

FAQ Flat Earth

All stars rotate East to West around Polaris just above the central North Pole like in a planetarium dome. The planetarium dome of our Earth however is so vast that the law of perspective doesn't allow you to see all the stars from any one vantage point. You can however see Polaris, Ursa Major/Minor and other Northern constellations from every point on Earth all the way to the Southern Tropic of Capricorn. The supposed "South Pole star," Southern Crux and other outer constellations conversely can NOT be seen from every point in the Southern Hemi"sphere" the way Polaris can from every point in the North. Nor do the Southern constellations circle around it West to East as is claimed. All stars rise more or less in the East and set in the West, with the angle/inclination being based on where you are on Earth and what direction you're facing.

"Another thing is certain, that from within the equator the north pole star, and the constellations Ursa Major, Ursa Minor, and many others, can be seen from every meridian simultaneously; whereas in the south, from the equator, neither the so-called south pole star, nor the remarkable constellation of the Southern Cross, can be seen simultaneously from every meridian, showing that all the constellations of the south - pole star included - sweep over a great southern arc and across the meridian, from their rise in the evening to their setting in the morning. But if the earth is a globe, Sigma Octantis, a south pole star, and the Southern Cross, a southern circumpolar constellation, they would all be visible at the same time from every longitude on the same latitude, as is the case with the northern pole star and the northern circumpolar constellations. Such, however, is not the case." -Dr. Samuel Rowbotham, "Zetetic Astronomy, Earth Not a Globe!" (286)

"It has often been urged that the earth must be a globe, because the stars in the southern 'hemisphere' move round a south polar star; in the same way that those of the north revolve round the northern pole star. This is another instance of the sacrifice of truth, and denial of the evidence of our senses for the purpose of supporting a theory which is in every sense false and unnatural. It is known to every observer that the north pole star is the centre of a number of constellations which move over the earth in a circular direction. Those nearest to it, as the 'Great Bear,' etc. are always visible in England during their whole twenty-four hours' revolution. Those further away southwards rise north-north-east, and set south-south-west; still further south they rise east by north, and set west by north. The farthest south visible from England, the rising is more to the east and south-east, and the setting to the west and south-west. But all the stars visible from London rise and set in a way which is not compatible with the doctrine of rotundity. For instance, if we stand with our backs to the north, on the high land known as 'Arthur's Seat,' near Edinburgh, and note the stars in the zenith of our position, and watch for several hours, the zenith stars will gradually recede to the north-west. If we do the same on Woodhouse Moor, near Leeds, or on any of the mountain tops in Yorkshire or Derbyshire, the same phenomenon is observed. The same thing may be seen from the top of Primrose Hill, near Regent's Park, London; from Hampstead Heath; or Shooter's Hill, near Woolwich. If we remain all night, we shall observe the same stars rising towards our position from the north-east, showing that the path of all the stars between ourselves and the northern centre move round the north pole-star as a common centre of rotation; just as they must do over a plane such as the earth is proved to be. It is undeniable that upon a globe zenith stars would rise, pass over head, and set in the plane of the observer's position. If now we carefully watch in the same way the zenith stars from the Rock of Gibraltar, the very same phenomenon is observed. The same is also the case from Cape of Good Hope, Sydney and Melbourne in Australia, in New Zealand, in Rio Janeiro, Monte Video, Valparaiso, and other places in the south. If then the zenith stars of all the places on the earth, where special observations have been made, rise from the morning horizon to the zenith of an observer, and descend to the evening horizon, not in a plane of the position of such observer, but in an arc of a circle concentric with the northern centre, the earth is thereby proved to be a plane, and rotundity altogether disproved - shown, indeed, to be impossible." -Dr. Samuel

Rowbotham, “Zetetic Astronomy, Earth Not a Globe!” (284-6)

The “Coriolis Effect” is often said to cause sinks and toilet bowls in the Northern Hemisphere to drain spinning in one direction while in the Southern Hemisphere causing them to spin the opposite way, thus providing proof of the spinning ball-Earth. Once again, however, just like Foucault’s Pendulums spinning either which way, sinks and toilets in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres do not consistently spin in any one direction! Sinks and toilets in the very same household are often found to spin opposite directions, depending entirely upon the shape of the basin and the angle of the water’s entry, not the supposed rotation of the Earth.

