

A CRITICISM UPON MODERN VIEWS OF OUR EARTH

Gyan Chand Jain, Delhi

Introduction

We have a number of religious concepts upon our earth. They do differ upon qualities of soul and in other alike matters. But so far as the shape of our earth is concerned, not only Jainism but all religions of the world say in one voice that the earth is **FLAT, MOTIONLESS, SUFFICIENTLY THICK and WIDELY SPREAD IN ALL FOUR DIRECTIONS**. When a Polish astronomer named Copernicus claimed the earth as spherical and moving and the Sun as hanging still, he was called a fool by the then Christian Priests. Later on Galileo, an Italian physicist, was convicted by the Christian authorities for the same offense. Still there is a society named **FLAT EARTH SOCIETY** in London which warns the people against modern teachings about the earth.

We all know that modern scientists have put a number of proofs in support of spherical shape of our earth. But on making a deep study of the Gravitational Field of our earth, I found that the properties of this field are quite different from those of a spherical body. In other words, I do not find the gravitational field of our earth with those properties which the scientists hold to possess. I put my findings before so many modern people and institutions, but there is no satisfactory solution of the problems raised therein. In this short essay, I am going to mention in what ways the gravitational field of our earth differs with that of a spherical body. Learned readers are requested for a careful study.

Absence of Centre of our Earth

Modern science teaches us that there is a centre of our spherical earth. This centre is inside the earth nearly 6400 k.m. away from the outer surface. The spherical earth pulls on all outer things towards the said centre.

By the teachings of the modern science, it can easily be understood that the gravitational forces of our earth are unparallel to each other in its eyes. In other words, it says that a body moves towards a point when it is allowed to fall freely under the action of earth's gravity by moving along converging lines of gravitational forces. This teaching is illustrated by the diagrams.

It is not difficult to verify whether or not the falling bodies might fall towards a point. On examining the diagrams carefully, we can easily determine that all falling bodies should contract in their sizes if they move towards a point.

The size of body should be reduced to half if it is allowed to fall from a height of 6400 km. and it should be converted into a point if unfortunately it reaches the earth's centre. But in practice we do not find any of the falling body to reduce in its size due to gravitational attraction. On the other hand, we find that all falling bodies maintain their original sizes no matter they are allowed to fall on the earth's surface or even inside the earth. Practical experience of falling bodies leads us to the conclusion that there is no such centre of our earth towards which all falling bodies might be moving. Since all falling bodies are found to maintain their original sizes, there seems no reason to believe that gravitational forces of our earth meet in a point and hence are converging. On the other hand, there are reasons to believe that the gravitational forces of our earth are perfectly parallel to each other not only outside the earth but also inside it. A system of perfectly parallel gravitational forces can be had only by a FLAT earth and not by a spherical one. This is the justification for holding our earth FLAT.

In initial days of my studies, I was very much keen to learn how the modern science has explained the motion of falling bodies along converging lines of gravitational forces. For this, I consulted a number of books on Mechanics. I found that it can not do so. It also requires parallelism in gravitational forces for doing so. But its concept of parallelism is very interesting. It says that the gravitational forces of the spherical earth meet in a point at a large distance of 6400 k.m. and so there is no harm if such forces are taken as parallel to each other for all falling bodies. In my opinion, this sort of man-made parallelism is of no use in practice. If our earth is really a spherical body and its gravitational forces meet in a point, modern science should attempt to explain that falling bodies can possibly maintain their sizes even on moving along converging lines of gravitational forces.

Motion of falling bodies is called TRANSLATIONAL MOTION in modern science. In translational motion all of the parts of a moving body move along perfectly parallel lines and with one speed. If this body is forced to move along covering lines, it would either contract in its size or it would not move at all if it is rigid. Since all falling bodies are mostly rigid, there is no possibility of their motion under the action of gravity if the forces of gravity are converging. Non-rigid or compressible bodies might do so. This being a truth, the gravitational fields of all spherical bodies—no matter it is spherical earth or spherical moon—are unsuitable for motion of the falling bodies. The defect of unparallelism in their gravitational forces can not be removed by holding their gravitational forces as parallel to each other.

