

EARTH NOT A GLOBE

SECTION I NEBULA HYPOTHESIS AND GRAVITY

As to the origin of this earth, when and how the world began to evolve itself, we are told that in the beginning there was gas, or a "nebulous cloud," according to scientists and evolutionists. This is rather a difficult subject to deal with, because there was scientifically, no beginning-just an "eternal evolution of substance." Anyway there was a time when this "nebulous cloud" arose-never mind where it came from, for no scientist has yet ever attempted an explanation on this point, although its existence requires some accounting for, considering it was inorganic matter, and it possessed the powers of "feeling and inclination." According to LaPlace, "The particles forming the cloud were very hot," he was not there to see, but I only mention this because some scientists, like Herbert Spencer, state that the "embryo universe" was cold. Anyway, hot or cold, the particles by universal suffrage, or by some other method, unknown to scientists, took upon themselves to form the "Solar system"; therefore, it was necessary that this "diffused fire mist" should condense a little and move its particles a little closer together, "according to Newtonian laws."

There is a difference of opinion among the men of science concerning the origin and destiny of this earth. Some geologists inform us that this earth had its origin in fire, others in water; some contend that it will become extinct by a lack of water-a drought; others by too much water,-

a flood; others, that the end is likely to come by fire-a burn out; others that it will be caused by intense cold-a freeze out. They all feel sure of their opinions, and yet no two of them quite agree.

Now concerning gravitation, C. Vernon Boyd, F.R.S., A.R.S.M., M.R.I., in his paper "*The Newtonian Constant of Gravitation*," says: "It is a mysterious power which no man can explain, of its propagation through space all men are ignorant" (*Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain*. p. 355, March, 1895). This is certainly an honest and authoritative confession of astronomical ignorance of their fundamental position.

Prof. W. B. Carpenter, in his paper, "Nature and Law," says: "We have no proof, and in the nature of things can never get one, of the assumption of the attractive force exerted by the earth, or by any of the bodies of the solar system, upon other bodies at a distance. Newton himself strongly felt that the impossibility of rationally accounting for action at a distance through an intervening vacuum, was the weakest point of his theory. The doctrine of universal gravitation then is a pure assumption (*Modern Review*, October, 1890).

This "absurd" law, or "mysterious power, which no man can explain," the existence of which has never been proven, and of which its supposed operation through space "all men are ignorant," amounts to nothing more or less than an empty assumption.

Astronomers themselves consider that gravitation is absolutely necessary to their system, in fact the very foundation of it all. But I deny that there is any such force in existence, and will express my denial in the language of Sir Isaac Newton himself, written in a letter to his friend, Dr. Bentley, February, 1692, just before the death of Newton; "That gravity should be innate and inherent in matter, so that one body can act upon another at a distance, is to me so great an absurdity, that I think no one who has, in philosophical matters a competent faculty of thinking, can ever fall into it." I agree with Sir Isaac, for I, too, think it "so great an absurdity" that I shall never "fall into it."

INERTIA OF MATTER AND INHERENT FORCE

Inertia is that property which renders a body incapable of putting itself in motion when at rest, or coming to rest when in motion. When a stationary body begins to move, or a moving body comes to rest, it is not through any power of its own, but because it is acted upon by some external agency, which is called force.

That no inanimate body can put itself in motion, is evident from our daily experience and observation. The rocks that we saw on the earth's surface years ago, are precisely in the same place today that they were then, and there they will remain forever unless some force removes them.

A moving body gradually comes to rest, when the force which put it in motion ceases to act; this is also due to the resistance of the air, and not by any agency of its own. A projectile may be thrown with such force as to be borne some distance in a straight line, without having its direction altered either by its weight or air resistance; but when the force is spent, its velocity diminishes, and it comes to rest.

Now since it requires force to act, whether that force be a pull or a push, I might inquire how did the planets ever tend to group themselves together about the sun, or speed off into space as we are taught to believe? Do they run on their own power? Does that force reside in them? Is it inherent force? It must have some source, some origin, some place of abode. Are the planets living organized bodies, or are they composed of dead unorganized matter? When they left the supposed nebula mass, did they separate, "move off" or "drop behind," on their own power or by some other force? Can a mass of dead matter at rest start itself into motion, or stop itself when once it is in motion? Can a pebble or your penknife start or stop itself? Then if, according to the inertia of matter and the first law of motion, a mass of dead matter can neither start nor stop its own motion; can it pull on some other mass of matter at a distance and start that mass into motion? These are pertinent questions, which, when carefully considered, lead to the conclusion that universal gravitation is a gross delusion, a presumptuous assumption.

EXHAUSITIVE ENERGY OF FORCE

And now, in case the planets can and do pull on the sun, and the sun on the planets, as we are told, how does that pulling force act? If that force does not reside in the planets, if it is not innate force, then the planets do not attract or pull on the sun, or the sun on the planets, and the force is not an attractive force. If, however, that force does reside in the planets, does it go out of the planets, pass across the intervening space between themselves and the sun, and on reaching the sun does it reverse itself and come back to the planets when they pull on the sun, and vice versa? Does that force flow out from the planets to the sun and back again in a steady constant stream, or does it go in impulses or waves? If so, would it not meet itself coming back and thus interfere with its own motion, or counteract or nullify itself

But does force ever reverse itself and return to its own source? Does force act that way? How often can you explode a stick of dynamite? What becomes of the force when dynamite is exploded? Does it return and concentrate itself in its original source ready for subsequent action? Does force push or pull when it leaves its source? Does dynamite accomplish the purpose for which it is used by a push or a pull? What is your answer? But is not force exhausted and wasted when it leaves its source or center instead of returning to that center? It is utterly impossible then for the planets to attract or pull on the sun or the sun on the planets, or on anything else, because force never reverses itself and returns to its own source, thus pulling on some object at a distance. On the