

THE EARTH - NOT A GLOBE - REVIEW.

A Magazine of Cosmographical Science :

THE ORGAN OF

THE UNIVERSAL ZETETIC SOCIETY.

(In continuance of "The Zetetic," "Folly," "The Earth," &c.)

EDITED BY "ZETETES."

No. 1.

JANUARY, 1893.

2d.

Contents.

	PAGE.
Greeting	1
University Extension	3
Science and Courtship	4
Creation <i>versus</i> Salvation	5
Sabbath Musings	7
Song of the Evolutionist	11
Correspondence	12
Perspective	14
Honest and Noble Confessions	15
Cuttings and Remarks	17
The New Scriptures	19
Globe Tinkering	21
"Science Siftings," Sifted	22
Highly Educated	24

By Post 2d. To be obtained from Mr. JOHN WILLIAMS, Secretary of the U.Z.S., Office, 32, Bankside, London, S.E.; or from the Editor, "ZETETES," Plutus House, St. Saviour's Road, Leicester.

H. Banbury & Co., Steam Printers, Leicester.

4
"THE EARTH REVIEW" ADVERTISER.

**Scale of charges for advertising in
"The Earth Review."**

(Inside Covers).

Two lines of not more than 20 words	...	£
Every additional line of 10 words	...	
Every additional 10 words after the first 50	...	
Quarter of a page	...	
Half page	...	12
Whole page	...	1 0

Apply to Mr. John Williams, Sec. U.Z.S., 32, Bankside, London, S.E.



THE
EARTH-NOT A GLOBE-REVIEW,

"To Him that stretched out the Earth above the Waters; for His mercy endureth for ever."—Psa. 136 : 6.

No. 1.

JANUARY, 1893.

PRICE 2D.

GREETING !

†T may be thought that there are a sufficient number of Periodicals in the market without adding one more to the extensive list. There are plenty no doubt, if they were all of the right kind. But are they? How many of them profess to stand by the Word of God as true and faithful in all its parts. And of those who profess to uphold the sacred Scriptures as inspired of God, how many believe and advocate the literal truth of the account of Creation as recorded therein? or the various descriptions given by them of the works of God as found in what is called Nature? Not one! At least, we know not of any.

Not a single Christian Editor who in the face of the so-called "Science" of the nineteenth century dare contend for the literal truth of the Bible text given at the heading of this paper? We repeat it, we know of none. We know of many, and some loud in their profession that they believe the Bible to be the inspired Word of God, who yet have declined to allow us, or our friends, to uphold in their columns the literal truth of the Bible in all its references to the material Creation. We deplore this fact; and hence the necessity has been laid upon us, with all our weakness, physically or numerically, to come to the rescue in *The Earth Review*. God is able to use the weakest instrumentality to his own glory, and to the confusion of the enemies of his truth. Our trust is in God; and in the faithfulness of his Word, in *all* its teachings from Genesis to Revelation. Our motto is, Let God be true, though every man be a liar.

If Genesis is not to be relied upon, in its description of Creation, how shall we trust Exodus? If the Old Testament is not true, what will become of the New? If the Creator, through his servants, the prophets,

has not correctly described his Works, how can we trust him for our salvation? As the great Teacher, who came from God, himself declared; "If ye believe not his (Moses) writings, how shall ye believe my words? They stand or fall together. Our Lord says so; and every logical and candid mind must see it is so. We are prepared to accept the conclusion; for we feel sure that no fact in nature is contrary to Bible teaching.

It is well-known that the teachings of modern Astronomy are opposed to the teachings of the Bible; but it is not so well understood that all known facts in nature are in harmony with Bible representations. Thomas Paine, in his so-called "*Age of Reason*," says:—

"The two beliefs"—Modern Astronomy and the Bible—"cannot be held together in the same mind: he who thinks he believes both has thought very little of either."

This witness is true here. But he makes the very common mistake of assuming, or supposing, that Astronomy must be true; and hence he draws the unwarrantable conclusion that the Bible must be false. This is not "reason," but assumption; and is surely an unpardonable offence against good logic on the part of one who professes to "reason." We call the attention of our sceptical friends to its inconclusiveness. Give us *facts*, or sound "reasons" based on facts, and we will listen to our opponents with attention; but it will be the province of *The Earth Review* to expose from time to time the flimsy pretexts for reason which so frequently are placed before us by those who oppose the Word of the living God on questions of Cosmology.

We want the *facts* of Science, not in its every varying theories and contradictions. For these facts we shall ever be glad to find room, in proportion to their importance and our space. But, we candidly confess at the outset that we do not know of any one fact in Nature which conflicts with the accounts of the Creation or Universe, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures. The God of Creation or of Nature, is the God of Revelation; and both these we believe to be in harmony. These harmonies we propose to shew to our readers as we have opportunity in future numbers of our little paper.

We invite our friends, all over the outstretched earth, to come forward and help us. They can strengthen our hands with means and with matter. Short, pointed, and pithy articles, or letters—written on one side of the paper only—and sent to the Editor, will receive careful attention. Also *marked* and prepaid newspaper articles, or cuttings connected with the subject. Subscriptions for the paper must be sent to the Secretary, Mr. John Williams, 32, Bankside, Southwark, London, S.E.



As we are entirely undenominational, we are not going to attempt to establish another sectarian church, or to support any particular existing one. "The Universal Zetetic Society" is simply banded together to contend for the Truth and honour of God's Word, especially as related to His Works in Nature and Creation; and *The Earth Review* is its organ. We therefore invite the co-operation of all earnest-minded men, by whatever distinctive names they may, unfortunately, happen to be called. We are certain that all who are concerned for the honour of God's Word, and all who desire to see Nature honestly interpreted, must acknowledge that our aim and purpose is good. To all such, we send greeting. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do"? But again, "If God be for us, who," with any hope of success, "can be against us"?

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION.

According to a report in the *Standard* of Tuesday, November 29th, 1892, the Chelsea centre of the University Extension Society held its annual meeting the previous night at St. Mark's College, Chelsea.

The chairman, Mr. H. D. Ackland, M.P., Vice-President of the Council, spoke of the advantages to be obtained in connection with our Universities, in providing students and teachers from elementary schools, with advanced scientific instruction. He asked the London County Council for a grant of £10,000 to £20,000, "for the purposes of a Teaching University in promoting the work of University Extension teaching." He also hoped that the Government would "meet that sum with something like a grant of a similar amount." London had "already devoted £30,000 a year to the purpose of forwarding education."