So many people are heard to say that Apollo Flights have proved our earth a spherical body without any doubt. But this idea is quite misleading. The place where the Apollo crafts landed had perfectly parallel lines of gravitational forces; otherwise they could not land. This being the case, that place was certainly a part of FLAT EARTH and not the spherical moon. The Apollo Flights in this way

provide us proof of this concept that our earth is not only FLAT but also widely spread. Other most convincing proof in this regard is being put in the next section.

Presence of Gravitational Forces in all Slanting Directions at our Earth

The bodies donot only fall vertically downward under the action of gravity but also roll down and slide down the inclined surfaces. For example, a vehicle roll down an inclined road by itself. At our earth, the bodies are seen to slide down and roll down no matter the inclination is small or large. It proves that our earth exerts its gravitational forces in all possible slanting directions. Whereas the modern earth is quite helpless in doing so. The contention can be illustrated by the diagram.

The diagram shows the modern earth and the Mount Everest which is nearly 8 km. high from the sea level. There is an inclined smooth surface with 2° inclination on the mount. A toy-car is allowed to roll down the inclined surface under the action of gravity. It can be seen that the gravitational forces which pull the toy-car down the inclined surface donot enter the modern earth but run above and above its curvature. In such a case the required forces of gravity cannot be exerted by the modern earth. It is one example of absence of gravitational forces in slanting direction at the modern earth. Numerous cases of this kind can be put in this regard

Now just imagine that our earth is not only FLAT but also widely spread up in all four directions. In this case the gravitational forces can enter the earth from all slanting directions and from all heights. This is the justification for holding our earth both FLAT and WIDELY SPREAD UP IN ALL FOUR DIRECTIONS.

The learned readers are requested to consider the contention most carefully. I will be glad if some of them make me understand that in such and such manner the modern earth can possibly exert the gravitational forces required in my example.

Failure of Modern Science in Case of Moon.

Copernicus first thought that the earth is spherical and the moon revolves around it. Later on, Newton discovered a law named Newton's law of universal gravitation. He proved the idea of Copernicus about the moon by his law of gravitation. Two centuries later, Einstein came into picture. He criticised Newton's law of gravitation in several fields but he found nothing wrong in case of moon. Not only Einstein but Fred Hoyle also took it granted that the Newton's law well makes the moon a satellite of the spherical earth. This credit goes to the author of this essay that he worked out complicated mathematics in this regard and proved that the said law totally fails in making the moon a satellite of the earth.

I donot wish to annoy the readers by putting the mathematics which I worked out. The result in simple words is that the Newton's law of universal

gravitation itself says that the sun pulls on the moon more than two times strongly than the spherical earth does. When it is so, the moon is required to revolve around the sun as an independent planet; the weaker gravitational field of the spherical earth can not keep it revolving around it (the spherical earth).

All manuscripts of Newton are under custody of Royal Greenwich Observatory, U. K., and it deals with the queries in this regard. Previously I wrote to it my above stated result and asked how Newton's law of gravitation succeeds in making the moon revolving around the spherical earth. My queries were dealt with and no objection was raised upon this result of mine that the law predicts more than two times stronger pull of the sun on the moon as compared to the pull of the earth. Other part of the query was answered with the remarks that I consider the earth and the moon two separate bodies whereas I should consider the two as one and then there would be no problem at all.

It was a matter of great satisfaction for me to know that the result drawn by me was correct and accepted by the Royal Observatory. Other remarks are obviously quite vague. When the moon and the earth are not joined by any rod, how can I hold them as one single body. The two bodies are quite separate and there is a considerable distance between the two. In such a case, the moon would be dominated by the sun and not by the earth.

The learned readers can well see that modern science has no proof to this effect that the moon is a satellite of the earth and that it revolves around the earth. This being the case; there seems no justification behind this idea that Apollo Flights have proved sphericity of our earth and that these flights were directed to moon.

Absence of Capillarity on the Modern Earth.

Capillarity is the natural phenomenon due to which lighter liquids rise up the surface in narrow tubes and heavier ones fall down. The plants get water from the earth through their fine roots due to capillarity. When water rises up in a narrow tube, its surface in the tube becomes concave. Water and other liquids which rise up in narrow tubes wet the surface of the vessel in which they are kept, whereas mercury and other heavier liquids do not wet the surface of the containers.

