Calculation of Masses Based on their Spacetime Curvature

Ivo Draschkow[1]

[1] Independent researcher

E-mail: ivo@draschkow.de

Received xxxxxx
Accepted for publication xxxxxx
Published xxxxxx

Abstract

This study introduces a method to calculate the gravitationally contributing mass based on gravitational relativistic contraction. The mass is non-scalar and non-invariant.

Keywords: Gravitational Potential — Gravitational Lorentz Factor — Schwarzschild Radius

1. Introduction

The relativistic nature of gravity has long been known; to date, however, it has not affected the understanding of the supposedly invariant mass. My results show that the specific amount of gravitational relativistic contraction, which is denoted by the symbol $\boldsymbol{L}$, with respect to the radius of a gravity-generating object, is directly proportional to an object's mass. The maximum value of $\boldsymbol{L}$ is known as the Schwarzschild radius $\boldsymbol{r_S}$. This study proves that not only this extreme case, but also every gravitationally conditioned relativistic contraction of an object shows the mentioned proportionality. $\boldsymbol{L}$ produces a mass-specific relativistic spectrum between $\boldsymbol{r_S}$ and the corresponding $\boldsymbol{L_{min}}$ for which the mass volume is large enough for gravity to approach zero.

2. Gravitational Relativistic Contraction

The classic formula for the mass of a black hole

$$\boldsymbol{M_B = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{r_S c^2}{G}} \tag{1}$$

uses the radius at which an event horion occurs. Not only does it represent a complete standstill of time, but also a complete relativistic contraction of the radius. Because gravitational time dilation must be caused by all objects, I investigated how their corresponding radial contraction might be related to mass.

Typically, to obtain the gravitational time dilation on a mass surface, the reciprocal Lorentz factor $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ depending on the surface escape velocity $\boldsymbol{v_E}$, which is expressed by the mean radius $\boldsymbol{r}$ and surface gravity $\boldsymbol{g}$, can be used to avoid $\boldsymbol{G}$:

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_E{}^2}{c^2}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{2gr}{c^2}}} \tag{2}$$

For time dilation states below the surface of a uniformly dense mass, the Lorentz factor must be adjusted according to the gravitational potential to provide the correct data. At the corresponding radius, $\boldsymbol{r_x}$

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha(r_x) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{g\,(3r^2 - r_x{}^2)}{rc^2}}} \tag{3}$$

represents the locally valid gravitational Lorentz factor. This optimized function can be used to obtain the searched amount of contraction. To do this, we must integrate $\boldsymbol{1 - \alpha(r_x)}$ from 0 to $\boldsymbol{r_m}$:

$$\boldsymbol{L = \int_0^r \left(1 - \alpha(r_x)\right) dr_x}$$

$$\boldsymbol{= \int_0^r \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{g\,(3r^2 - r_x{}^2)}{rc^2}}\right) dr_x} \tag{4}$$

For a black hole

$$\boldsymbol{L_{max} = (1 - 0) \cdot r = r_S} \tag{5}$$

is completely contracted relativistically and becomes directly proportional to its mass. The formula

$$\boldsymbol{M = k \cdot \frac{Lc^2}{G} = k \cdot \int_0^r \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{g\,(3r^2 - r_x{}^2)}{rc^2}}\right) dr_x \cdot \frac{c^2}{G}} \tag{6}$$

should be valid if that proportionality applies to every object.

To determine $\boldsymbol{k}$ the classic formula

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \frac{\boldsymbol{gr^2}}{\boldsymbol{G}} \tag{7}$$

is divided by the derived one, eliminating the relativistic influence:

$$\boldsymbol{k} = \lim_{(g,r)\to(0,0)} \frac{\boldsymbol{gr^2}}{\boldsymbol{Lc^2}} = \boldsymbol{0.75} \tag{8}$$

$\boldsymbol{k}$ is exactly 1.5 times larger than in the non-relativistic formula for black holes. The reason for this is the now considered spectrum of the gravitational potential between the surface and core of the object. With the classic formula different $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{r}$ always lead to identical masses as long as product $\boldsymbol{gr^2}$ is fixed. However, in my formula, they do not provide a constant $\boldsymbol{L}$, but create an overhead. Dividing the limits of $\boldsymbol{L}$ yields

$$\boldsymbol{L_{max}} = \boldsymbol{r_s}$$

$$\boldsymbol{L_{min}} = \int_0^r \frac{\boldsymbol{g\,(3r^2 - r_x{}^2)}}{\boldsymbol{2rc^2}}\,dr_x = \frac{\boldsymbol{4gr^2}}{\boldsymbol{3c^2}}$$

