CELESTIAL PHENOMENA,

A short time ago I published a pamphlet under the above title, with a diagram on page 17, which also appeared in *The Earth* for October and November, 1903, Nos. 39 & 40, p. 275. The diagram was a representation of the globe with the equator as a straight line, and the tropics of Cancer and Capricorn also were shown as straight lines at a distance of $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees from the equator; the lines produced beyond and outside the globe were to show the sun's relative position when in the tropics, and also to show that when in these positions the direct rays of the sun cannot reach the two poles. Readers should refer to that diagram, and compare it with the diagrams which follow.

Two or three correspondents have been pleased to criticise the diagram above referred to, as not exactly representing the globular theory. So it is necessary to write this article, and to give a few further thoughts upon this subject.

Many of our readers have, perhaps, never realized how very difficult it would be to represent the globular theory exactly. It would be impossible for us to do so. The astronomers themselves never do so. High-class works on geography and map projection generally have the same defect. Why therefore should I be required to give what is not found, either in works on astronomy or in recognized standard atlases? However, I gave some approach to the theory; something which I think fairly represents the theory; while at the same time comparing that theory with some known facts. I cannot yield to the globular theory, nor accept all its wild hypotheses.

Now it has been thought by the correspondents above referred to, that I ought not to have made the lines in my diagram, representing the tropics of Capricorn, Cancer, and the equator, parallel straight lines, nor have produced the line say representing the tropic of Cancer to A (see diagram referred to). And it was thought that the diagram in *Celestial Phenomena* does not give the sun in its true position on the globular theory.

It has been said that the sun should be placed on a line drawn from the centre of the globe through the end of the line representing the tropic of Cancer as at E, and beyond in the following diagram I. This diagram I shall refer to later on.

Even then we shall find this would not be in exact accordance with the globular theory, as I will show later on. But it is thought that the line should be produced from centre E through E^1 , and beyond, so that the observer at E^1 would see the sun vertical at noon. And vertical to a globularist means that an imaginary line should pass from the centre of the earth into "space," through the point where the observer is said to stand.

This then fairly represents the globularist's objection, with which I shall proceed to deal. But I have some remarks to make first, under heading of my new diagram I.

MAP PROJECTION.

DIAGRAM I



The above diagram represents the general projection given with the Map of the world, that is with one so-called hemis-phere. The equator C E M is given as a straight line; the tropic of Cancer—H I E¹—as a curved line, curving towards the North; and R R₁ as another curved line—the Arctic Circle—also curving towards and around the North "Pole"—A. South of the equator we have the line II I¹, as the tropic of Capricorn, curved inwards towards the South that is in a direction opposite to the northern tropic; and lastly, the curved line—L L¹—round the so-called South "Pole." And we have been taught to receive this account "Pole." And we have been taught to receive this account of globular projection without any questioning. But let us examine it a little.

First let us ask what determines the points H and E¹ for the tropic of Cancer?

the tropic of Cancer? It will I suppose be replied that they are $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees from the points C and M on the equator, measured along the curve towards the North Pole. Then if the point E₁ be $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees from the equator, measure along the curved line M E¹ A will the point (1) also be the same number of degrees from the point E taken as being on the equator? If not, why not? If it be the same, then we have the fact cropping out, that on all maps of the world the degrees measured along a straight meridian from E to A are not as large as those measured along the curved meridian M E¹ A. And if each degree measures, as we are told it does, 60 geographical miles, then the distance in such miles from M to A, along the curve, would be 5,400 geographical miles; while from E to A the line would be only about 3,436 such miles, for anyone can see that the distance from E to A is miles, for anyone can see that the distance from E to A is considerably less than the distance along M E^1 to A. So that all our maps of the world are out of the truth,

with respect to the size of countries measured from the equator, either towards the North or towards the South, even on the globular assumption. And the scale of miles is also wrong in this direction, as given with such maps. Also as the meridians recede from the centre to either side the scale is always altering until we reach the outside circle. But if we were to take E^{11} as the true scale for the $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, then $h^{\circ}e^{1}$ would represent the tropic of Cancer: that is the upper curve of the two. And the same may be said of the two lower curves-I1 I1 and 12 i1. Which of these represents

3

the true tropic? I leave readers to take their choice.