These are modest sums of money; but we would not complain if they were indeed devoted to the purposes of "education." Students should be allowed, and trained, to think for themselves, and not crammed, like school children, with mere theories already in vogue. To educate (*Le*, and *duco*) means to *educere*, or to draw forth the thinking powers of the mind, not merely to cram it with dates, historical facts, or so-called scientific hypotheses. To teach men, indeed, *how to think*; not simply to fill their minds with the ideas or thoughts of other men.

Does the University Extension Society aim at this? Do our Universities? For instance, if any student should get up and call in question the teachings of modern Astronomy, giving his reasons for so doing, would he be encouraged as an original thinker? Would he be tolerated even, however strong the reasons he might be prepared to offer? We think not, and if he would not, what becomes of the boast of education? What powers of mind are *educated* by stifling all scientific discussion? What was the state of theology when the Church of Rome had power to silence—

not by argument, but by fire and faggot—all controversy? And such at present is the state of scientific teaching in our Schools and Universities. It is one sided, cramped, and in some cases, even superstitious, out of harmony with Nature.

If we are wrong in so speaking, let anyone of our University friends step down for a moment from his high pedestal of learning, and let him give us one proof in support of the popular view that we are living on a whirling globe flying through something called "space" at the fearful rate of about eleven hundred miles in an hour, or nineteen miles a second! Or to simplify matters, we will waive the question of the shape of the earth, if any of our *savants*, with all his boasted University education, can give us one decent proof that the earth has any motion at all. We only ask for one, if it be a good one. Who will give it? Our "space" shall be at his disposal; at least a fair share of it. Now, "Scientists" to the rescue; and if you can give us only one proof of the Earth's supposed motion, we will yield your right, and advocate your claim, to the modest sum of £30,000 to £40,000 which you are asking in support of your University Extension Scheme. But if you cannot give us the proof asked for in support of one of your favourite "Sciences," and one, too, which is positively asserted to be an "exact" Science, then you must excuse us saying that we think you are unworthy of the support demanded; and that, moreover, your boasted system of education is unsound, unscientific, and misleading, and must sooner or later give way to the true Zetetic mode of teaching advocated by us.

SCIENCE AND COURTSHIP.

At the meeting of the University Extension Scheme, before referred to, one of the speakers (S.A.B), "spoke of a workman who was devoted to literature, another who was absorbed by scientific study," and of "a young man who was courting," and who complained that when "he walked out with his young woman he could not talk history with her, or Science, or Literature; so that but for the matter of an occasional kiss, his courtship was very monotonous." This, it is reported, made the audience laugh; but whether at the awkwardness of the promising young scientist, or at the novel way of recommending "science" to the sex, the report does not proceed to inform us.

But our fair readers will not be slow to perceive the moral of this. Let them attend well to University Extension Lectures, or let them be prepared to forego the honour, if not the pleasure, of being wooed by any young aspirant after scientific honours. Just think of it. "Only an occasional kiss"! And no "scientific" jargon, or learned technicalities, to fill up the "monotonous" intervals! Oh Venus! What a fearful

prospect! Ye virgins take heed. We are living in the nineteenth century; and vain shall be all your fair blandishments, and youthful charms, unless you are prepared to satisfy Mercury that you are fully competent to conduct your courtship according to the rules of scientific terminology. How in the world did our forefathers manage in past ages? Poor, simple and misguided souls!

Fancy the dreariness of their courtships, for over five thousand years—at least!—and with only “an occasional kiss” to relieve the monotony of their unscientific existence! How thankful we, their sons, ought to be that we were not born in their days, nor in the olden times before them! But ye maidens, take courage; and instead of wasting your time at your toilets, attend henceforth to your studies. Instead of learning such common place acquirements as how to stitch, cook, and darn, to make shirts or to knit stockings, you must now go in for “science,” study “literature,” and how to “talk history.” Then when you have “passed” your examinations in these higher studies, certificates may be awarded you, by our grave and “reverend” seigniors, certifying our younger scientists that they are now in a fit and proper condition of mind to be wooed and won by them. Certifying you can “talk history, science, or literature,” in such a sort as to relieve the tedium of cool scientific courtship, even though there be only a “very occasional kiss” thrown in for the sake of a little unscientific variety.

CREATION *versus* SALVATION.

OR

ILLOGICAL CHRISTIANS.

We are often advised by well-meaning Christians, who are ignorant of the bearings of our contention, to allow the subject of the plane earth to “drop,” and to join with them in proclaiming what they are pleased to call “the gospel.” As we are going to press we have received another gratuitous piece of advice of the same nature. Our friend writes:—

“You believe the earth is flat and stands still. I may give it a passing notice. I am surprised to find a man of so much intelligence and learning should persist in such notions. Is it not a clear fact that we can determine the approximate size of the globe? And if you go in a straight line in any direction you will come to the place from which you started, and how do you account for the Seasons, and the difference in the length of the days at different Seasons; and tidal motions, &c. I think you would be better engaged in helping to swell the world-wide cry of the Gospel. Don't you think so?”

In answer to the last question we say decidedly, No! not at the expense of leaving off teaching the *plain truth*. It is undeniable that the Holy Scriptures teach that the Earth is stationary; that it rests on "foundations" and "pillars"; and that it is "established so fast that it cannot be moved." We therefore contend that if, as some of our christian friends would have us believe, the Bible is not true in its material teachings respecting the Universe, it is not reliable in its promises of spiritual blessings. But we maintain that the Bible *is* true; true to fact and to every day observation; and that the earth does not move. In future numbers we hope to give good proofs of the earth's immobility for those who need them; but in the meantime we have a right to ask for some *one* proof, and we only ask for one, of the earth's supposed terrible motions? It *appears* stationary. It *feels* stationary. Then why should we give up the evidence of our God-given senses for the sake of a mere astronomical and unsupported assumption?

There is much more behind this question of the shape of the earth than our good natured but illogical advisers are aware of. If we are credited, as we are by those who know us, with at least an average share of common sense, and a little more than the average amount of "intelligence and learning," how is it that our advisers—who for the most part have never really *studied* the question—how is it they cannot credit us with understanding *this* subject, which *we* have studied, and with understanding its importance as supplying a good foundation for our confidence in the sure Word of God? We maintain that if the Bible is not true respecting the material Creation, it is not reliable in its promises of Salvation; and that it is perfectly useless to preach the Gospel of Jesus the Christ to men who have lost their faith in the inspiration, or truthfulness, of the Word of God. It is, moreover, a great pity when Christian friends unite with sceptical foes in support of a godless science, falsely called "science," which strikes at the very foundation of the truth of the Creator's Word. They incur a grave responsibility in so doing. Let them take heed.