“While the premise makes sense - that the earth’s eastward spin would cause the water in a toilet bowl to spin as well - in reality, the force and speed at which the water enters and leaves the receptacle is much too great to be influenced by something as minuscule as a single, 360-degree turn over the span of a day. When all is said and done, the Coriolis effect plays no larger role in toilet flushes than it does in the revolution of CDs in your stereo. The things that really determine the direction in which water leaves your toilet or sink are the shape of the bowl and the angle at which the liquid initially enters that bowl.” -Jennifer Horton, “Does the Rotation of the Earth Affect Toilets and Baseball Games?” Science.HowStuffWorks.com

The Coriolis Effect is also said to affect bullet trajectories and weather patterns as well, supposedly causing most storms in the Northern Hemisphere to rotate counter-clockwise, and most storms in the Southern Hemisphere to rotate clockwise, to cause bullets from long range guns to tend towards the right of the target in the Northern Hemisphere and to the left in the Southern Hemisphere. Again, however, the same problems remain. Not every bullet and not every storm consistently displays the behavior and therefore cannot reasonably be used as proof of anything. What about the precision of the sight aperture, human error, and wind? What about Michelson-Morley-Gale’s proven motion of the aether’s potential effect? Why does the Coriolis Effect affect most storms but not all? If some storms rotate clockwise in the North and counter-clockwise in the South, how do those storms escape the Coriolis force? And if the entire Earth’s spin is uniform, why should the two hemispheres be affected any differently? Coriolis’s Effect and Foucault’s Pendulum are both said to prove the Earth moves beneath our feet, but in reality only prove how easy it can be for **wolves in sheep’s clothing to pull the wool over our eyes. -The Flat Earth Conspiracy**

Another favorite “proof” of ball-Earthers is the appearance from an observer on shore of ships’ hulls being obfuscated by the water and disappearing from view when sailing away towards the horizon. Their claim is that ship’s hulls disappear before their mast-heads because the ship is beginning its declination around the convex curvature of the ball-Earth. Once again, however, their hasty conclusion is drawn from a faulty premise, namely that only on a ball-Earth can this phenomenon occur. The fact of the matter is that the Law of Perspective on plane surfaces dictates and necessitates the exact same occurrence. For example a girl wearing a dress walking away towards the horizon will appear to sink into the Earth the farther away she walks. Her feet will disappear from view first and the distance between the ground and the bottom of her dress will gradually diminish until after about half a mile it seems like her dress is touching the ground as she walks on invisible legs. The same happens with cars speeding away, the axles gradually get lower and the wheels vanish until it appears as if the car is gliding along its body. Such is the case on plane surfaces, the lowest parts of objects receding from a given point of observation necessarily disappear before the highest.

“This law of Perspective meets us on every hand; and cannot be gainsaid. If, in a straight line, we look at a frozen lake from a certain distance, we shall observe people who appear to be skating on their knees, but, if we approach sufficiently near, we shall see them performing graceful motions on their feet. Farther, if we look through a straight tunnel, we shall notice that the roof and the roadway

below converge to a point of light at the end. It is the same law which makes the hills sink, to the horizon, as the observer recedes, which explains how the ship's hull disappears in the offing. I would also remark that when the sea is undisturbed by waves, the hull can be restored to sight by the aid of a good telescope long after it has disappeared from the naked eye, thus proving that the ship had not gone down behind the watery hill of a convex globe, but is still sailing on the level of a Plane sea." -David Wardlaw Scott, "Terra Firma" (75)

Not only is the disappearance of ship's hulls explained by the Law of Perspective, it is proven undeniably true with the aid of a good telescope. If you watch a ship sailing away into the horizon with the naked eye until its hull has completely disappeared from view under the supposed "curvature of the Earth," then look through a telescope, you will notice the entire ship quickly zooms back into view, hull and all, proving that the disappearance was caused by the Law of Perspective, and not by a wall of curved water!

