

Electrostatics, Gravity, and Galactic Force

© US 2015

by Jack Bidnik

This paper is a continuation of my paper entitled Gravitational Forces Revisited (GFR), <http://vixra.org/abs/1707.0128> and may be considered as Chapter 2 of the concepts developed in that paper.

Two corollaries of the derivation of  $G_s$  in GFR are elaborated here to show that the formula can be extended to include both the smallest and the largest masses and spaces. The same formula can give both the electrostatic force of the Hydrogen atom and also the force which counteracts the centrifugal force of large galaxies. I believe this development nullifies the most basic motive for postulating dark matter, which is that the gravitational force at such high speeds could not hold the galaxy together. Examples are given for galaxies of various size.

The paper starts with continuing analysis of the mathematical conclusion in GFR that the derived force  $F_t$  is equivalent to the centripetal force of the orbit  $v_o^2/r$ . This analysis is perhaps superfluous since there is no other acceleration present radially than the one derived for  $F_t$ , but I present various looks at the math to dispel any nagging doubts.

Another set of doubts to be dispelled involves the idea of frames of motion. It suffices to point out that when one uses the reduced mass, it is the equivalent of the motion of either mass in the frame of the other, since it is the equivalent of one mass being stationary.

We assume a mass is moving in orbit with respect to a second mass with a velocity whose tangential component is  $v_o$ , and whose radial component is  $v$ . Then, in the absence of an external force, there is a central force or acceleration, due only to the kinematic property of centripetal acceleration, along the line of the radius joining the two masses. I have called this force  $F_T$  in the first chapter, my paper entitled “Gravitational Forces Revisited” (GFR), identifying it with the force derived from relativistic relative momentum. The numerical results in GFR for the value of Newton's constant for the planets and moons have borne this out, and I will enlarge upon this further below. So:

$$\mu_0 a_T = F_T = \mu_0 \frac{c^3}{(\sqrt{c^2 - v^2})^3} \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right)$$

$$F_T = c\mu_0 \frac{1}{(\sqrt{c^2 - v^2})} \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right) + c\mu_0 \frac{v^2}{(\sqrt{c^2 - v^2})^3} \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right), \text{ respectively } F_T = F_m + F_c.$$

and associated with it by the formulas presented in the above paper GFR is the force  $F_m$ , with the following property which we have derived there:

$$F_m = \frac{Mm}{r^2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{Mm} \right) \cdot F_T \frac{(\mu_0 c^2)^2}{(F_T^2 + 2F_T(\mu_0 c^2)/r + (\mu_0 c^2)^2/r^2)} \right], \quad F_T = \mu_0 a_T,$$

where  $\mu_0 \equiv \frac{Mm}{(M+m)}$ , the reduced mass.

The part in the square brackets reduces to a function,

$$G = \left[ \frac{(\mu_0^2) \cdot \left( \frac{1}{(M+m)} \right) \cdot (a_T c^4)}{((\mu_0^2)(a_T^2 + 2a_T c^2/r + c^4/r^2))} \right] \text{ and, since } a_T = \frac{v_o^2}{r}, \text{ the centripetal acceleration,}$$

$$G = \left( \frac{1}{(M+m)} \right) \frac{\left( \frac{v_o^2}{r} \right) c^4}{\left( \frac{v_o^2}{r} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{v_o^2}{r} \right) c^2/r + c^4/r^2}.$$

This function, G, has been shown in chapter1 (GFR) to have the value of Newton's Gravitational Constant for points nearby the semi-minor axis point of a planetary orbit, which for purposes of this paper I call the “equinox” point. This is a point which yields a good value for average orbital velocity when the eccentricity is small. (see calculations and BASIC program above in GFR.)