In answer to our correspondents questions, we say. It is *not* "a clear fact that we can determine the approximate size of the globe." It is *not* a clear fact that the earth is a globe at all. Let proof be offered. And again, it is not possible "to go in a straight line in any direction, and come back to the place of starting." Any "straight line" is an impossibility on a spherical surface. But apart from this self-evident fact, no one has ever travelled or voyaged due North, or due South, and come back to the same place again. The great ice barriers would prevent this. Yet our correspondent thoughtlessly says, "in *any* direction"! Men can go round the World in an easterly or a westerly direction; but this is also possible on a plane. Hence it is no proof of the earth's sphericity. But

our opponents do not seem to be able to discriminate in these things. It is the fault, doubtless, of our system of "education," which crams young minds with other men's ideas, instead of teaching them to think for themselves, and to think cautiously and accurately.

Let us hope that *The Earth Review* will help, at least, to raise enquiry, and so teach men to think for themselves; and not to leave all their thinking to professional and interested preachers of science. There is an evident need of such a paper as ours, even apart from its advocacy of the truth of the Bible, if only to awaken candid enquiry. Let us hope that all lovers of truth—natural truth or spiritual—and all lovers of original ideas, possessing true freedom of thought, will rally round us, and help us on towards a world-wide circulation of *The Earth Review*.

SABBATH MUSINGS.

"THE GLORY OF GOD."

The inspired Psalmist says that "The heavens declare of glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork"; therefore, whatever some professed Christians affirm to the contrary, the subject of Creation is connected with right views of God, his worship, and his glory. But if we would have a right conception of God, and his glory, we must see to it that we have a right conception of his works in Creation. How, for instance, do we obtain an insight into the character of any great man, whether he be a poet, politician, sculptor, general, or king? It is not by his acts, or his works? But suppose these acts, or works, are mis-represented to us, or defaced by someone, should we not have false and distorted views respecting the author, artist, or the maker of those things? Assuredly. And so it comes to pass in respect to the construction of the world, false views of the universe have led men into a misconception respecting the Character of God, and even alas! in many cases, to a denial of the very existence of such a personal Being.

Let us, then, endeavour to come back to first principles. The world exists, and must have come from somewhere. It is "unthinkable" to say it came by chance, or any "fortuitous concourse of atoms." Its wonderful variety, the general co-relation and adaptability of its various parts, and the exact and never failing motions of all the heavenly bodies, *prove*, to any well-balanced and unprejudiced mind, that some grand and controlling Intelligence directs and rules over all. As the apostle Paul declares, "The invisible things of Him from the creation to the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead: so that they are without excuse." Rom. i. 20.

A grand truth lies in this statement of the apostle. Paul was no fool. It is allowed on all sides, alike by friend and foe, Sceptic and

Christian, M. Renan and the Archbishop of Canterbury, that no one man has had more influence in forming Christianity, the history of which has for eighteen centuries been making the history of the civilised world, than the apostle Paul. His name will be had in honour when the names of the adversaries of the truth will have sunk into merited and everlasting oblivion. And this great man agrees with the Psalmist in teaching that the Creation, as set forth in the Bible, and as found in what some call "Nature," sets forth unmistakably the grand truth that God is. Now, this is a fundamental verity, and the foundation of all true faith. GOD IS. And "he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Now, this faith is, on the one hand, neither an unreasoning credulity, nor, on the other hand, is it a bigoted *disbelief*. It is based on an intelligent and reasonable understanding of the things that are seen above and around us.

The Book of Nature is open to all men; but it must be read and studied without prejudice and without philosophical bias. We must come to it like little children, with the honest desire to know the truth, and not attempt to read into it our own, nor any one else's, plausible or implausible hypotheses. If we do this patiently and persistently, we shall be "rewarded": the grand and ineffaceable truth will dawn upon us that GOD IS.

We shall see His glory in the bright and blazing sun as he goes forth majestically, like a giant, to run his daily course. We shall own *His* Power and Godhead when the moon, queen of the night, rises in quiet and stately splendour, to reflect her silver radiance in every rippling stream. And we shall confess *His* wisdom and unfailing skill when, at night, we gaze up into the firmament and behold ten thousand glittering gems, shining in matchless beauty, and shedding upon the earth their silent influences, as they nightly perform their appointed revolutions. Truly we shall then confess with the Psalmist, that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork."

"The firmament sheweth His handiwork." That vast and incomparable structure which spans the heavens, and covers the earth with its capacious dome, divides the waters which are "above" the firmament from the waters which are "under" the firmament. And when we realize something of the tremendous size of this tent-like covering, spanning with one mighty arch across the whole of the outstretched earth; when we considered its weight, its strength, its stability, and the avowed purpose for which it was made by the Creator, we can unhesitatingly and devoutly again exclaim with the Psalmist, "The firmament sheweth His handiwork." No wonder such a "work" occupied the whole of one day, the third, in the "great and marvellous" work of the six days Creation. Job, one of the finest, and certainly one of the most ancient, of true philosophers,

when comparing the works of God with the puny works of man, asks : "Hast thou with Him spread out the sky, which is strong, and as a molten lookingglass?" Job 37 : 18. It is, perhaps, this mirror-like quality which the firmament possesses that makes unbelieving "scientists" think that they can, with their glasses, peer into what they call "space," which they affirm to be "boundless." As well might a child, gazing upon the bosom of a glassy lake, affirm that it had no bottom, and that the sky and clouds, reflected from its placid surface, were slumbering in the unfathomed depths below, and not above, its waters.

The idea of illimitable "space," filled with an infinity of revolving worlds or globes, is not only a bewildering idea, unfounded on fact, but it directly tends to remove the Creator, or rather the idea of a Creator, far, and farther, away from this earthly plane of ours. It necessarily and logically leads to Atheism ; and too often, alas ! it practically leads men there. The idea of Heaven as a place, the abode of The Eternal, becomes to the logical and thinking Newtonian a *myth* ; and God, if he acknowledge such a personal Being at all, becomes farther and farther removed from the scene of all earthly operations. Whereas the Saviour of the World, who "came down from Heaven," to do his Father's will, taught His disciples to believe that Heaven was not very far off ; that it was directly and always "above" us ; that God was concerned in the work of His hands ; and that as "our Father," He was near enough to hear the prayers of all those who call upon him in sincerity and truth. This is assuring : this is comforting. God cares for the world ; and He will punish those who afflict mankind with their selfishness, their greed, their falsehoods, and their oppressions. Yea, God has "so loved the world"—not the "globe," as some misguided Christians have lately printed and perverted this sublime text with a ridiculous "globe" stamped on the paper—God "so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." This, we say, is comforting. It is assuring. But, on the astronomical hypothesis, the world is like an uncared-for orphan, or a desolate wanderer : God is removed too far from us to be any practical use ; and the idea of Heaven is so vague, that such a place, if it exist at all, may be anywhere or nowhere ; "all round the globe ;" or spirited away from us altogether, "beyond the bounds of time and space." Thus the Christian's hope is undermined, and his faith is eaten away at the very core by this insidious and so-called "scientific" worm. This is most calamitous ; yet even some of our "spiritual guides" are either so false to their professions, or are so deceived themselves, that they cry out, "It does not matter what shape the earth is ; we don't care whether it be round or flat, square or oblong, so long as"—yes, so long as they get a good "living," and hold a respectable position in society ? Is this it ? Such a confession really means, when put into plain language, We do not care

