

No matter what part of the level is used in each, the same figure is used as given above for each separate level, whether the ends or the middle, no allowance for the "curvature" said to exist is ever thought of let alone made. The study of "Earth not a Globe" by "Parallax" sets the matter in its proper light. In a conversation with

one of the Civil Engineers in this district, after some amount of argument on each side as to the reason why no allowance for curvature was allowed, he said, he did not believe anybody would know the shape of the earth in this life.

Yours faithfully,

T. WESTWOOD.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

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

LEO CASTLE,
c/o MR. J. WILLIAMS,
32, Bankside, LONDON, S. E.

C. HARPUR.—Thanks for your letter, which we cannot insert.

II. VETTERLING, and others writing on the *same* subject.—When absolutely practical measurements South of the Equator are made, we are sure that they will be in confirmation of *the fact* that the "Earth" is a vast irregular Plane. It is an utter impossibility for one fact to contradict or set aside another fact. Zetetics South of the Equator are seeking the desired information. We accept Truth from anyone. May we suggest that your question; in fact ALL questions relating to the subject, "In what direction did Mr. C. E. Borchgrevink see the Southern Midnight Sun," be sent direct to that gentleman, and his answer sent direct to us for publication. His answer should be confirmed by the signature of the whole of the crew, for the cabin-boy's statement on such a matter is equally as good as any Professor's. Thanks for papers sent.

J. BRADLEY.—Hearty thanks for your promised help. The quotation, "We shall take for granted from the outset the Copernican system of the World," etc., will be found in *Herschel's Astronomy*, p. 4, 5.

G. H. COWPER.—Thanks for your kind letter and cutting. We have no reasons to believe that the statements made by Mr. Borchgrevink are either true or false, anyway they do not affect the fact that the surface shape of water everywhere is LEVEL.

EDITORIAL NOTICES.

Please to ask for "The Earth—not a Globe—Review," at all Newsagents, Reading Rooms, and Railway Bookstalls. To be had direct from the Hon Sec., post free, to any address in the postal union for 10d. per year, in advance.

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

EARTH-NOT A GLOBE-REVIEW.



A Sectional View of the World as a Plane.

VOL. I. No. 1 (MONTHLY SERIES). APRIL, 1896.

PRICE 1D.

"UNIVERSAL GRAVITATION, A PURE ASSUMPTION."

BY LEO CASTLE.

No. III.

Dedicated to THE EDITOR of *Reynolds's Newspaper*.

The silent admission of the impregnable position of Zeteticism leads us to believe that the Editor of *Reynolds's Newspaper* has read the following or similar extracts:—

"We have any quantity of hypotheses thrust upon us as discoveries, which are merely false knowledge that later science will have to *unlearn*! As a matter of fact the fashionable notions which are paraded as Science stand only because their advocates shut their eyes to realities, make assertions with little or no fact to start from, ignore the facts which do not suit them, refuse to meet objections, and ignore any really scientific (that is provable) explanations which do not agree with the specialistic facts."—SIGMA, *English Mechanic*, Oct. 5th, 1894.

"The repetition of a blunder is impertinent and ridiculous. To liberate oneself from an error is difficult, sometimes indeed impossible for even the strongest and most gifted minds. But to take up the error of another, and persist in it with stiff-necked obstinacy, is a proof of poor qualities. The obstinacy of a man of originality when he errs may make us angry, but the stupidity of the copyist irritates and renders us miserable. And if, in our strife with (Sir Isaac) Newton, we have sometimes passed the bounds of moderation, the whole blame is to be laid upon the school of which Newton was the head, whose incompetence is proportional to its arrogance, whose laziness is proportional to its self-sufficiency, and whose virulence and love of persecution hold each other in perfect equilibrium." "Through the whole of Newton's experiments (?) there runs a display of pedantic accuracy, but how the matter really stands, with Newton's gift of observation, and with his experimental aptitudes, every man possessing eyes and senses may make himself aware. It may be boldly asked, where can the man be found, possessing the extraordinary gifts of

Newton, who would suffer himself to be deluded by such a *hocus pocus* if he had not in the first instance wilfully deceived himself? Only those who know the strength of self-deception, and the extent to which it sometimes trenches on dishonesty, are in a condition to explain the conduct of Newton and of Newton's school. To support his unnatural theory, Newton heaps fiction upon fiction, seeking to dazzle when he could not convince."—GOETHE. *Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Gt. Britain.* Vol. ix., part iii., p. 353.5.