But notice what a difference it would make to the sun's position North. In one case the globularist would contend that the sun should be seen along the line $E E^1$, somewhere in the direction of E^{11} ; and in the other case somewhere along the line $E e^1$, or about e^{11} .

Readers may take their choice; for both positions are founded on globular assumptions! And both tropics, whichever we take North and South, are untrue to the lines of perspective. In the North, the Arctic Circle R R¹ would shoot off northwards into space; and in the South the Antarctic Circle, L L¹, would also shoot off into space *in an opposite direction*. But I will leave for the present globular map projection, and ask my readers to notice diagram IJ.

"PARALLELS OF LATITUDE."



DLAGRAM II.

We now have briefly to consider diagram II., which is based on a more natural projection.

4

If the spectator be supposed to be in such a position that he can see the Arctic Circle as a curve, and not a straight line, then the other great circles should be shown in a similar position as regards their curvature. In other words, the tropic of Cancer—H E¹—should curvate towards the North; the equator—C E M—should do the same; the tropic of Capricorn—I I¹—should also curve in the same general direction; and the Antarctic Circle—L L¹—the same; all of them traversing the earth in the same general direction as the rest of the parallels of latitude.

These circles are known as "parallels of latitude," and therefore they should *all* be PARALLEL! But this would expose the position of geographers and astronomers in making the *parallels* north of the equator curvate in one direction, while the so-called "parallels" south curvate in another and opposite direction ! I fear there is more trickery about the globe and its delineations than most of our readers are yet aware !

Let us now notice the relative position of the sun in the tropics. We will draw a line from E as the centre of the supposed globe, and pass it through E^1 , towards the sun at E^{11} , for the tropic of Cancer. Similarly we will draw a straight line from E through I^1 towards T, for the position of the sun when in the tropic of Capricorn. How does that suit our opponents?

If someone should suggest that the diagram of the globe should be tilted, and that the "axis"—A B—should be inclined 23½ degrees from the vertical, all they need do is to tilt the paper just so much—or as much more as they like! It is more convenient for printing as we have placed it.

But we should like to know why the globe should be so tilted; and whether it is deemed more proper to tilt the "axis" $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees to the right, or to the left? Perhaps some astronomer might be able to enlighten us on this point, and give us reasons for his hypothesis. But I must pass on: these two diagrams are merely preliminary to what I have to say in connection with diagram III.





TRUE PARALLELS OF LATITUDE.

If we want one general view of the so-called "globe," with the Equator as a straight line, we must make all the lines denoting latitude, both north and south, parallel to the equator. I have so placed the leading parallels of latitude in diagram III. The central line C E M represents the equator; $H E^1$ the tropic of Cancer; and R R¹ the Arctic Circle. South of the equator I I¹ would represent the tropic of Capricorn; and L L¹ the Antarctic Circle. The line A B would represent the supposed "axis" of the globe, as it passes through the centre of the earth at E.

In a former article and diagram the sun was placed on a continuation of the equatorial line as at S, so that a spectator at M would see the sun on the 21st of March, directly over his head in the direction of S. But when the sun arrives at the tropic of Cancer, in the northern midsummer, it is said to be $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees north of the equator. In other words, the same spectator at M, on the equator, would see the sun at S¹ $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees from his former vertical position at M S.

Therefore, to place the midsummer sun there corresponds with fact; but it does not correspond with the astronomical theory, so the objector says that the midsummer sun should be placed in the line $E E^{1} E^{11}$.

That is the $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, they say, should be measured from the centre of the globe! Yet no one in this world ever saw the sun from that position; so that I am required to sacrifice fact to fancy; and instead of putting the sun at S¹, where it is actually seen in summer, I am asked to place it at E¹¹, as though it were seen from the centre of the earth!

To please the objector I will place the sun there for arguments' sake, and then let us notice what follows. When the sun is at E^{II} , the spectator on the equator, at M, would see it at some angle nearer to 40 degrees from the vertical than $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees. This angle would be greater or less great according to the various distances at which the sun might be placed, but it would never come down to the required $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees. Besides Zetetics have on several occasions given proof that the sun is not at such a great distance from the earth. But we have placed it as far off as it was in the former diagrams, and no objection has been raised to the distance of the sun from the earth, but only to the angular position given.