"On any frozen lake or canal, notably on the 'Bedford Canal,' in the county of Cambridge, in winter and on a clear day, skaters may be observed several miles away, seeming to glide along upon limbs without feet--skates and boots quite invisible to the unaided eye, but distinctly visible through a good telescope. But even on the sea, when the water is very calm, if a vessel is observed until it is just 'hull down,' a powerful telescope turned upon it will restore the hull to sight. From which it must be concluded that the lower part of a receding ship disappears through the influence of perspective, and not from sinking behind the summit of a convex surface." -Dr. Samuel Rowbotham, "**Zetetic Astronomy, Earth Not a Globe!**" (216)

The Sun and Moon luminaries revolve around the Earth once every 24 hours illuminating like spotlights the areas over which they pass. The Sun's annual journey from tropic to tropic, solstice to solstice, is what determines the length and character of days, nights and seasons. This is why equatorial regions experience almost year-round summer and heat while higher latitudes North and especially South experience more distinct seasons with harsh winters. The heliocentric model claims seasons change based on the ball-Earth's alleged "axial tilt" and "elliptical orbit" around the Sun. Their flawed current model even places us closest to the Sun (91,400,000 miles) in January when its actually winter, and farthest from the Sun (94,500,000 miles) in July when its actually summer throughout much of the Earth. They say due to the ball-Earth's tilt, different places receive different amounts of direct sunlight and that is what produces the seasonal and temperature changes. This makes little sense, however, because if the Sun's heat travels over ninety million miles to reach the ball-Earth, how could a slight tilt, a mere few thousand miles maximum, negate the Sun's ninety million mile journey, giving us simultaneous tropical summers and Antarctic winters?

"The earth is a stretched-out structure, which diverges from the central north in all directions towards the south. The equator, being midway between the north center and the southern circumference, divides the course of the sun into north and south declination. The longest circle round the world which the sun makes, is when it has reached its greatest southern declination. Gradually going northwards the circle is contracted. In about three months after the southern extremity of its path has been reached, the sun makes a circle round the equator. Still pursuing a northerly course as it goes round and above the world, in another three months the greatest northern declination is reached, when the sun again begins to go towards the south. In north latitudes, when the sun is going north, it rises earlier each day, is higher at noon and sets later; while in southern latitudes at the same time, the sun as a matter of course rises later, reaches a lesser altitude at noon and sets earlier. In northern latitudes during the southern summer, say from September to December, the sun rises later each day, is lower at noon and sets earlier; while in the south he rises earlier, reaches a higher altitude at noon, and sets later each day. This movement round the earth daily is the cause of the alternations of day and night; while his northerly and southerly courses produce the seasons. When the sun is south of the equator it is summer in the south and winter in the north; and

vice versa. The fact of the alternation of the seasons flatly contradicts the Newtonian delusion that the earth revolves in an orbit round the sun. It is said that summer is caused by the earth being nearest the sun, and winter by its being farthest from the sun. But if the reader will follow the argument in any text book he will see that according to the theory, when the earth is nearest the sun there must be summer in both northern and southern latitudes; and in like manner when it is farthest from the sun, it must be winter all over the earth at the same time, because the whole of the globe-earth would then be farthest from the sun!!! In short, it is impossible to account for the recurrence of the seasons on the assumption that the earth is globular and that it revolves in an orbit around the sun." -Thomas Winship, "Zetetic Cosmogeny" (124-125)

The Sun and Moon spotlights are perpetually hovering over and parallel to the surface of the Earth. From our vantage point, due to the Law of Perspective, the day/night luminaries appear to rise up the Eastern horizon, curve peaking high overhead, and then sink below the Western horizon. They do not escape to the underside of the Flat-Earth as one might imagine, but rather rotate concentric clockwise circles around the circumference from tropic to tropic. The appearance of rising, peaking and setting is due to the common Law of Perspective where tall objects appear high overhead when nearby, but at a distance gradually lower towards the vanishing point.