"It has, over and over again, been the hope and expectation of intelligent and unprejudiced men that some less extravagant and more intelligible system would, sooner or later, be found as a substitute for the mathematical romance with which Newton has favoured the World. This name has been the sanction for a device which, the more it is examined, excites the more astonishment at its adoption by men of research and observation."—*Dr. W. Friend.*

From the preceding extracts we hope it will be seen and admitted that there can be no true system of astronomy, till the laws and demonstrable facts of *terrestrial* physics are thoroughly understood—not from "text books" and the assumptions of Modern Professors, but from *the same practical evidence* as the purchaser of an estate would require ere he paid his money or was satisfied with his possession.

"Muster your wits; stand on your own defence,
Or hide your heads like cowards, and fly hence."

—SHAKESPEARE.

11th. It has been dogmatically and arrogantly asserted that 'no one who understands the Newtonian theory questions its truth;' so that those who question its truth are treated as not understanding it. If this style of argument, or rather dictation, were allowed to prevail, discussion would be suppressed, and progress in Science interdicted. The Newtonian definition of Weight is that 'it is the *effect* of Gravity (*i.e.*, gravitation); the measure of the force of gravitation on bodies of different densities.' I propose to show that this explanation is sheer nonsense. Gravitation has no weight; how then can it give to something else, that which it does not itself possess? I offer the following definition of Weight. "*Weight is that inherent property of matter which causes any body according to its density to take the most direct path possible to its level of stability or equilibrium.*" This is the reason why *smoke ascends* to a stratum of atmosphere where it can find its level, and why a stone falls to the ground, because there only is its proper resting place. The Newtonian asserts that if it were not for the 'attraction of Gravitation,' ourselves and our possessions would fall off into space, unless indeed we took root in the soil and lost our power of locomotion; but according to my definition of Weight, nothing could fall off the earth into space, because nowhere else but on the earth could any object so readily reach its level of equilibrium.*

The New Principia by NEWTON CROSSLAND.
(To be Continued)

[*This is true when the Fact of the earth's configuration as a vast irregular plane is admitted, but not when it is considered to be a "globe," as it is by this authority.—ED.]

BIBLE ASTRONOMY.

A DEFENCE AND TESTIMONY.

By J. SMITH, ESQ.

It may be that some readers of *The Earth not a Globe—Review—* have read an article that appeared in *Zion's Watch Tower* (May 15th, 1895), anent a small Zetetic tract entitled "*Bible Astronomy.*" Some readers not well established in the truth may have had their minds disturbed and unsettled by its specious reasonings. "Z.W.T." professes that it will review the tract from a "*Bible stand point and from that stand-point ONLY.*" A careful reading of the various sections will shew clearly that almost every assumption is of the stereotype and orthodox modern science style, and *not scriptural at all!* This we will now prove. We are to'd that "discoveries, deductions and suggestions of all past time, have greatly advanced Astronomical Science? Nor should it be a matter of surprise, that while God has been disclosing the wonders of His grace to His people, He has also been paving the way . . . for a more correct idea of His no less wonderful creation." And further, "that while *it is true* that gross error with reference to spiritual things has marked the steps of great ecclesiastics, &c., . . . quite the opposite is true of Science, Art, and Mechanics," and the explanation is that "spiritual things are spiritually discerned. But the great truths of nature are not so learned."