whether the Bible be true or false, in its record of Creation, so long as our interests or our hope of "Salvation" is assured. But "woe" is pronounced against such easy going shepherds of Israel. "Woe" to them who are leaving their flocks to become a prey to the devouring wolves of "Science," "falsely so called," as the great apostle intimates. Let us be on our guard. There are honourable exceptions to such false shepherds and teachers, and others are being raised up to warn us. We have quoted some of their noble testimonies. Let us give heed to these needful warnings. God has never left Himself without witnesses to His Truth whether in Nature or in Revelation. We may shew this, if the Lord permit, more fully another time as regards Creation truth.

In conclusion, we would call the attention of all our readers to the seasonable warning given us by the Apostle Paul, where he says;—"Beware lest any man spoil you through *philosophy* and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and *not after CHRIST.*" Col. 2 : 8. And again, Let us "prove all things ; and hold fast that which is good."

"Historically as well as logically the concession of any scientific errors has led to the downfall of the whole Biblical system of doctrine. Moses in his vision of the creation during six days may not have reviewed the whole physical development of the globe."

The Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine.

Of course the "concession" of error in the Bible must eventually, and logically, lead to the downfall of "the whole Biblical system of doctrine" *in the minds of those making the concession* : but we do not make that concession, and we call for proof that the Earth *is* a "globe" before we can make it. But the above extract shews the importance of our contention that the Earth is a plane.

ED. T.E.R.

"If the origin from which a system of philosophy is derived be a false and erroneous one, whatever emanates from it must of necessity be also false."

LORD BACON.

"We should have fewer disputes in the world if words were taken for what they mean."

LOCKE.

Mr. J. Lack read a paper on "Zetetic Astronomy" at the Breakley Road Chapel, London, December 20th, 1892. But the report reached us too late for further notice.

THE SONG OF THE EVOLUTIONIST.

By "ZETETES."

In the infinite ages of past time
 There was nothing but "atoms" about ;
 They groped up and down in the darkness,
 Or ran in irregular rout :
 At length seized by "gravity's" impulse,
 They all rushed away after one
 And clashing around it struck fire, so
 They formed the bright spherical sun !
 The heat soon expanded his body
 To most disproportionate size ;
 And Sol felt himself solitary,
 Lone occupant then of the skies :
 With labour he threw off young star-suns,
 To occupy parts unexplored ;
 And kept but a few suns about him,
 Not liking too much to be bored.
 The planets he tied to his body—
 The rest he could never restrain—
 And these fled the centre, for freedom,
 But strong was great "gravity's" chain !
 Our world as she whirled—hot and plastic—
 Made herself like her father the sun ;
 But as the long ages rolled over
 Her blazing and brightness got done.
 However, at length germinated
 In a quiet old "Cambrian" spot,
 From Sunshine and mud in solution,
 "A shapeless albuminous dot :"
 He could "push out an arm when he wanted,"
 He learned to "catch prey, so he thrived ;"
 And from him, our mighty ancestor,
 All life on the planet's derived !
 Then "active Ascideans" evolving
 Fresh forms he contrived in his spleen,
 Legs, limbs, improvised for the sexes,
 All sorts up to twelve or sixteen :
 The strongest the beautiful choosing—
 The "fittest" survive on a Ball—
 And beauties the weak ones refusing,
 The weakest soon "went to the wall."
 Too many limbs proved inconvenient,
 For "mammals" which came into view ;
 He therefore dropped ten or a dozen,
 Reduced them to four, or to two :
 Made monkeys four-legged, or four-handed,
 Evolving in time into men,
 With two legs, and two hands for labour,
 And toe-fingers, remnant of ten.
 So on through the ages still future
 The world will keep "whirling" about.
 The "law of survival" is cruel,
 It threatens to make me drop out :
 I'll eat then and drink, for to-morrow,
 The Book is right here—we shall die ;
 And after—ah me ! this here-after—
Suppose I've believed but a lie !

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letters intended for publication in the "The Earth Review" must be legibly written on one side only of the paper, and must have some bearing on the subject before us.

The Editor cannot, of course, be held responsible for the various opinions of his correspondents.

All letters must be prepaid, and addressed,

*"ZETETES," Plutus House,
St. Saviour's Road,
Leicester, England.*

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,—It is reported that Colonel Dulier has brought out an "ingenious apparatus for washing smoke." It was also reported that Lord Armstrong, at the banquet given to the members of the British Association at Newcastle, said, "there is after all some connexion between smoke and science." Beyond all question of doubt Lord Armstrong is perfectly right, as I know you will ultimately prove, but I write to ask, if you are in possession of any information as to the fact or otherwise, whether there is a smoke washing apparatus to be placed in every observatory in the United Kingdom to wash away the smoke of the globe? Your kind reply will be esteemed by

BALAAM'S ASS.

Our correspondent who signs himself *Balaam's Ass*, has asked us a question we are not able directly to answer. He might obtain the desired information by writing to the officials at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. No doubt an apparatus for "washing smoke" would be very useful in such places. Astronomers often complain of particles of dust, or smoke, obstructing their field of view when they look through their powerful telescopes. But if an apparatus could be devised for washing from off their own own visions much of the philosophic, and scientific smoke which prevents them seeing Nature as she is, it would indeed be a useful and an ingenious invention. Let us hope that our EARTH REVIEW may help them in this matter.