"Although the Sun is at all times above and parallel to the Earth's surface, he appears to ascend the firmament from morning until noon, and to descend and sink below the horizon at evening. This arises from a simple and everywhere visible law of perspective. A flock of birds, when passing over a flat or marshy country, always appears to descend as it recedes; and if the flock is extensive, the first bird appears lower, or nearer to the horizon than the last. The farthest light in a row of lamps appears the lowest, although each one has the same altitude. Bearing these phenomena in mind, it will easily be seen how the Sun, although always parallel to the surface of the Earth, must appear to ascend when approaching, and descend after leaving the meridian or noon-day position." -Dr. Samuel Rowbotham, "Earth Not a Globe, 2nd Edition" (85)

"What can be more common than the observation that, standing at one end of a long row of lamp-posts, those nearest to us seem to be the highest; and those farthest away the lowest; whilst, as we move along towards the opposite end of the series, those which we approach seem to get higher, and those we are leaving behind appear to gradually become lower ... It is an ordinary effect of perspective for an object to appear lower and lower as the observer goes farther and farther away from it. Let any one try the experiment of looking at a light-house, church spire, monument, gas lamp, or other elevated object, from a distance of only a few yards, and notice the angle at which it is observed. On going farther away, the angle under which it is seen will diminish, and the object will appear lower and lower as the distance of the observer increases, until, at a certain point, the line of sight to the object, and the apparently uprising surface of the earth upon or over which it stands, will converge to the angle which constitutes the 'vanishing point' or the horizon; beyond which it will be invisible." -Dr. Samuel Rowbotham, "Zetetic Astronomy, Earth Not a Globe!" (230-1)

To quote Lion: "Now, when you say the whereabouts of the sun during the night, you do realize that during the night or what makes "the night" is that the sun's light has moved OFF of the area where you are."

Also if the Sun is a flat 2D light moving away from us, once it is finally set beyond the horizon vanishing line of perspective it could not be brought back into view with a telescope because there is no substance or dimensionality to it. And if all that still doesn't satisfy, here is another explanation: Many cultures throughout the world for thousands of years have talked about a huge magnetic mountain at the North Pole center of our flat Earth disc. Some have even gone so far as to claim the mountain high enough that when the Sun/Moon travel "behind" it from your perspective,

you can no longer see the luminaries or their lights until they come back around to the other side:

When light of any kind shines through a dense medium it appears larger, or rather gives a greater glare, at a given distance than when it is seen through a lighter medium. This is more remarkable when the medium holds aqueous particles or vapor in solution, as in a damp or foggy atmosphere. You can see this by standing within a few yards of a street lamp, and noticing the size of the light; on going away to many times the distance, the light upon the atmosphere will appear considerably larger. This phenomenon may be noticed, to a greater or less degree, at all times; but when the air is moist and vapory it is more intense. It is evident that at sunrise, and at sunset, the sun's light must shine through a greater length of atmospheric air than at mid-day; besides which, the air near the earth is both more dense, and holds more watery particles in solution, than the higher strata through which the sun shines at noonday; and hence the light must be dilated or magnified, as well as modified in color. So the Sun as it sets towards the horizon, from a viewer's perspective on Earth, simultaneously gets bigger due to the reason given above, AND smaller due to the law of perspective. The net result is what you see.

Notice how the distant lights have a brighter/bigger glare even though they're further away? Here they mention many contributing factors (wavelength, diffraction, air pressure, air temperature, width of aperture, altitude, humidity, clarity) all contributing to the net result. The amount/degree to which the Sun/Moon will be magnified (due to the above reasons) and shrink (due to law of perspective) will depend on all of the above. Hence why sometimes you'll see video of the Moon shrinking off into nothingness like here, and sometimes you'll see it magnified like here:

"The Moon's warm color when seen at lower angles is caused by the relatively larger amount of atmosphere through which one is observing it as compared to when the moon is right overhead. This additional atmosphere scatters the bluish component of the light of the moon, making the low-lying moon appear redder to the observer's eyes. If you look later when the moon is higher above **the horizon, you'll see it appears much whiter than earlier in the evening.**" -Enature.com

Jun 21, 2015 at 2:23pm aleksandar2015, schpankme and 6 more like this.