With the latter sentence we quite agree, but while many *details* of natural things are not made known by revelation, yet so far as God has been pleased to reveal His works of creation in the Bible they are to be believed by those who hold the Bible to be the Word of God, and readers only need to refer to the past editions of this journal to find abundant proofs that while modern philosophers have been tracing the steps of so called Modern Astronomical Science (!) the greatest mistakes, inconsistencies and contradictions have marked their so-called progress? *e.g.* Have they not been ever shifting the sizes and distances of all the orbs of heaven, fixing the sun at ever-varying distances from 44,000 miles (Pythagoras) to 184 millions (Mayer) of miles from the earth? And further, have we not been asked to believe that by some assumed process of evolution in the unknown past history of time the planet earth was but a gaseous scintillation discharged from the sun which gradually cooled from its gaseous condition till ultimately it condensed into its present liquid and solid form, &c., &c., whilst the Bible plainly teaches us that the Heaven and Earth were first created; and that the

sun, moon, and stars were made on the 4th day: thus giving the lie to the modern theory of a sun-begotten-planet-earth. We have only to use our God-given intellect to know that the earth and seas constitute the great terrestrial part of the universe inasmuch as travellers and sailors have traversed thousands of miles over its surface in several directions, whilst the sun, moon and stars are so far removed from close observation that it is most likely we shall never fully know either their size, or their distance from us. "Z.W.T." presumes that if the earth is a plane floating on the waters "that the seas must in turn be supported by *something tangible*, and that in turn by something else, *ad infinitum*." As if God had no means of supporting the earth and seas upon foundations devised by wisdom and power upon a plan never revealed to and not to be known by us. 1 Sam. ii. 8, and Job xxxviii. 4-6, &c., and Jer. xxxi. 37, Ps. xxiv. 2.

SECTION 1.

In this section we are told—(a) "That the air envelops the earth to a distance of about 50 miles from the surface."* Is that a Scripture proof, or a modern theoretical guess? (b) "That it has been suggested (by whom?) and *apparently?* with *good evidence (not produced)*, that before the deluge the volume of water above the firmament or aerial heavens was much greater than now, and that the waters below the firmament were correspondingly less, that the earth at that time *probably (?)* had a ring of water similar to the several rings of saturn: the *theory* being that the precipitation of the water of that ring produced the deluge, &c."† If there be any ring of truth in all this sentence it is in describing the whole thing as a "*theory* i.e. *speculation*," the Scripture proof being wanting.

* We deeply regret that our critic did not look up current astronomical teaching upon this subject, for then he would have found that this guess of 50 miles has been supplanted by another guess which we quote for his learned consideration:—"We may infer that a few hundred miles embrace all the gaseous envelope of the globe."—*Science Siftings*, March 18th, 1893. He might also have found that "the height of the atmosphere is NOT known with any certainty. There is probably no fixed limit to the atmosphere."—*Elementary Physiography*. p. 293.—Ed.

† Evidently the outcome of "Vail's Annular World" theory taught in California.—Ed.

SECTION 2.—THE SKY A SUBSTANTIAL VAULT.

Here the "Z.W.T." adopts the usual style of many modern theologians who endeavour to reconcile the Bible and Modern Science, by describing *plain words of Scripture relating to matters of fact* as "highly figurative and poetic as Amos ix. 6, Job xxxvii. 18, Is. xl. 22."

SECTION 3.—UP. DOWN. SUNRISE AND SUNSET.

(a) If it were true that all planists believe that the sun, moon, and stars move in a plane above the earth; "Z.W.T." is distinctly in error in declaring "such motion to be in direct opposition to their theory?" inasmuch as both by experience and custom, and also according to optical laws, it is quite correct to say that the sun rises or sets as it is manifest to the senses that it does. So in respect of the *natural horizontal datum line* called the horizon, which is the rule or standard to which all varying elevations of objects are referred, and by which objects are said to be higher or lower as they are seen above or below such line whether actually or perspective.

