnson:

(1) How do you explain the fact that the distance between two meridians, one degree apart on the equator, is about 69 miles, and as we recede either Northwards or Southwards the distance between the same meridians diminishes, and diminishes in the same ratio to the distance from the equator, both North and South?

(2) How do you explain the fact that when the days and nights are equal in duration at the equator, as we approach the North or South the periods of duration become more and more unequal as we get into high latitudes, until in the Polar regions we get six months of day and summer, alternating with six months of night and winter?

(3) How do you explain the difference of time in various places on the earth, or in other words,—why does the sun appear to rise earlier in some places than in others? You will recollect that the sun rises 4 minutes earlier for every degree of longitude East, e.g., when it is 12 (noon) at Greenwich it will be only 11 a.m. at Naples (15° E).

Yours faithfully, HAROLD A. WATKIN.

I shall esteem it a favour to receive a reply from you, for which I thank you in anticipation.

Yours faithfully, HAROLD A. WATKIN.
THE EARTH'S ROTATION.

can give us proof that they do we will examine it, and report accordingly.

(2) The proportional lengths of the day and night do not vary when the sun is on the equator, neither would they as "we approach the equator at that time of the year. But when the sun approaches the north the days of course become longer and the nights shorter in those parts; and in the south the nights of course become longer and the days shorter, because the sun is further away from them.

(3) The difference of time in different places is owing to the fact that the sun comes to those places at different times in its journey round above the earth. The sun moves in one hour $15^\circ$, therefore when it is 12 (noon) at Greenwich it will be one o'clock at Naples, not 11.

What causes the moon's half, quarter, and full appearances from our standpoint—A. Y. R.

An. — If you get an indiarubber ball and paint over one half of it some kind of phosphorus paint, then take it in a dark room, and turn it round you will see all the phases of the moon as the ball turns.

(1) If the earth is a plane how can you account for day and night, as the sun disappears at one point and re-appears at the opposite point? (2) How do you account for time differences, as when it is 12 (mid-day) here it is 9 p.m. in Australia? If as you said, water under the earth, how can the sun pass under and re-appear at the opposite point to its disappearance?—E. P.

An. — (1) The sun is not large enough to light all of the earth at once, because the atmosphere resists the rays when the sun gets too far away over any particular part. But when the sun comes round again to the East we see it once more, and it brings morning light. (2) The sun never passes "under the earth," but goes round above the earth. But when it gets away too far from us its rays cannot reach us because of the perspective of the distance, and the atmosphere. The reason why the time is out in Australia from our time is because Australia lies on the opposite side of the plane earth, and the sun does not reach those parts until about ten hours after it has been over England.

THE EARTH'S OBSERVATORY.

(1) The fact that the sun and moon have both been seen above the horizon at the times when a lunar eclipse occurred," proves that "it is not the shadow of the earth which causes the moon's eclipse. (2) "Parallax" thought that a semicircular or dark moon coming between our moon and an observer on the earth so caused the eclipse. Astronomers have ever admitted the existence of dark bodies in the skies. "Zeutes" suggests in his teaching that the moon's eclipse may be caused by its getting into a mass of thick darkness which revolves around and over the earth in opposition to the sun. But in any case we cannot admit that it is the shadow of the earth because we do not admit that the earth is a heavenly body rushing through space, because it is contrary to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures and also to the evidence of our senses and demonstrated facts.

If you sail 10,000 miles east in one particular latitude hold the same star at the same point as you did when you were at one part of the earth; but if you start from another the aspect of the heavens is different. This is because the stars move round the earth from east to west; but the stars do not move north and south.

THE ROMANCE OF SCIENCE:

EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESSES GIVEN BY LADY BLOUT.

TRUTH is a certain sound, divinely garnished, But fiction ever is with falsehood tarnished.

"The truth of the Religion of any people may be tested by its Cosmogony; whatever it may be, the system of Religion associated with it must stand or fall."—Lord Macaulay (Lives of the Popes.)

Science is simply the Latin word Scientia, which means Knowledge reduced to system under general facts or principles. Fact we know is solid, and is the very essence of veracity. But Romance is not Truth. It is the very opposite to it; it is fiction.

Now we maintain that no system, however elaborated, can be placed on the high pedestal described as "Science" unless it be uncontroversitely based and founded upon Fact.

Therefore all things, whether they be methods, or systems, or mere calculations, without a true factor or foundation to start upon, are really only superficially erected upon hypothesis: and being without true origin or foundation we know are not only unproven in themselves, but when such things are in contradiction to the Holy Scriptures they cannot be more graphically described than as the Scriptures describe them, viz.: "Science falsely so-called."

And this so-called "science" is not true knowledge. It is opposite to Truth.

Nevertheless truth undivided is essential to every individual upon the face of the earth, and not merely a part of it; and so far as we are bound in error we are held in bondage.

If we are thus bound unwittingly, or even unwillingly, we may not suffer condemnation. But in any case we shall suffer loss—and it may be great loss.
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