Now we will rename this G,  $G_s$ , for “Special G”.

$$\text{From the above, } G_s = \left( \frac{1}{(M+m)} \right) \frac{\left( \frac{v_o^2}{r} \right) c^4}{\left( \frac{v_o^2}{r} + \frac{c^2}{r} \right)^2} \text{ or } G_s = \left( \frac{1}{(M+m)} \right) \frac{r v_o^2 c^4}{(v_o^2 + c^2)^2}$$

So, again looking at  $F_m$ ,  $F_m = G_S \frac{Mm}{r^2}$  has the form of Newton's equation, and for planets it is.

For the case of the orbit of an electron about the nucleus of Hydrogen we might expect this formula to give us a value for the gravitational force between the proton and electron,  $3.623E-47$  N, a very small value, but this is not the case. The value of G, ie.  $G_S$ , has changed here, as it is dependent on the orbital speed, and the force  $F_m$  is now actually equal to the electrostatic force between them,  $8.213E-8$  N. So we see that both planetary gravitation and atomic orbits are special cases of the same force formula.

The classical way of determining the Bohr orbit force:

$$F = Z k_e e^2 / r^2 \quad \text{in the case of hydrogen, } Z=1. \text{ So electrostatic force } F=8.2187E-8 \text{ N.}$$

$$F = Z \cdot k_e \cdot e^2 / r^2$$

ke=8.99e9 REM Coulomb's constant NM<sup>2</sup>/C<sup>2</sup>  
e=1.6e-19 REM charge of electron in Coulombs in SI units  
m=9.1e-31 REM mass of the electron in kg  
r=5.29172e-9 REM radius of H, Bohr radius, meters

In both cases, the assumption that  $F_T = \mu \frac{v_o^2}{r}$  leads to valid physical conclusions about the attracting force, that it is  $F_m$ .

So we see that the formula  $F_m = G_S \frac{Mm}{r^2}$  is equal to  $k_e e^2 / r^2$ , even though the numerator of

$F_m$  does not give any specific information about Coulomb's constant or the charge of an electron or proton. By  $F_m$  being equal to the electrostatic force of the atom, this does point out qualitatively the nature also of the electromagnetic force.

$F_m$  is derived mathematically from relativistic relative momentum and  $F_T$ . If, as we have shown, that  $F_T = \mu \frac{v_o^2}{r}$  as an average, in between periapsis and apapsis, then  $F_m$  is a legitimate function also of centripetal acceleration, and takes the place of Newton's gravitational and Coulomb's attractive force.

Further evidence that  $F_T$  is equal to the centripetal acceleration:

In the previous paper "Gravitational Forces Revisited"(GFR), I assumed it was reasonable to suppose that  $F_T = \mu \frac{v_o^2}{r}$ , and the real-world calculations bore this out.

What is the evidence that we can assume that  $F_T$  is equal to the centripetal force? For an elliptical orbit, at the narrow ends of the orbit, periapsis and apapsis, the radial velocity is zero, however there is an acceleration of  $\frac{v_o^2}{r}$  at these points, greater at the former than the latter. Since there is zero radial motion at these extrema, this acceleration, or force, must derive only from the tangential velocity, that

is to say, the radial velocity under the square root sign of  $F_T$  disappears, and leaves unity for the fraction:

$$F_T = \mu_0 \frac{c^3}{(\sqrt{c^2 - v^2})^3} \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right), \text{ so } F_T = \mu_0 \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right),$$

but the acceleration term in  $F_T$  remains, and is equal to the centripetal acceleration. Thus

$$F_T = \mu_0 \frac{v_o^2}{r} = \mu_0 \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right).$$

This is represented by an average value of  $\frac{v_o^2}{r}$  as calculated at the 'equinox', as in the GFR paper above, even though both  $F_T$  and  $F_m$  are periodic functions, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

We must note that although  $F_m$  is necessarily close to  $F_T$ , at these speeds, much lower than  $c$ , this is entirely analogous to Newton's force being assumed equal to centripetal force.

To summarize:  $F_T$  is derived from relativistic relative velocity, and for an elliptical orbit, it has the apsidal value of  $\mu_0 \frac{v_o^2}{r}$ , and a similar average value.