(b) While the expression, "Four corners of the Earth," could have no literal signification in reference to a ponderous Sea-Earth-Globe such as is taught by the Newtonian philosophy. How forcible it is when used in respect of the Earth spread out upon the waters as declared in the Scriptures, as Ps. xxiv. 2; 2 Peter iii. 5., &c.

SECTION 4.—SUN AND STARS EARTH'S ORNAMENTS.

"Z.W.T." tells us that God was not attempting to teach Astronomy (we say modern Astronomy?) but leaving such things for mankind to investigate." Can any intelligent and unbiassed reader peruse the words recorded in Gen. i. 14-18, without being convinced that the very thing taught is *the truth* in regard to the creation, and the uses of the sun, moon, and stars, and as if the Lord would place it beyond doubt or controversy, He thrice repeats the special object for which they were created. "Z.W.T." says (page 118): "Sun and stars were *caused to give light* to the earth . . . and were intended to do so, but there is nothing to indicate that they could not lighten *other planets*." Is that not twisting and warping the Scriptures to give a diametrically opposite sense to what is given in them? Gen. i. 15 distinctly says: "Let them *be for lights* in the firmament of heaven TO GIVE LIGHT UPON THE EARTH; and IT WAS SO;" but to suggest that they were *merely caused to give light* as a kind of *secondary service*, whilst their primary service was withholden for man to discover, is too absurd to be received even on the authority of "Z.W.T."

SECTIONS 5 AND 6

needs no comment beyond simply observing the usual poetic licence introduced to cover up the deficiency of interpreting the true and plain teaching of literal scriptures as to pure matters of fact.

SECTION 7.—SUN AND MOON STOOD STILL. (Josh. x. 12-14.)

This clear and unmistakable passage of scripture, "The Sun stood still," has baffled every attempt at reconciliation with the teaching of modern theories, though often attempted by many good meaning men,

neither are we any nearer by the two theories suggested by "Z.W.T."—both of which, instead of being Bible proofs, are diametrically opposed to its plainest teachings. The theories suggested are—(a) "That by *some* miraculous process the rays of the sun were refracted by clouds specially arranged for the purpose"; or, (b) "that even if the earth was *slowed up* in her diurnal motion, it would be equally proper to say that the sun hastened not to go down"; or, we think it is highly *improper* to say "that clouds refracted the sun's rays"; and equally *improper* to say "that the earth slows up, &c." When the Scripture repeats the fact that the "sun went down," "the sun stood still," can anything be more unscriptural or improper than to attribute to the "earth which is fixed upon foundations" a diurnal motion to get its light, when the Scriptures declare it to be the sun that *moves* in its circuits to give light upon the earth? We prefer to let God be true, though all modern philosophy be untrue.

SECTION 8.—EARTH FOUNDED AND IMMOVABLE.

Z. W. T. in this section surpasses itself; for whilst on page 116 it professes the "necessity of a material earth being sustained on something tangible, &c., *ad infinitum*," it reminds the "intelligent and *thoughtful* reader that there are other foundations than *stone ones*, adding, that principles as well as things, have foundations." As for instance, "Justice is the habitation of God's Throne (Government)." But is the foundation of God's Throne, viz. (the attribute of Justice), the foundation of the material earth? If not, where is the point in the argument? In wisdom He hath made all His works, and hath appointed suitable foundations for His works, whether of a spiritual or material order. But while "Justice is the foundation of His Throne (spiritual), He hath appointed such physical foundations for the earth and seas as it hath pleased Him in His wisdom." See Job xxxviii. 4-6, Ps. xxiv. 2, Ps. xciii. 1, Ps. civ. 5, Jer. xxxi. 37, &c.

SECTION 9.—AN IMPORTANT PASSAGE OVERLOOKED

"*He hangeth the earth upon nothing.*" Job xxvi. 7.