Scientists are generally alive to the smallest particles of dust and smoke which may obstruct the visual ray, or

interfere in the least degree with the results of their experiments; but few of them seem to think it necessary to guard against the mental smoke of prejudice and early training, especially in the matter referred to by our correspondent, "the smoke of the globe." It is not very long ago that Galileo was condemned, as a philosopher and a Christian, for teaching that the earth was a moving ball, rolling on nowhere; but now it is considered a sign of mental incapacity to doubt it. But why so? Let our learned men honestly apply themselves to the fundamental question as to whether the Earth be a globe, or a plane, and they will find that the globular theory has been enveloped in much more Scientific Smoke and dust than most people are aware of. It will be the object of *The Earth Review*, in future numbers, to help to clear away some of this accumulated philosophical smoke, so that our readers may get to know whether we are living on a star, or planet, shooting through "space"; or whether, as our senses attest and the good old Book declares, we are living on an "outstretched" earth, "founded upon her bases, that it should not be moved for ever." PSA. c.iv. 5. REV. VER. MARGIN.

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND,

NOVEMBER 2ND, 1892.

DEAR SIR,—A short time ago someone sent me five pamphlets, called "Cranks" from London, the name on the wrapper was ——. I am not acquainted with the gentleman, but I can truly say I feel very grateful for them, and shall circulate them among my friends. I have only very recently

become acquainted with any of the facts relating to the plane Earth subject through the kindness of Mr. J. T. B. Dines; Auckland, and they certainly appeal to my common sense and reason as indisputable proofs. Above all I am glad that so much testimony can be got from the "Sacred Writings" in corroboration of the facts of Nature. I have sent to Mr. W. Carpenter for one of his "100 Proofs." It is pleasing to find that we have one grand foundation truth, Water Level and not Convex. I should like to get some more information on the subject, or reading matter. Are there any regular publications issued? Would you kindly send me a list of publications, also best method of sending payment for the same.

I suppose N.Z. Stamps are no use at Home.

Have you any leaflets on the absurdity of atmospheric pressure?

Hoping to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

I remain, yours respectfully,

GEO. REVELL.

We may inform our N.Z. friends that P.O. Orders can be made payable to us in English money, and if a few of our Colonial friends would join, a number of pamphlets and papers could be sent to the same address.

We have already forwarded a few papers to our correspondent, and hope to hear from him again soon. Probably our indefatigable Secretary will send copies of *The Earth Review* to him.

Our esteemed London friend, who generously helped us to publish "Cranks," will be glad to know the cause is progressing well in New Zealand, at the so-called "Antipodes." Our friends, however, seem to have their heads right side up! ED. T.E.R.

BELFAST,

MONDAY, DEC. 12, 1892.

DEAR SIR,—My lecture according to programme has been delivered. I had an audience numbering between 70 and 80, and from enquiries made and interest displayed, together with demonstrations of approval, I have reason to believe that my efforts have been somewhat of a success. But even should this not have been the case, I consider

it a privilege to be permitted to proclaim the truth which is at such a discount nowadays.

My audience was mixed. The poetry from your *Satire* was well received by all, and it was understood by those who were not able to follow the more difficult portions of the Lecture; and I proclaimed the name of the author with no uncertain sound.

I shall circulate the New Organ with pleasure; and be glad to have anything fresh on this interesting subject.

Will you please forward me some copies of "The sun-dial," two or three "Do the Bible and science agree,"? and a few leaflets on "Bible Astronomy," for which I enclose 2/-.

Yours very sincerely,

J. ATKINSON.

The following was refused insertion in "The Faith."

To the Editor of THE FAITH.

32, BANKSIDE, LONDON, S.E.,

AUGUST 20, 1892.

DEAR SIR,—Pardon the liberty I take in addressing you. Believe me I should not do so only that I see you intend to exclude from the pages of your invaluable pamphlet a subject of the utmost importance to the faith of God's people.

Lady Blount in this month's issue of "The Faith" informs us that she believes in the Scriptural (not the Scientific) account of Creation, and that that account is, that the earth is a circular, and stretched out plane. Is this God's truth Sir? And if so, Why close your columns to it and declare that "The Faith" has no testimony to bear to it?

If the first chapters of Genesis are not an accurate and *literal* account of the Creation, the whole Bible is a lie, and the Christian Faith is folly in essence. Can you Sir as a Christian professedly seeking to defend God's Truth permit "the gaze of the people to be to man" instead of to God's unchanging, unerring Holy Word, and not lift up your voice in testimony? Are you not by your fiat hindering the fulfilment of the Divine injunction on

the first page of your pamphlet to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints"? You invite contributions about Spiritualism, Theosophy &c., these are but forms of demonology, and what is the *so-called* science of Modern Astronomy but *the same*? I can understand the Editors of "Science Siftings" excluding from their pages the truth of God, but I cannot understand a Christian Editor of a periodical of the character of "The Faith" doing the same. Surely it becometh us to fulfil

all righteousness "for God's" glory sake. May I add that I believe that full liberty of discussion on *all* matters of faith, would increase, not only the size, but also the circulation of "The Faith."

With Christian regards and wishes.

Believe me, yours respectfully,

JNO. WILLIAMS.

Cyrus E. Brooks, Esq.

PERSPECTIVE.

FROM THE FUTURE OF DEC. 1892.

SIR,—I should like to say a few words in reply to "Enquirer." His criticism of the "One Hundred Proofs" I shall leave Mr. Carpenter to answer. I am pleased to find that "Enquirer" has the candour to admit that "the effects of perspective alone are sufficient to compel the removal of the time-honoured mistake of the hull-down 'proof' of the 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 out 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 and stated 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 that 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 movement (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 the greatest assumption of all, viz: Solar attraction or "Gravitation," without which the globular theory falls to the ground.

Leicester.

ZETETES.

[We are glad to report that the Editor of *The Future*, has, during the past year, had the courage to admit several letters discussing the important question of "The Shape of the Earth."
Ed. T.E.R.]

HONEST AND NOBLE CONFESSIONS.

"When we consider that the advocates of the earth's stationary and central position can account for, and explain the celestial phenomena as accurately, to their own thinking, as we can ours, in addition to which they have the evidence of their *senses*, and SCRIPTURE, and FACTS in their favour, which we have not; it is not without a shew of reason that they maintain the superiority of their system. . . . However perfect our *theory* may appear in our estimation, and however simply (?) and satisfactorily the Newtonian *hypothesis* may seem to us to account for all the celestial phenomena, yet we are here compelled to admit the astound-

ing truth that, if our premises be disputed, and our facts challenged, the whole range of Astronomy does not contain the proofs of its own accuracy."—*Dr. Woodhouse, a late professor of Astronomy at Cambridge.*

MY "BELIEF." "I believe in the Scriptural, and not in the so-called 'scientific' account of Creation. I believe that the Earth is a circular and out-stretched plane; and that it will 'not be removed for ever.' I believe that the Sun, Moon, and Stars are what they appear, mere lights made to serve this earth; and that the heavens form a canopy or tent-like covering, to encircle it."—*LADY BLOUNT.* [See the full expression of her Ladyship's "Belief" in *The Faith* for August, 1892].

