

Unity

Introduction

Ever since Newton formulated his gravitational theory we have accepted the simple contention that gravity increases to the center of the Earth and inversely decreases from the center of the Earth in a manner whereby the force of attraction decreases in proportion to the inverse square of the distance.

Yet, if you think about this seemingly rational idea you have to ask how this could possibly be true?

Einstein suggested that gravity was not itself a force but an effect corresponding to the curvature of the four-dimensional space/time world. But we still contend the Earth's greatest gravitational potential to be located at the center of the Earth.

Newton based his theory on some very fancy footwork, which necessitated the invention of calculus. And up to this point the apparent rational logic of his mathematical innovations are considered to be beyond question, as the numbers don't lie. But despite the accuracy of the mathematical calculations the idealistic legitimacy of linear based geometry being capable of accurately describing the dimensional properties of our planet is extremely doubtful.

It would seem logically apparent that the inner core of the Earth must be smaller than the Earth itself, but the rational logic of such an assumption is based upon a numerical system intended to satisfy the needs of trade and commerce, which involves a linear based system of accounting.

This system has also been applied to geometry, whereby the linear dimensions of a static geometric form are assumed to conform to the dynamic properties of the Earth, Sun and Moon. Consequently Newton was able to convince his colleagues that the force of gravity increases to the center of the Earth.

This simple assumption has determined the fundamental perception of those who followed, whereby it has been considered unthinkable to question the legitimacy of Newton's premise. Consequently most scholars continue to assert the correctness of this basic assumption.

If Newton were wrong on this point, it is indeed time to call his bluff, as Newton has had the world dancing to this tune for a very long time.

If the gravitational potential increases to the center of the Earth or to the center of field, what does it do in relation to the relative conditions of a black hole?

Does the gravitational potential of a black hole not increase toward the center of field whereby the Universe is contracting relative to the dynamic condition of a black hole? And is the Universe not expanding relative to the dynamic condition of our Earth?

Would the increasing gravity to the center of the Earth not cause the structural dynamics of the Earth to fold inward? Yet the Earth remains dynamically balanced in its orbit around the sun, while the Moon remains dynamically balanced in its orbit around the Earth.

The immediate response would be to point out that I had not taken centrifugal force into account, but centrifugal force is merely an inverse form of gravity.

And if gravity is not itself a force how could the centrifugal effect be considered a force capable of maintaining the dynamically balanced structure of the Earth?

The short answer is that centrifugal force explains nothing as it merely allows us to rationalize the concept of gravity increasing to the center of the Earth as a logical assumption.

Therefore I contest on the basis of rational logic that Newton was mistaken on this important point.

The gravity of the Earth, Sun and Moon does not increase to the center of their fields, nor does the gravity of the Solar System increase to the center of the Sun.

The greatest gravitational potential of our planet exists along its surface curve, which is equally true of the Sun and Moon.

The gravitational potential existing at the center of our Earth is of a non-absolute value corresponding to zero, which is equally true of the Sun and the Moon.

Therefore it would appear that we have some catching up to do. I remain hopeful that we might move forward in respect to achieving an understanding of those underlying dynamics determining the form and function of physical structure.

- David Barclay