Z. W. T. says "The advocates of the flat earth idea *seem* to overlook (this) the only text of scripture which *really* has to do with the subject." We deeply regret to see that the Editor of "Z.W.T." here confesses his ignorance of what the "advocates of the flat earth idea" overlook, underlook, and look at! Some of his own followers can, if they will, tell him where and when we have *not* overlooked this "text of Scripture which really has to do with the subject" to the utter annihilation of the globular hypothesis! Well, things are not always what they *seem*, and this is one of them, for Zetetics rejoice in the fact that such a passage exists. Even "Z.W.T."

will hardly suggest that it is possible to hang a tangible earth upon NOTHING. It is an ambiguous sentence as it stands in English, but just in the same way as when a person says "I did nothing," he means "he did not do anything"; so this passage properly rendered should be, "He doth not hang the earth upon anything." This then perfectly agrees with Young's version, and confirms the other portions of scripture as quoted under Section 8, viz., that it is *not* hanged upon anything, but built upon foundations, for it is both unscriptural and unreasonable to speak of hanging any material thing upon NOTHING.

In conclusion, while we are willing to exercise charity, yet we decline to allow the Word of God to be tangled and twisted to suit the mere speculations of modern science so-called; and while we believe, also, that this is not the gospel of the grace of God, yet it is part of the Word of God, and to be received by all who love God, whether received or rejected by men of science. And the more we observe how much of modern science (so-called) is based upon "theory and hypothesis"—*i.e.* a mere process of guessing, the more we shall receive the testimony of God (which is truth) rather than the doctrines of men.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST TO THAT WHICH IS TRUE."

THE DEATH AND BURIAL OF THE CIRCUM-NAVIGATION PROOF THAT THE EARTH IS A GLOBE!

"*Circumnavigation in an easterly and westerly direction does not prove the earth to be globular.*"

"The earth has been circumnavigated a great many times, and it is a common occurrence for a ship to leave England, and by steering westward all the voyage to arrive in England again without retracing an inch of her way. Similarly, we can journey round the globe, sometimes travelling on land, and sometimes on the sea, but eventually return to the starting point without at all turning back on our course. This would appear to be a certain proof that the earth's surface is curved, nevertheless it has been pointed out that circumnavigation would be possible if the earth had a flat surface, with the north magnetic pole at its centre. A compass needle would THEN *always point* to the centre of the surface, and so a ship might sail due east and west, as indicated by the compass, and eventually return to the same point by describing a circle." *Elementary Physiography*, Eighth Ed., by Professor Richard A. Gregory, F.R.A.S., etc

In the Preface of the book we read, "Owing to the rapid advances of science in recent years, text books, which formerly ranked first of their kind, have dropped out of date." The above extract doubtless explains the cause for this.—Ed.

FAITH AND SCIENCE.

BY "BALAAM'S ASS."

"After the intoxication of the imagination comes its prostration and relapse."—CANON KINGSLEY'S "Hypatia."

Should not the men of every land,
Who love the Truth and Right,
Be leagued in one paternal band,
Against all ill to fight?
Creeds and opinions men may woo,
But love of Truth and Right
O'er all, whatever else may sue,
Should all good men unite.

We have often been told that the question of the configuration of the earth is of no importance to Christianity or mankind in general. Indeed, the writer has been charged with "giving up communion with the Lord to quarrel with men about the earth's shape." Our object, therefore, in this article is to demonstrate that our well-meaning friends are utterly mistaken as to our Object, and entirely ignorant of the importance and connection of the subject with Holy Writ. Christian friend, will you tell me that your faith is based in the Word of God, *i.e.*, the Bible? and that that Book being the Spirit breathed, or in other words, the inspired Word of God, cannot lie? I know your answer is, Yes, with all my heart. I add my hearty Amen.