Now, as a matter of fact, a spectator at the equator sees the sun at $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees from the vertical; therefore, the sun's position at E^{11} is not its true position. This may be seen by making at S M S¹ an angle of $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees; and afterwards drawing a line from M to E^{11} , making, with S M, an angle nearly twice as great!

Again, if the sun be placed at E^{11} , and we draw a line parallel to the equator across the so-called "globe," it would about coincide with the line R R¹, and so the tropic of Cancer would be super-imposed on the Arctic Circle ! Would this suit our globular friends?

But why should the objector stop at E^{11} ? Why not go on to E^{111} ? In this case we should have the tropic of Cancer, if represented at all, outside the globe, a long way north of the North Pole itself—say at T T¹! If we must take the globular theory for our standard, we should find it impossible to properly represent it on paper. We should have to continue the line from the centre of the globe, at E through

 E_1 , on to E^2 , on to E^8 , on and on for 92 millions of miles! This would be the globular theory with a vengeance. But who could represent it? And yet some have objected because I have not been true to the theory in every detail. It is impossible to be true to it. The astronomers themselves are never true to it; nor are the geographers and those who bring out map projections. Some of the diagrams in the best astronomical works outrageously misrepresent their own theories, and the reader is thus deceived. I could give instances, but it would make my article too long, and require too many diagrams.

What I have already shown ought to be sufficient. But I will point out another fact. If the sun were a million times larger than the globe, the globe would be a mere mote in comparison to the sun, and it would be impossible for one half of it to be darkness at any time; the rays from one side of the sun would overlap or go beyond the north pole on the one hand, and the rays from the other side of the sun would overlap or go beyond the so-called south pole! Try reader for yourself. Make your diagram of the globe on a sheet of paper, and take the whole size of one wall of your chamber for the sun; then draw your lines accordingly, that is if you can.

This tremendous exaggeration of the sun's size is a mere theory of the astronomers, and is bound up with the whole hypothetical system. To make its reputed size at all har-monize with the theory, the astronomers have to push the sun away from the earth 92 millions of miles, or more, to make it look small enough! This tremendous distance and size is the basis of their theory about sun spots. "Spots," indeed !

It is a gross misnomer, too, for the astronomers to call them sunspots, when they teach that they are thousands of miles wide. Holes so large, that as one of these scientists declares "the earth could easily drop in." This same astronomer—Mr. Garrett P. Serviss—who has been writing to *The American* (New York), is reported to have said :

"If people had telescope eves, so that they could see at a glance things hidden from all but the astronomers, they would leave the most exciting occupation of life, and stand gazing with acce-if not with fear-at the strange sights in the sun."

Yes, they want us to look with "telescope eyes" at these things, and not with the eyes which God has given us. If we were to look at a tiny insect with a telescope eye, or rather with a microscopic eye, we could IMAGINE it bigger than an elephant; but the little thing would not alter its actual size, would it?

It is this "telescope eye" which makes astronomers see in the sun "an immense globe of blazing gas," swaying the earth and the distant planets "as resistlessly as the ocean sways a floating chip"! The spots break out "on the distorted face of the solar giant like black soot." "Their centres are yawning holes, many thousand miles in depth"! That is to the "telescope eye," which magnifies depth as well as length and breadth.

Is it not wonderful? If we only had been created with "telescope eyes." But I think that the Creator of the world has done better for us, and given us natural eyes, wherewith we may see things in their natural proportions.

And yet a weekly paper, of Jan. 14th, 1904, which professes to honour the Creator, and advocates the Seventh Day Sabbath as the memorial of Creation, publishes the above absurd sentence as "a sign of the times," and publishes it with signs of prophecy.

Doubtless such teachings are a sign of the times in which we live; when men, and even professed Christians, are departing from the old paths which were founded upon *faith in the Divine inspiration of the Bible*. If the Bible be inspired, —and we believe it is—how can Christians consistently believe such extravagant astronomical theories, in the face of the first chapter of Genesis, the second and fourth Commandments, and the many references to the order of Creation which are interspersed in the Word of God. But I must draw this article to a close.

What I have tried to show is, that the globular theory is not consistent with known facts. And I have shown this especially in the last diagram by placing the sun where objectors have thus put it. And even there we have shown that this agrees neither with astronomical theories nor with Zetetic facts. In short it is impossible to represent the globular system of the universe on paper at all, for its assumptions are so extravagant and outrageous that even the astronomers themselves cannot represent them in their own books. And what is more, it seems evident that they dare

9

not make the attempt, lest their diagrams strike their readers as suspicious and preposterous. \checkmark

STRANGE "PROOFS" OF GLOBULARITY.