$F_m$  is part of  $F_T$ , and is also related to  $F_T$  by the formula involving  $G_S$ , derived by the methods in GFR. For low velocities  $F_m$  is very close to  $F_T$ , and parallels Newton's Law by

$$F_m = G_S \frac{Mm}{r^2}$$

This applies to all forms of orbits, from planets to atoms, and if the orbital velocities of the galaxies are correct, ***it may obviate the need to postulate dark matter.***

The fact is that, however great the centripetal acceleration of a star on the outside rim of a galaxy,  $F_m$  has a value which is very close to it, unlike the force using Newton's constant. The following BASIC program illustrates this. Substituting a few values for  $n$ ,  $d$ ,  $x$ ,  $v$  and  $M1$ , will show this. Included are the values for a Milky Way type galaxy.

```
n=4          REM scale factor
l=9.46e15    REM light year in meters
d=10^n       REM scale factor
r=l*d        REM distance in meters (light years *scale) from galaxy C of M
sm=1.99e30   REM one solar mass
x=100
stmr=x       REM input a value for x, the star mass ratio of the star
m2=stmr*sm   REM mass of star = star mass ratio * sm
M1=200e9*sm  REM number of sm's
v=10e5       REM orbital velocity m/s
c=2.99e8     REM speed of light in meters/s

Gs=(r/(M1+1))*(v^2)*(c^4)/(((v^2)+(c^2)))^2    REM value of gravitational
term
print "scale factors: "; "n=";n,"d=";d,"x=";x
```

```

print "For a radius of " ; r ; " meters", "For a galactic mass of "
;M1;" kg", "Gs="; Gs

Gn=0.667384e-10
Fn=Gn*M1*m2/r^2
print "using Gn, Newton's constant, force=" ; Fn ;" N"
Fm=Gs*M1*m2/r^2
print "force using Gs =" ;Fm ;" N"
CF=m2*(v^2)/r REM centripetal force of star
print "centripetal force =" ;CF ;" N"

```

OUTPUT

```

scale factors: n=4.0, d=10000.0, x=100.0
For a radius of 9.46E19 meters, For a galactic mass of 3.98E41 kg, Gs=2.37683124944934E-10
using Gn, Newton's constant, force=5.906492628134932E23 N
force using Gs =2.1035470213839805E24 N
centripetal force =2.1035940803382664E24 N

scale factors: n=5.0, d=100000.0, x=100.0
For a radius of 9.46E20 meters, For a galactic mass of 3.98E41 kg, Gs=2.3768312494493396E-9
using Gn, Newton's constant, force=5.906492628134932E21 N
force using Gs =2.1035470213839804E23 N
centripetal force =2.1035940803382664E23 N

scale factors: n=6.0, d=1000000.0, x=100.0
For a radius of 9.46E21 meters, For a galactic mass of 3.98E41 kg, Gs=2.3768312494493396E-8
using Gn, Newton's constant, force=5.906492628134933E19 N
force using Gs =2.1035470213839808E22 N
centripetal force =2.1035940803382664E22 N

scale factors: n=4.0, d=10000.0, x=200.0
For a radius of 9.46E19 meters, For a galactic mass of 3.98E41 kg, Gs=2.37683124944934E-10
using Gn, Newton's constant, force=1.1812985256269863E24 N
force using Gs =4.207094042767961E24 N
centripetal force =4.207188160676533E24 N

scale factors: n=5.0, d=100000.0, x=200.0
For a radius of 9.46E20 meters, For a galactic mass of 3.98E41 kg, Gs=2.3768312494493396E-9
using Gn, Newton's constant, force=1.1812985256269863E22 N
force using Gs =4.207094042767961E23 N
centripetal force =4.207188160676533E23 N

scale factors: n=5.0, d=100000.0, x=300.0
For a radius of 9.46E20 meters, For a galactic mass of 3.98E41 kg, Gs=2.3768312494493396E-9
using Gn, Newton's constant, force=1.7719477884404797E22 N
force using Gs =6.310641064151941E23 N
centripetal force =6.3107822410148E23 N