Quote like

Post Options

Post by Admin on Jun 21, 2015 at 2:23pm

There are several theories about the relative size and distance of the Sun and Moon all with their points of evidence and points of contention. Flat-Earthers throughout the ages have used sextants and plane trigonometry attempting to make such calculations, usually concluding the Sun and Moon both to be only about 32 miles in diameter and less than a few thousand miles from Earth. Perhaps the least plausible model, certainly the most exaggerated and imaginative, is the reigning heliocentric theory claiming the Sun to be a whopping 865,374 miles in diameter, 92,955,807 miles from the Earth, and the Moon 2,159 miles in diameter, 238,900 miles from the Earth. Heliocentrists' astronomical figures always sound perfectly precise, but they have historically been notorious for regularly and drastically changing them to suit their various models. For instance, in his time Copernicus calculated the Sun's distance from Earth to be 3,391,200 miles. The next century Johannes Kepler decided it was actually 12,376,800 miles away. Isaac Newton once said, "It matters not whether we reckon it 28 or 54 million miles distant for either would do just as well!" How scientific!? Benjamin Martin calculated between 81 and 82 million miles, Thomas Dilworth claimed 93,726,900 miles, John Hind stated positively 95,298,260 miles, Benjamin Gould said more than 96 million miles, and Christian Mayer thought it was more than 104 million!

"As the sun, according to 'science' may be anything from 3 to 104 million miles away, there is plenty of 'space' to choose from. It is like the showman and the child. You pay your money - for various astronomical works - and you take your choice as to what distance you wish the sun to be. If you are a modest person, go in for a few millions; but if you wish to be 'very scientific' and to be 'mathematically certain' of your figures, then I advise you to make your choice somewhere about a hundred millions. You will at least have plenty of 'space' to retreat into, should the next calculation be against the figures of your choice. You can always add a few millions to 'keep up with the times,' or take off as many as may be required to adjust the distance to the 'very latest' accurate column of figures. Talk about ridicule, the whole of modern astronomy is like a farcical comedy - full of surprises. One never knows what monstrous or ludicrous absurdity may come forth next. You must

not apply the ordinary rules of common-sense to astronomical guesswork. No, the thing would fall to pieces if you did." -Thomas Winship, "Zetetic Cosmogeny" (115)

"Regiments of figures are paraded with all the learned jargon for which science is famous, but one might as well look at the changing clouds in the sky and seek for certainty there, as to expect to get it from the propounders of modern astronomy. But is there no means of testing these ever-changing never-stable speculations and bringing them to the scrutiny of the hard logic of fact? Indeed there is. The distance of the sun can be measured with much precision, the same way as a tree or a house, or church steeple is measured, by plane triangulation. It is the principle on which a house is built, a table made or a man-of-war constructed ... The sun is always somewhere between the tropics of Cancer and Capricorn, a distance admitted to be less than 3,000 miles; how then can the sun if it be so many thousand miles in diameter, squeeze itself into a space of about 3,000 miles only? But look at the distance, say the professors! We have already done that and not one of the wise men we have so often challenged, has ever attempted to refute the principle on which we measure the sun's distance ... If the navigator neglects to apply the sun's semi-diameter to his observation at sea, he is 16 nautical miles out in calculating the position his ship is in. A minute of arc on the sextant represents a nautical mile, and if the semi-diameter be 16 miles, the diameter is of course 32 miles. And as measured by the sextant, the sun's diameter is 32 minutes of arc, that is 32 nautical miles in diameter. Let him disprove this who can. If ever disproof is attempted, it will be a literary curiosity, well worth framing." -Thomas Winship, "Zetetic Cosmogeny" (114-120)

Jun 21, 2015 at 2:23pm [aleksandar2015](#), [schpankme](#) and 6 more like this.

[Quote](#) 

- Select Post
- Deselect Post
- Link to Post
- Report Post
- Member
 - [Send Message](#)
 - [Give Gift](#)
- Back to Top



Post by Admin on Jun 21, 2015 at 2:23pm

There are several theories about the relative size and distance of the Sun and Moon all with their points of evidence and points of contention. Flat-Earthers throughout the ages have used sextants and plane trigonometry attempting to make such calculations, usually concluding the Sun and Moon both to be only about 32 miles in diameter and less than a few thousand miles from Earth. Perhaps the least plausible model, certainly the most exaggerated and imaginative, is the reigning heliocentric theory claiming the Sun to be a whopping 865,374 miles in diameter, 92,955,807 miles from the Earth, and the Moon 2,159 miles in diameter, 238,900 miles from the Earth. Heliocentrists' astronomical figures always sound perfectly precise, but they have historically been notorious for regularly and drastically changing them to suit their various models. For instance, in his time Copernicus calculated the Sun's distance from Earth to be 3,391,200 miles. The next century Johannes Kepler decided it was