But, now, tell me, do you believe that the Rev. Professor Bonney, D.S.O., F.R.S., spoke the truth at the Church Congress held at Norwich, Oct. 1895, when in his paper, "Is scientific progress increasing the difficulties of belief in the Christian Creed" (President, the Bishop of Peterborough) he said:—

"I cannot deny that the increase of scientific knowledge has deprived parts of the earlier books of the Bible of the historical value which was generally attributed to them by our forefathers. The story of Creation in the book Genesis, unless we play fast and loose, either with words or with science, cannot be brought into harmony with what we have learnt from geology. Its ethnological statements are imperfect, if not sometimes inaccurate; the story of the Fall, of the Flood, and of the Tower of Babel, are incredible in their present form. These narratives are allegorical, not historical; they are spiritual, not scientific truths."—*Eastern Daily Press* (Supplement), Oct. 10th, 1895.

Such is the teaching emanating from the pulpits and platforms of this so called "enlightened age." The following is another specimen:—

"No student of science is able to believe that any such Flood as that recorded in the early chapters of Genesis ever took place in the history of

the human race. . . . The Flood story is a myth, not history."—The Rev. C. F. Aked at Pembroke Chapel, Liverpool. See *Christian World Pulpit*, June 14th, 1893, p. 371.

Now, most Christians think that Freethinkers are a blind and ignorant lot of bigots, but upon this subject, at anyrate, he is on a par with the Parson? The following extract will incontestably prove that this is so:—

"There is something in Christianity calculated to make it hostile to science. Its sacred books are defaced by a puerile cosmogony, and a vast number of physical absurdities: while its whole atmosphere, in the New as well as in the Old Testament, is in the highest degree unscientific.

"The Bible gives a false account of the origin of the world; a foolish account of the origin of man; a ridiculous account of the origin of languages. It tells us of a universal flood which never happened. And all these falsities are bound up with essential doctrines, such as the fall of man and the atonement of Christ; with important moral teachings and social regulations. It was therefore inevitable that the Church, deeming itself the divinely-appointed guardian of Revelation, should oppose such sciences as astronomy, geology, and birlogy, which could not add to the authority of the Scripture, but might very easily weaken it. Falsehood was in possession, and truth was an exile or a prisoner."—*The Freethinker*, Oct. 16th, 1892.

And what is the opinion of the public press (?) upon this matter? Here is an extract from one:—

"The most noteworthy feature of the British Association this year is that the assembled savants—representing religion, science, philosophy, and politics—have surrendered hands down to views which, if accepted by anyone ten years ago, would be sneered at as a mark of disgrace. The Church has had to give in because geology and biology have been too strong for the Book of Genesis, which is no longer to be accepted as a real account of the Creation, but merely a symbolical one. The incontestible experiments and experiences of the practical scientists have proved that Darwin was right, and that evolution is as certain a law as that of gravitation. What a number of the 'learned' books of a few years ago opposing evolution must now be ignominiously withdrawn from circulation? And how small must the controversial parson and the lay evangelist, who would prove to you in 'two jiffies that science was all bosh,' feel at the thunders of competent scholars!"—*Reynolds's Newspaper*, Oct. 13th, 1895.

Now, dear Christian reader, here we have a representation of professors of so-called science, the clergy, freethinkers, and editors of the public press, and everyone of them appear to be ignorant that to follow any man's conclusions, because he is considered a "competent scholar," is proof positive that they thereby become an acolyte to an *ignis fatuus*. As they all teach the same thing, have we not an irrefutable proof that the so-called sciences of modern theoretical astronomy, geology, and evolution are three unclean frogs, with which the Christian should have no connection whatever?

(To be Continued.)

"THE FAITH" v. THE TRUTH.

To the Editor of "The Faith."