In *Past and Future*, for Feb., 1904, Mr. Dimbleby attacks what he is pleased to call "the flat earth theory." He says:

"The distance between Holy Head, in North Wales, and Kingston Harbour, just below Dublin, is 60 miles, but because, when a steamer is half-way between these two places, the lighthouse of Holy Head could be seen through a telescope, Lady Blount says that the earth cannot be globular, insomuch as the top of the lighthouse should be almost 600 feet below the level of the horizon. But distances of 30 miles are seen in other places when a good elevation is secured. For example a person standing on the highest land of Jersey, in the Channel Islands, a height of 300 feet, can see the Cathedral at Containes, in France, which is 30 miles distant."

Now if Mr. Dimbleby had seriously set his mind upon showing that our position was untrue, he should have shown that such long sights as the above could be seen on a globular earth. That is, he ought to have attempted to show that the amount of curvature on such a globe as "our earth" is said to be is compatible with the above facts. But he conveniently ignores such a reasonable proceeding, and practically says, that because in other places besides the Irish Channel, distances of 30 miles can be seen, therefore the earth must be a globe !

This is a curious way of "proving" globularity, but it is quite according to the Dimbleby style of argument. He simply asserts that "when a steamer is halfway between Dublin and Holyhead it IS on the brow of an arc, formed by the globular earth"!

But we give the readers of *Past and Future* credit for better perception than is implied in such a dictum; especially as Mr. Dimbleby further adds that the "telescope enlarges the perspective *arc* of the laws of vision." Yet this writer rails at the "pretentions of science," for not admitting "the truth of Biblical Chronology;" and speaks of the "rigmarole of fictitious systems on time." We think he should look to his own house. He refuses to believe the Bible doctrine that the earth is placed on "foundations, so that it cannot be moved." In fact he teaches the opposite, and says that the "earth" travels through all the heavenly signs of the Zodiac! And contends that this is taught in the holy Scriptures; and he tries to make them fit in with the idea that the earth is a whirling globe, flying through space like a shooting star. This is shown in the concluding paragraph of the above quotation, which reads as follows: "the first chapter of Genesis contradicts the flat earth theory, otherwise *how* could the *earth* arrive at the autumnal equinox, which is more north than the equator, on the fourth day?"

I simply repeat the question Mr. Dimbleby raises, and I ask him to answer it himself; "How could the earth arrive at the autumnal equinox" at all?

How, in fact, can the earth "arrive" at any place, much less the place of the autumnal equinox, when as the Bible declares, "it cannot be moved"? Mr. Dimbleby not only contradicts Bible teaching respecting the immovability of the earth, but he fails to write in a clear and sensible manner. For instance, he asks "how could the earth arrive at the autumnal equinox, which is more north than the equator, on the fourth day?" That is, the autumnal equinox, according to this authority, is more north than the equator, on the fourth day! How the earth ever could arrive at the equator passes our comprehension, much more its postulated arrival at the autumnal equinox, either on the fourth day, or any other day. But Mr. Dimbleby tries to make his readers believe that the first chapter of Genesis is responsible for such unreasonable and extravagant statements.

It is the *sun*, according to the Bible and our senses, which arrives at the autumnal equinox, and that orb was created on the fourth day of Creation week; but to talk of the earth "arriving" there, is not only subversive of all Bible teaching, but is contrary to all sound reason, history, and experience. Yet this writer professes that he accepts and supports Bible inspiration and science !

To be consistent men ought to give up either the Bible or that science, falsely so-called, which is in opposition to it. But, alas ! many minds are crippled by the spirit of inconsistency : and the absence of a true logical faculty is

- 11

strangely prevalent in all classes of minds. We cannot account for this sad affliction.

But strangely charged with mystery are many things by which we are closely surrounded is a truism that may at times strike us with deep force; this is the experience of the writer, who has been led to exclaim:

> Ah! strange life's conditions, And strange men's reliance, In "priestly" physicians And nebular science; And strange *Truth* and *Knowledge*, In church, chapel, and college, Are oft found with *error* And *evil* things mixed !

But, nevertheless, let us ever endeavour to remember that "all things work together for good, to them that love God."