



Scan to know paper details and
author's profile

The Earth is Not Flat

Volker W. Thürey

ABSTRACT

Three arguments for a spherical earth are presented. The first is new, as far I know. The other two repeat arguments from the 'old greeks'. I think that it is necessary to record them. For the first argument, we need modern technique like telephones or mobiles. .

Keywords: NA

Classification: LCC Code: QB637

Language: English



Great Britain
Journals Press

LJP Copyright ID: 925604
Print ISSN: 2631-8490
Online ISSN: 2631-8504

London Journal of Research in Science: Natural and Formal

Volume 24 | Issue 1 | Compilation 1.0



The Earth is Not Flat

Volker W. Thürey

ABSTRACT

Three arguments for a spherical earth are presented. The first is new, as far I know. The other two repeat arguments from the 'old greeks'. I think that it is necessary to record them. For the first argument, we need modern technique like telephones or mobiles.

INTRODUCTION

Since Nicolaus Copernicus (19 February 1473 – 24 May 1543) we know that the earth is spherical, but many people believe in a flat earth. I think that it is nonsense, but I cannot change their minds. In this paper I describe three arguments which are not compatible with a flat earth. I don't use things like photography or spaceflight.

The first argument is very easy: Either it is bright or dark outside since it is day or night. Imagine that it is bright, i.e. it is day. Use a telephone or a mobile. Call somebody on the other side of the earth. (Perhaps you wake up the person). It will say that it is dark. If it is dark at your home, it would say that it is bright. This observation is not compatible with a flat earth, except the person lives on the other side of the earth disk.

The second argument refers to an old idea. You need two rods. With a pencil or a ballpoint you make a mark on each of the rods. The marks are placed in such way that on one side the first rod has the same length as on one side of the mark of the other rod. Now you bury one rod up to the mark. You bury the rod as vertically as possible. The same make you with the second rod. You bury it at a different parallel of latitude, for instance, at the equator. The parts above the marks have nearly the same length, i.e. the two rods have the same height. Then you measure the length of the shadows. They are different. This is not compatible with a flat earth.

The third argument uses partial lunar eclipses. The shadow of the earth is always a part of a circle. This observation is compatible with a flat earth, but it requires an earth disk which is always vertical to the moon. This seems to be impossible.

I know that these three arguments will not convince a 'flat-earther', but I think that it was necessary to write them down.