DEAR SIR,—I have read many articles in "The Faith" with great pleasure and profit, but that one on "Satan and Sorrow" in the current number of "The Faith" caused me surprise and disappointment. The writer speaks of "our sun" as though there were a plurality of suns, and of several worlds besides ours,—this one. Such language surely must be known to be quite foreign to the Holy Scriptures, not only being contrary, but also utterly antagonistic to the teachings of those Scriptures. *Both cannot be true*; and these are not the days for half beliefs or measures, one way or the other. The "Science," falsely so-called, which teaches and enforces this stultifying of Holy Scripture, is *modern*, and, what is still worse, *Infidel*, and you must admit was no part of "The Faith once for all delivered to the saints"; then why teach in *your* "Faith" this so-called science which is made the basis of attacks on the *Ancient* and only *True Faith*, by those who presumptuously pose as being *Educated* and capable of what they call Higher Criticising? *If* the planets are worlds, why not the stars also? Perhaps some of your readers *think* they are, but God, through His servant Moses, calls them all merely "lights!" Again, since the Bible speaks of only *one material World*, by what right do we add to the number? If we are allowed to play fast and loose with God's Word, where shall we stop? Why do you not speak as the Oracles speak? Is this possible unless we *think* as they do? It seems that much of the Article in question *is drawn from the writer's* (or other's) *imagination!* It is dangerous to be wise above that which is written, then why attempt to be so? I trust the greater part of your readers prefer True Wisdom to that of the World's, which God declares is "foolishness;" by all means keep to the "*Ancient Faith*," or in consistency alter the title of your periodical, as such a title,

covering such Anti-Biblical matter, is to say the least of it, very pernicious and likely to be most misleading to many. Trusting you will see this matter in its true light, and publish this letter in "The Faith," believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully,

H. H. S.

London, Feb. 5th, 1896.

P.S.—"The Puzzled Cleric" and "The Bible and New Science" enclosed.

DEAR FRIEND,—Yours to hand, but I am unable to use it, as the advocacy of the matter named forms no part of the testimony of the Magazine. Wishing you every blessing in the Lord, our Life, I remain,

Yours fraternally,

Feb. 5th, 1896.

CYRUS E. BROOKS.

To H. H. S.

To the Editor of "The Faith."

DEAR SIR,—Your post-card to hand. Of course, as Editor of what is called "The Faith," you are empowered to refuse, and, therefore, not insert, my letter, in which I contend for the accuracy of the Bible account and view of Creation, as against the *Modern-Astronomical* and *Infidel* view; but when you say the subject named "forms no part of the testimony of the magazine," I must demur and protest, for you have already inserted that particular article ("Satan and Sorrow") I wrote you upon, which supports the *Modern* view held by every disbeliever in the Word of God. Had you not first made the subject a matter of testimony (on the wrong side, too!) in your periodical, I should not have troubled you with my letter. I may add, I have heard from other Zetetic Life believers, that they, too, were surprised and disappointed by your printed testimony to this "Modern (Infidel-making) Astronomy," which is undoubtedly a "Science falsely so-called." Trusting you may yet be led to believe completely, and therefore acknowledge publicly, the ancient faith and record, believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully,

London, Feb. 11th, 1896.

H. H. S.

[As "the advocacy of the matter named" forms part of the testimony of this magazine, we print the above, trusting that the Editor of "The Faith" will avail himself of the opportunity of explaining himself in *these columns*. We regret to see that the slimy, sulphurous theory of Evolution is now being taught in "The Faith!" Perhaps the "advocacy of the matter named *does form part of the testimony* of the magazine?" If not, why is it there?—Ed.]

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

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

LEO CASTLE,
c/o MR J. WILLIAMS,
32, Bankside, LONDON, S. E.

ICONOCLAST.—Thanks for *The Latest Discoveries in Astronomy*, also *The Square World*. Rev. vii. 1. teaches that the *earth*—not the “world”—hath “four corners.” No man on that account should, or can logically assert that “it *must* be square, or it would never have four corners.” Hath not a Rectangle, Rhombus, Rhomboid, Trapezoid, and a Diamond each four corners? Draw them on paper and see.