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{L_{max}}}{\boldsymbol{L_{min}}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{2gr^2}}{\boldsymbol{c^2}} \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{3c^2}}{\boldsymbol{4gr^2}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{1.5}}{\boldsymbol{1}} \tag{9}$$

and that is why for an assumed weak point mass the result is

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \frac{\boldsymbol{3}}{\boldsymbol{4}} \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{Lc^2}}{\boldsymbol{G}} \tag{10}$$

Using this formula, the results agree with those from the NASA reference for every celestial body in our solar system, provided the correct mean values for $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{r}$ are populated. This is not surprising because the relativistic effect for planets and pre-supernova stars is almost negligible and there is almost no relevant difference between the results of the two formulas. Evidently, the relativistic spectrum of $\boldsymbol{L}$ closely follows the gravitational potential between the core and the surface. This also means that if $\boldsymbol{k}$ were constant, the mass and gravity of each object according to its classification in this spectrum would be higher than those in the classical calculation. This is particularly noticeable for its upper limit, and thus with black holes, where the initial mass increases by half:

$$\boldsymbol{M_B} = \frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{2}} \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{r_s c^2}}{\boldsymbol{G}} \cdot \boldsymbol{1.5} \tag{11}$$

From a scientific point of view, there is no discernible or plausible reason why $\boldsymbol{k}$ should be variable and compensate for relativity. If this were the case, moving objects would also not experience relativistic energy and mass gains due to a relevant compensation.

3. Exemplary Calculations on Celestial Bodies

To prove the accuracy of my formula, I present the resulting masses of four celestial bodies in our solar system.

Moon: $\boldsymbol{r} = 1737400\,m$ $\boldsymbol{g} = 1.622\,\frac{m}{s^2}$

$\boldsymbol{M}_{☾}$ *=0.75****0.00007263531****299792458^2/(6.6742*10^-11)*

$\approx \mathbf{7.34 \cdot 10^{22}}\ kg$

Venus: $\boldsymbol{r} = 6051800\,m$ $\boldsymbol{g} = 8.87\,\frac{m}{s^2}$

$\boldsymbol{M}_{♀}$ *=0.75****0.0048193679****299792458^2/(6.6742*10^-11)*

$\approx \mathbf{4.87 \cdot 10^{24}}\ kg$

Earth: $\boldsymbol{r} = 6371000\,m$ $\boldsymbol{g} = 9.807\,\frac{m}{s^2}$

$\boldsymbol{M}_{\oplus}$ *=0.75****0.00590719828****299792458^2/(6.6742*10^-11)*

$\approx \mathbf{5.97 \cdot 10^{24}}\ kg$

Sun: $\boldsymbol{r} = 695700000\,m$ $\boldsymbol{g} = 274\,\frac{m}{s^2}$

$\boldsymbol{M}_{\odot}$ *=0.75****1967.3993430****299792458^2/(6.6742*10^-11)*

$\approx \mathbf{1.99 \cdot 10^{30}}\ kg$

The calculated results agree with the NASA reference values.

4. Conclusions

As initially assumed, the gravitationally contributing mass can be calculated by determining its gravitational relativistic contraction. The measured gravity must always be higher than that without a relativistic overhead. $\boldsymbol{L}$ ultimately yields the mass amounts by being a relativistic slider that forms them according to the parameters between the described limits. This is where my results differ from those of the classic computational methods. A 1.5 times greater mass of a black hole compared to its former mass inside a collapsing star would be something that science would have to observe astronomically to fully prove my approach.

References

[1] NASA Space Science Data Coordinated Archive, Moon Fact Sheet. Retrieved from https://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/factsheet/moonfact.html

[2] NASA Space Science Data Coordinated Archive,Venus Fact Sheet. Retrieved from https://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/factsheet/venusfact.html

[3] NASA Space Science Data Coordinated Archive, Earth Fact Sheet. Retrieved from https://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/factsheet/earthfact.html

[4] David B. Newell and Eite Tiesinga,Editors,NIST SP 330, 2019 edition,The International System of Units (SI),46. https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.330-2019.pdf

[5] NASA Space Science Data Coordinated Archive, Sun Fact Sheet. Retrieved from https://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/factsheet/sunfact.html

[6] The NIST Reference on COnstants, Units, and Uncertainity, Newtonian constant of gravitation. Retrieved 17 January 2023 from https://physics.nist.gov/cgi-bin/cuu/Value?bg

[7] University of Washington Big G Measurement, Jens H. Gundlach and Stephen M. Merkowitz. Retrieved from https://asd.gsfc.nasa.gov/Stephen.Merkowitz/G/Big_G.html