THE following was the official confession, in 1616 A.D., of the Church of Rome, when confronting the then Astronomical innovator, Galileo, who recanted and publicly confessed that his doctrine of the earth's motion was false:—

"I.—The proposition that the Sun "is the centre of the World and immovable from its place, is absurd, philosophically false, and formally heretical; because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scriptures."

"II.—The proposition that the Earth is not the centre of the world, nor immovable, but that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is also absurd, philosophically false, and theologically considered, equally erroneous in faith."

"And so we say, pronounce and by our sentence declare, decree, and reserve, in this and in every other better form and manner, which lawfully we may and can use. So We, the subscribing Cardinals pronounce."—

"This 26th day of February, 1616."

(SUBSCRIBED BY SEVEN CARDINALS).

"I AGREE with you in your contention respecting the Earth; for my motto has long been, 'Let God be true and every man a liar.'"

REV. W. E. BULLINGER, D.D.

"It may be a surprise to find that we are still imperfectly acquainted with the exact figure of the Earth." *Daily Chronicle* (science notes) April 8th, 1891.

"THE whole of Astronomical science, so far as the stellar universe is concerned, is founded upon a false basis. This arises from the fact that the construction of the heavens in respect to the apparent arrangement of the stars in space is always erroneous, and yet necessarily all astronomy is founded upon this supposititious situation of the stars."—*The English Mechanic, Jan. 4th, 1889.*

"WHOEVER considers aright will acknowledge, that, next to the Word of God, the most certain cure of superstition, and the best aliment of faith, is the knowledge of Nature."

LORD BACON.

"THESE (Bereans) were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." *Acts 17 : 11.*

Let us follow their example in searching into the book of Nature.—ED. E.R.

THE "Catholic World," says; "The defence of the sacred Scriptures is to-day the great talk of the Christian apologist, and most of the attacks that are made upon the Bible are based upon scientific theories of some kind or other." "But," it adds, "the Christian has nothing to do with *defending the sacred Scriptures*. The Word of God is quick (living) and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, *HEB. iv. : 12.* *It is fully able to defend itself*; what the Christian wants is THE SACRED SCRIPTURES AS A DEFENCE FOR HIM. To those who dwell in the secret place of the Most High, the promise is, His TRUTH shall be thy shield and buckler. Those who profess the religion of Christ need such an acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, that they will not be alarmed lest that ROCK should be *overturned* by idle 'scientific' theories."

CUTTINGS AND REMARKS.

A very distinguished Visitor.

We have no desire to unduly alarm our readers, but our duty to the public compels us to announce *that to-night a collision may be expected between the earth and a comet*. The notice we give is somewhat short, so short indeed that if the worst comes to the worst, some distant readers may have barely learned the fact before the shock gives it an emphatic confirmation. The Rev. M. BAXTER has somehow or other overlooked this noteworthy prediction, an oversight possibly accounted for by his feverish desire to discover some unfortunate individual who may be publicly described as "The Beast" without running foul of the law of libel. . . .

Just at present it is perhaps risky to speak disrespectfully of comets, but it

is undeniable that they are chiefly distinguished by their eccentricity. They resemble in no small degree political parties. They consist of a definite point or nucleus, with a remarkably nebulous tail preceding or following the nucleus. The tail precedes the nucleus when the comet has passed its perihelion and is receding from the sun, and it follows it when the sun is approached. That is to say, it is always to the front in a retreat and in the rear in an attack. As with the humble members of political parties, its distinguishing feature is prudence. Nor does the resemblance end here, for astronomers assure us that comets' tails are noted for their extreme tenuity. Stars which the slightest fog completely obscures shine through *millions* (?) of miles of their transparent material. In the same way it is easy to see through

the motives and tactits of the political hanger-on. The nucleus is really the only part of a comet which need be noticed by practical men. The vaporous tails have frequently come within the earth's attraction (?) and have been absorbed into its atmosphere, just as the Liberal Unionists have been "merged" into the Tory party. *Whether the effect of the absorption of a comet's tail into our atmosphere has been salubrious or deleterious, or even if the event has had any perceptible influence at all, is only a matter of speculation among the learned.* This extremely negative result resembles the action of homœopathic medicines upon the human frame—at least, as described by allopaths. The moral seems to be that the world will be wise if it carefully avoids the nucleus to-night and collides simply with the tail. "Run into something cheap," shouted the economical peer to his coachman when his horses bolted down Piccadilly.

Mankind has received comets in various moods. Sometimes they have been hailed with rapturous welcome. They have been supposed to herald a superior wine vintage. The produce of 1811 and of 1858 was specially announced as "comet wines," and toppers declared that it was very good. On the other hand, these eccentric heavenly bodies have been regarded with hatred and terror. They were included in a very uncomplimentary prayer in the year 1456. The Turks had just captured Constantinople, and it was feared that they would soon overrun Europe. A comet was hovering about at the time, and the pious of the day added to the Ave Maria the following special supplication: "Lord, save us from the devil, the Turk, and the comet." It is strange that at the end of the nineteenth century we should be threatened by the same three influences. The first seems destined to be always with us, the second will haunt us until the Eastern Question is really settled, and

the third threatens to mend or end us to-night.—*From the Morning Leader, London, November 21st, 1892.*

A fearful Collision—

BETWEEN A ROCK AND A WREATH
OF SMOKE!

A Dalziel Telegram, dated Philadelphia, November 24, says Professor Synder, instructor of astronomy in the High School here, states that the earth last night collided with a comet in the Andromeda group and shattered it to pieces. This theory is *said* to receive confirmation (!) by news from Illinois and other States, where there was a great fall of meteors. These are *supposed* to be the remains of the defunct comet.—*Reynolds, November 27th, 1892.*

In the above paragraph the words "said," and "supposed," which we have underlined, are very properly inserted by the thoughtful editor; but the Astronomical "Professor" has not been so cautious in boldly affirming that the earth "collided with a comet, and shattered it to pieces." But I probably presumed either upon the ignorance, or the credulity, of the students in the "High School;" upon his own self-sufficient authority—a learned "Scientist." Many of the "highly" learned men seem to think utterly superfluous to offer "proofs or "reasons," for their self-confident assertions. But, as the earth's supposed revolution has never yet been proved, he might as well have talked of a great mountain colliding with a little wreath of smoke! A little more "Scientific Smoke" for our correspondent "B.A." to clear away?

ED. T.E.R.

The Globe Shining!