The assertion that Jesus could, on his bason-earth theory, see “all the kingdoms of the world” is equally as false as it would be if he asserted that the globular theory were true. Is he conscious of that when he says, “One could, from the centre, see all the kingdoms of the world *at once*”? A person *might* or he *might not* be able to see all the kingdoms of the world from the centre. Certainly he could not see them all *at once* even were it square! What about those kingdoms situated behind him?

The fact is he has seized the plane earth facts, advanced, both by “Parallax” and the late John Hampden, to make his theory appear a feasible one! He has done the same with LADY BLOUNT’S *Nebular Hypothesis* (Earth Review, May, 1894, p. 157), and has not been honest enough to acknowledge the persons or the source of his information! Those who live on a “square world” should act on the square, but I suppose that while the round globe world can roll on in space, the square world requires *pushing*!

C. HARPUR.—Thanks for your “comments” they are always amusing, especially when you “cannot understand,” and plead “not guilty.” Our space is so very limited we must close the controversy between you and G. M.

The evidence for the Alleghanies having been seen from Teneriffe will be found in Tallis’s Literary Newspaper, June 11th, 1864.

We can quite understand why Professor G. H. Darwin, of Cambridge, “refused to allow his answer to be sent to us.” The Professors know and realize as no others do, the *power of the Truth* we wield against their suppositions. Glad to see you own that “Gravitation is a name and NOTHING MORE.” But would anyone save a fool attempt the idiotic feat of calling “nothing” a “law of Nature,” and attribute to it the intelligence found only in living creatures?

EDITORIAL NOTICES.

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

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

Errata.—In our last issue, p. 143, from “Cannock to Whiton,” read Cannock to Wolverhampton; from Whiton to Smethwick read Wolverhampton to Smethwick.

We have from time to time received many letters asking us to issue this journal every month. We have great pleasure in announcing that in future it will be issued Monthly at its present price and size, and therefore ask the help needed to do so. We gladly give time and labour free, but the printer must be paid, therefore we ask the co-operation of all Zetetics to assist us to increase its circulation and so help us in our testimony for God’s Truth as found in Nature and taught in His Word.

—THE—
EARTH—NOT A GLOBE—REVIEW.



A Sectional View of the World as a Plane.

VOL. III. No 2 (MONTHLY SERIES). MAY, 1896. PRICE 1D.

“UNIVERSAL GRAVITATION, A PURE
ASSUMPTION.”

BY LEO CASTLE.

No. IV.

Dedicated to THE EDITOR of *Reynolds’s Newspaper*.

We have received the *Earth (not a globe) Review*, a 1d monthly publication, which may be obtained from John Williams 32 Bankside, London, S. E. It is melancholy to think that at this time of the day even a handful of people are wasting their energies upon an absurdity of this nature.—*Reynolds’s Newspaper*, April 5th, 1896.

Is this all the otherwise outspoken Editor of *Reynolds’s Newspaper* can say? It appears so! But what does he mean by “an absurdity?” Does he mean the globular theory? If so we most heartily join him in his righteous denunciation, but if he means the teaching that the earth is *not* a globe, then we challenge him to prove his assertion. Seeing that he owns to being in a melancholy state, we trust this challenge will prove an effectual antidote.

11th—*Continued*. “In ascending a hill we experience a hard struggle, and feel more fatigued than when walking on level ground. Why is this? The Newtonian attributes this result to the attraction of gravitation of the earth, against the *pull* of which we have to contend; but if he would be consistent with his theory that the ‘attraction of gravitation *diminishes* inversely as the square of the distance from the centre of the earth,’ we ought, in defiance of experience, to feel it to be less laborious to ascend a hill than to promenade the same distance on level ground, because as we ascend we *recede from* the centre of the earth; therefore the force (pull) of gravitation ought to diminish in a corresponding degree. The Newtonian can only get over this difficulty