```

The following is a copy of the post I made to Prof. Leonard Susskind's blog on March 11, 2015  
 Blogger: Susskind's Blog: Physics for Everyone - Post a Comment

<https://www.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=2240954547063076010&postID=7797502399248012496&page=3&token=1426115932807&pli=1>

If you use the formula for force in Newton's Gravitational Equation:  $F = G Mm/r^2$ , on the proton and electron of the Hydrogen atom you will find that the attraction is a very small number, compared to the electrostatic force.

If, however, instead of G, you use the following expression:

$$G_s = (1/(M+m)) * r * v_o^2 * c^4 / (v_o^2 + c^2)^2,$$

where  $v_o$  is orbital velocity,  $c$  is speed of light, and  $G_s$  is what I call Special G, thus:

$$F = G_s * M * m / r^2,$$

you will find that the calculation yields the accepted figure for the electrostatic force of the Bohr Hydrogen atom.

In fact, if you use  $G_s$  instead of  $G$  for the equation of force for any planet, with  $r$  being the length of the semi-major axis and  $v_o$  being the average orbital speed, then the result will be the same as if you had used only  $G$ , Newton's constant, in the first place, for under those conditions  $G_s = G$ .

This is a result of the equation's dependency on the orbital speed; in the atomic case, this speed is high, and it translates to a much larger attraction, while in the planetary case the speed is slow relative to the speed of light, giving the classical force value.

This is not a mere mathematical contrivance. It is a fact of nature, derived from physical laws and equations.

In fact, from understanding how these equations have been derived one can see that this establishes the relationship between gravity and electrostatics and, by extension, electromagnetic forces.

$m = 9.1 \times 10^{-31}$  ,mass of the electron kg

$M = m * 1836.15$  ,mass of proton

$r = 5.29172 \times 10^{-11}$  ,radius of H, Bohr radius, meters

$c = 2.99792458 \times 10^8$  ,speed of light in M/s

$k_e = 8.99 \times 10^9$  ,Coulomb's constant  $NM^2/C^2$

$q_1, q_2 = 1.6 \times 10^{-19}$  , charge of electron and proton in H atom

$v_o = \sqrt{(k_e * q_1^2) / (m * r)} = 2.186153 \times 10^6$  m/s ,orbital speed

Force from electrostatic formula,  $f_e = k_e * q_1 * q_2 / r^2 = 8.21875 \times 10^{-8}$  N

Force from Special G formula,  $F_g = G_s * M * m / r^2 = 8.2134 \times 10^{-8}$  N

For planetary cases:  $F = G_s * M * m / r^2$ , a few examples:

Sun's mass  $M = 1.9891 \times 10^{30}$  kg, Newton's  $G = 0.667384 \times 10^{-10}$   $N(m/kg)^2$

For Earth  $m = 5.97219 \times 10^{24}$  kg,  $r = 1.49598262 \times 10^{11}$  m,  $v_o = 29788$  m/s,  $F = 3.53 \times 10^{22}$  N,  $G_s = .66735 \times 10^{-10}$

Mars  $m = .641693 \times 10^{24}$ ,  $r = 2.27943824 \times 10^{11}$ ,  $v_o = 24136$ ,  $F = 1.64 \times 10^{21}$ ,  $G_s = .66759 \times 10^{-10}$

Jupiter  $m = 1898.130 \times 10^{24}$ ,  $r = 7.78340821 \times 10^{11}$ ,  $v_o = 13065$ ,  $F = 4.1589 \times 10^{23}$ ,  $G_s = .66732 \times 10^{-10}$

Saturn  $m = 568.319 \times 10^{24}$ ,  $r = 1.426666422 \times 10^{12}$ ,  $v_o = 9647.7$ ,  $F = 3.7067 \times 10^{22}$ ,  $G_s = .66732 \times 10^{-10}$