"As seen from the moon, the earth would appear four times greater diameter, and thirteen times wider surface than the moon does to us. I

illumination of the earth is fourteen times greater on the moon than that of the moon on the earth."—*Homeland*, December 8th, 1892.

Proof wanted of the above statements.

Fancy our "dull distant mountains" shining "fourteen times" brighter than the moon, and yet we "can't see it"! Perhaps we need "glasses"—astronomical ones?

ED. T.E.R.

"A disquieting feature of the recently issued yearly return of shipping casualties is the increase in the number of missing sailing vessels, which rose

from 46 in 1888-89, and 26 in 1889-90, to 64 in 1890-91."

We need not be astonished at this when we remember that all our Mariners are taught to believe the absurd theory that they are navigating a whirling globe, instead of sailing on the "level of the sea." It is a sad reflection on the boasted "science" of the nineteenth Century.

ED. T.E.R.

Said Tim to Mickey: "Do you belave the Earth turns round?" "Oi do," replied Mickey, "whin Oi'm drunk; but not whin Oi'm sober."

THE NEW SCRIPTURES.

ACCORDING TO TYNDALL, HUXLEY, SPENCER, AND DARWIN.

- 1—"Primarily the Unknowable moved upon comos and evolved protoplasm.
- 2—And protoplasm was inorganic and undifferentiated, containing all things in potential energy; and a spirit of evolution moved upon the fluid mass.
- 3—And the Unknowable said, "Let atoms attract"; and their contact begat light, heat, and electricity.
- 4—And the Unconditioned differentiated the atoms, each after its kind; and their combinations begat rock, air, and water.
- 5—And there went out a spirit of evolution from the Unconditioned, and working in protoplasm by accretion and absorption, produced the organic cell.
- 6—And cell, by nutrition, evolved primordial germ, and germ developed protogene; and protogene began coozon, and coozon begat monad, and monad begat animalcule.
- 7—And animalcule begat ephemera; then began creeping things to multiply on the face of the earth.
- 8—And earthly atoms in vegetable protoplasm begat the molecule, and thence came all grass and every herb in the earth.
- 9—And animalculæ in the water *evolved* fins, tails, claws, and scales; and in the air, wings and beaks, and on the land they sprouted such organs as were necessary, as played upon by the environment.
- 10—And by accretion and absorption came the radiata and mollusca, and mollusca begat articulata, and articulata begat vertebrata.

- 11—Now these are the generations of the higher vertebrata, in the cosmic period when the Unknowable evolved the bipedal mammalia.
- 12—And every man of the earth, while he was yet a monkey, and the horse while he was a hipparion, and the hipparion before he was a an oredon.
- 13—Out of the ascidian came the amphibian and begat the pentadactyle ; and the pentadactyle, by inheritance and selection, produced the hylobate, from which the simiadæ in all their tribes.
- 14—And out of the simiadæ the lemur prevailed above his fellows, and produced the platyrrhine monkey.
- 15—And the platyrrhine begat the caterrhine, and the catterrhine monkey begat the authropoid ape, and the ape begat the longimanous orang, and the orang begat the chimpanzee, and the chimpanzee evolved the *what-is-it ?*
- 16—And the what-is-it went to the land of Nod, and took him a wife of the longimanous gibbons.
- 17—And in process of the cosmic period were born unto them and their children, the anthropomorphic primordial types.
- 18—The homunsulus, the prognathus, the troglodyte, the autochthon, the tarragen, these are the generations of primeval man.
- 19—And primeval man was naked and not ashamed, but lived in quadrumanus innocence, and struggled mightily to harmonise with the environment.
- 20—And by inheritance and natural selections did he progress from the stable and homogeneous to the complex and heterogeneous ; for the weakest died and the strongest grew and multiplied.
- 21—And man grew a thumb, for that he had need of it, and developed capacities for prey.
- 22—For, behold the swiftest men caught the most animals, and the swiftest animals got away from the most men ; wherefore the slow animals were eaten and the slow men starved to death.
- 23—And as types were differentiated the weaker types continually disappeared.
- 24—And the earth was filled with violence ; for man strove with man, and tribe with tribe, whereby they killed off the weak and foolish, and secured the survival of the fittest."—*From the "Rainbow," and copied from an American Journal.*

If it require *faith* to believe the grand, simple, and reasonable account of Creation given in Genesis, how much credulity and gullibility does it require to swallow down this new gospel of Evolution ?

ED. E.R.

GLOBE TINKERING, OR GAS METORITES.

Our esteemed Editor has privileged me with the reading of an article to appear in this number entitled, "University Extension." In that article he has Sampson-like felt for the pillars of modern Astronomy, doubtless, with the intention of pulling down that "house of cards." He knows that the so-called sciences—which in the point of fact are not science at all, but mere speculations, or a contrivance to explain phenomena—have not got the shawdow of *practical* demonstrated proof, either of globularity or mobility to support them! If confirmation of this is needed, it can be found in the *Daily Chronicle* (April 8th, 1891). There we read a confession of ignorance with respect to the shape of the earth. "It may be a surprise to find that we are still imperfectly acquainted with the exact figure of the earth"! But how did the savants manufacture our whirling, twirling, tumbling, rotating seven-motioned globe? Why, they *imagined* that it was one, and hence they can never demonstratively prove their speculations, by a practical appeal to nature! Having imagined the earth to be a globe, they set about to find out its origin by other speculations. For instance, Professor Laplace "*supposed* the solar system to have originally consisted of a mass of Gas in rotation"; and, lo and behold! as it "cooled it contracted," and by consequence "rotated more rapidly, until at length, it became so much flattened, that it could no longer subsist in a single shape," therefore it began to evolve and "shed a ring." This loss is said to have caused the "central portion" to contract still further, until a second crisis arrived, when again by the process of physical evolution—not the man-monkey evolution of the Darwinians—"another ring was shed"; and then another, and another, *ad infinitum*. Subsequently these rings coaleced into planets, and the central portion formed the Sun!

Now, Sir, some time after this speculation had been accepted by scientists, there arose another Professor by name *Lockyer*, who by another supposition proved Laplace to be in gross error on the "matter," and taught us, that the immediate antecedent condition of the Sun and planets ("the earth," they say, "being a planet") was not gas at all, but, "that they consisted of a swarm of loose stones or meteorites"! Is it any wonder that Lord Bacon in his *Novum Organon Scientiarum*, ch. iv., speaking of the origin of systems of philosophy says, "if it (the origin) be false and erroneous, whatever immediately arises from it must of necessity be false also"? This is self-evident.