A careful study of capillarity makes us known to the fact that the capillary action is possible when the surface of water etc. is quite flat by nature. If the said surface is convex as of mercury, there can be no capillary action in water and in other lighter liquids, nor these liquids could wet the surface of the containers. In modern views, the shape of our earth is spherical and so the surface of water and of other liquids—no matter these are in big oceans or in small vessels—become convex by nature. In such a case neither water etc. can wet the surface of the container nor they can rise up their level in the outer vessel in narrow tubes. In other words, we could not find any capillary action on our earth if our earth would have been spherical. Presence of capillary action on our earth and presence of plants on our

earth due to capillarity prove our earth quite FLAT and not spherical or of any other shape.

Conclusions.

It is correct that modern science has put some proofs before us in support of sphericity of our earth. But these proofs are mostly based upon photographs and observations by sight. Proofs based upon experimental facts have not been given so far. Its proofs are not dependable and reliable due to 'optical illusions'. The proofs which I have given in support of flatness of our earth are all based upon experimental facts and are matters of our daily experience. There is no chance of any optical illusion in my proofs.

लेखसार

पृथ्वी विषयक आधुनिक मान्यताओं की समीक्षा

ज्ञानचंद जैन, दिल्ली

हमारे धर्मशास्त्रों में पृथ्वी को चौरस (चपटी), स्थिर, पृथुल तथा चारों दिशाओं में फैला हुआ बताया गया है। इस मान्यता के विपर्याय में जब कापरनीकस ने यह कहा कि पृथ्वी गोलाकार है और स्थिर सूर्य के चारों ओर घूम रही है, तो लोगों ने उसे मूर्ख माना। शताब्दियों बाद उसके अनुयायी गेलीलियो को फाँसी दे दी गई। लेकिन यह मान्यता बलवती ही होती गई। इसके बावजूद भी लन्दन में अभी भी 'प्लैट अर्थ सोसायटी' काम करती है। मैंने पृथ्वी की आकृति विषयक वैज्ञानिक अध्ययन किया है और मुझे प्रतीत होता है कि इसका गुरुत्वीय क्षेत्र इसके गोलाकार को प्रमाणित नहीं करता। उदाहरणार्थ, वैज्ञानिक गोलाकार पृथ्वी का एक केन्द्र मानते हैं जो भूतल से 6400 किमी० गभं में है। सभी वस्तुएँ उस केन्द्र की ओर आकृष्ट होती हैं। वस्तुओं के ऊँचाई से अधःपतन पर उनके आकार में परिवर्तन होना चाहिये, पर यह प्रयोग पुष्ट नहीं होता। इसलिए पृथ्वी के केन्द्र की बात भी नहीं जँचती। इसके विपरीत यह मानना अधिक न्यायसंगत लगता है कि पृथ्वी के गुरुत्वीय आकर्षण बल एक-दूसरे के समान्तर होते हैं तथा भूतल और भूगर्भ दोनों जगह कार्यकारी होते हैं। यह स्थिति पृथ्वी को चपटी मानने पर ही उत्पन्न हो सकती है। अपोलो की उड़ानों ने भी यही तथ्य सिद्ध किया प्रतीत होता है।

हमारी पृथ्वी सभी दिशाओं में और अवनमनों में गुरुत्वीय बलों को आपतित करती है। इसीलिये अवनमनों में भी पिंड गतिशील होते हैं। गोलाकार पृथ्वी की मान्यता में यह संभव नहीं दिखता।

न्यूटन और आइन्स्टीन चंद्रमा को पृथ्वी का उपग्रह मानते रहे। लेकिन मैंने अपने जटिल परिकलनों से इस मान्यता को खंडित किया है। इस तथ्य को मैंने रोयल ग्रीनविच वेधशाला को लिखा, जिसे इन्होंने स्वीकार किया है लेकिन उन्होंने अपनी मान्यता में परिवर्तन नहीं किया है।

केशिका-प्रभाव के अध्ययन से पता चलता है कि यह प्रभाव तलों के चपटे होने पर ही होता है, गोलाकार होने के कारण नहीं। यदि पृथ्वी गोल मानी जायगी तो उसमें केशिका प्रभाव नहीं होगा।

इस प्रकार वैज्ञानिक पृथ्वी के गोलाकार होने के लिये जो प्रमाण देते हैं, वे प्रायोगिक तथ्यों पर आधारित नहीं हैं, वे केवल प्रकाशीय विभ्रम हैं।