Now Lord Kelvin, the President of the Royal Society, at the anniversary meeting at Burlington House, on Nov. 30th, spoke of the sun's rotation, and thus contradicted Sir Isaac Newton, who, in his "Principia,"

says, that the sun is "immovable." How in the name of common sense can an immovable thing rotate? Will these gentlemen condescend to answer? If they do, perhaps they will also inform us how meteorites can overcome the frictional resistance of a rotating sun? How can meteoric matter overcome the frictional resistance of their seven motioned globe? If the orbital speed of this "globe" is "over one thousand miles a minute," what chance is there of meteoric dust falling on to such a flying Dutch Cheese-shaped affair? In the interest of the public whose money they spend, I challenge the Astronomer Royal, Lord Kelvin, or any official astronomer, to answer these and similar questions.

Lately we have been informed by a cheap Science Sifter, that "the Sun is a frozen mass eternal"! To say that these contradictions and speculations are more or less than absolute falsehoods would be superfluous. Therefore I await some reply; and no doubt we shall have to wait long enough.

J. WILLIAMS.

"SCIENCE SIFTINGS," SIFTED.

To the Editor of The Earth Review.

SIR,—The following is a copy of my letters to the Editors of "Science Siftings," with their replies. You will see by them, that although they say they will "endeavour to distinguish fact from hypothesis, truth from falsehood" (No. 1), yet when put to the test, they utterly decline to do anything of the kind.

JULY 9TH, 1892.

To the Editor of Science Siftings.

SIR,—In your issue for June 4th, 1892, you state, that, "the curvature of the earth is 8 inches for 1 mile, 32 for 2 miles, and keeps on increasing as the square of the distance for longer distances." Now by this rate the curvature of 90 miles is 5,400 feet. Therefore an object at 20 miles distance, the height of which is 1,000 feet, could not be seen at that distance. I presume that you are aware that there is another rate of curvature in existence which is the product of modern astronomy, viz:—2.04 inches to the mile, multiplied by the square of the distance in miles? Now, even by this rate it is evident that an object 1,000 feet high could not be seen at 90 miles distance, for it would be hid behind a curve, over 1,300 feet. Now I come to *practical facts*. The Eiffel Tower is not quite 1,000 feet high, but its top can be seen at a distance of over 90 miles!! Now Sir, let me ask you how on globular principles, this is to be rationally accounted for? I trust in the interests of truth you will kindly publish this letter in your next issue, and your reply thereto.

On July 9th, the following appeared. "The paradox referred to in your letter is apparent only. It is true that there are two ways of reckoning the earth's curvature: but one refers to the arc, the other to the chord of the circle. It was of the last that we spoke in the paragraph you refer to. Within moderate limits, it may be assumed that the chord of the terrestrial circle, joined the eye of an observer with the base of a distant vertical object, represents the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle, of which the vertical object forms one of the sides. Hence the simple rule that the height of this object, when just visible, is proportional to the square of the distance along the chord, which, although not an absolutely accurate rule, is sufficiently nearly so for many practical purposes."

Comment on this is hardly necessary. But on August 20th, I wrote as follows;—

AUGUST 20TH, 1892.

To the Editors of Science Siftings.

GENTLEMEN,—Permit me to call your attention to the introduction of yourselves to the public as given in No. 1 of "Science Siftings."

There you promised to "distinguish fact from hypothesis, truth from falsehood." This you have not done, for, to go no further, your reply to me in "S.S." of July 9th, is a direct contradiction of it! When you can prove your globe has two circumferences, then, and then only, will your reply be consistent with logical reasoning and common sense. You know as well as I do that your reply is not true, and that it is *only* theory and utterly false, hence it is you are obliged to have resource to *assumption*.

In Vol. i. p.38. you say, "since water finds its own level, it is compatible with the theory (*theory* mind) of a spherical or oblate World, that the sea is a plane of Water, &c.

Is it possible you do not see the contradiction which exists in this grandiloquent statement, with which is coupled the sarcastic question to a friend of mine about "tumbling over the edge"? "The sea being a plane" as you admit, the World cannot be a globe. How in the name of common sense can a plane of water be a part of a sphere or oblate globe? Do you not see that the thing is a practical and moral impossibility? Is that the reason why you told "E. J. Cooper" (Vol. II. No. 41. p.210) that "flat earth theories are kicked out of your columns"? I do not Sir want the £1,000 you offer, but I do want the truth of *practical science* to be known by the people, and I therefore challenge the Astronomical Editor to prove the earth to be a spinning and whirling globe, by an appeal to demonstrated facts found in Nature. I will prove it is *not*, if you have the manliness and courage to open your columns for the elucidation of the truth of the subject.

Yours respectfully, JOHN WILLIAMS.

P.S.—I enclose a £1,000 challenge in the hope that you will accept it. J.W.

THE FOLLOWING REPLY WAS GIVEN IN THE ISSUE FOR SEPT. 10TH.

"We cannot think of accepting your challenge. The "reward" of £1,000 is doubtless a hoax on the part of someone who has simply invented the American references. Not a cent could be recovered from anybody, upon the strength of such a "startling offer" as is published upon the hand-bill. Then apart from this, most of our readers have been educated past flat earth hypotheses. And if we devoted to these such an amount of our space as would be needed for the rigid demonstration of the motions and form of the earth, *Science Siftings* would be considered uninteresting, and its demonstrations redundant. Then our circulation would be converted from an increasing to a decreasing one. Probably this last consideration has not presented itself to you; but we cannot lose sight of it."

So we see that these gentlemen evidently distinguish between truth and £ s. d.; and they chose the latter. Comment is needless.

Yours &c., J. WILLIAMS.

Highly Educated.

By M. A. BUXTON.

Miss Pallas Eudora von Blurky,
Who did'nt know chicken from turkey,
High Spanish and Greek
She could fluently speak,
But her knowledge of poultry was murky.
She could name the great-uncle of Moses,
The dates of the Wars of the Roses,
The reason of things,
Why the Indians wore rings
Through their red aboriginal noses.
The meaning of Emerson's "Brahma,"
Why Shakespeare was wrong in his grammar;
And she went chipping rocks
With a little black box,
And a small geological hammer.
She had views upon co-education,
And the principal needs of the Nation;
Her glasses were blue,
And the number she knew
Of the stars in each high constellation.
She expounded the use of bacilli,
And learnedly lectured on calci;
Her costume was mannish,
Her ways very clannish,
'Mongst the Cult and the 'Varsity foci.
She wrote in a handwriting clerky,
And spoke with an emphasis jerky;
High German and Greek
She could fluently speak;
But—she didn't know chicken from turkey.

From the "Yankee Blade."

