Big Gravity Remains Elusive

By Clark M. Thomas

Abstract

Big Gravity's (G) Newtonian constant for the local universe seems to be something that eludes astrophysicists seeking better numbers for the claimed four forces. The latest G data have failed to confront the hermeneutical limits of what their experimental tools measure. We need better multiversal causative precision in 4D dimensions, not weak mathematical correlations. Big Gravity, and Earth's variable surface gravities (g), include electromagnetism, along with the properly conceived net push/shadow kinetics. Unifying harmony among all physics dimensions is needed for any elegant multiversal paradigm.

The Standard Model of Particle Physics (the standard model) says there are four fundamental forces: gravity, electromagnetism, the strong nuclear force, and the weak nuclear force. In this model, starting with Newton, and refined by experimentalists, everything in our local universe is built on energy attractions and repulsive forces. That model worked best during the 20th century. It still has great value among nearby classical dimensions. It is less correlative for all multiversal physics dimensions, including the real physics everywhere underlying GR and quantum models.

The standard gravity model, even as modified in 4D General Relativity spacetime, cannot handle real net push/shadow gravity, with proximal yin/yang Coulombic EM. Big Gravity (G) is a constant that ideally could be plugged into gravity computations at all classical linear dimensions above the Planck dimensional entry point below negative 35th meters.

However, the comparative correlative precision of Big G is degrading, not sharpening, as reported by *Science News* on April 16, 2026.**[1]** It would also be more elegant to say that there are two fundamental forces: net

gravity, and electromagnetism (including dipolar and primary). Both the strong force and the weak force would be included in emergent yin/yang EM. Disharmony among aging correlative paradigms dooms any attempt to model the real unifying causative theory of everything (TOE) that fits all multiversal 4D dimensions.

The standard model, including GR, fails to correlate with *real* physics, and hardly causatively explains what should be measured with increasing precision. Adding partial ideas about quanta doesn't help. *Incompatibility between GR and quantum theories* is at the crux of why nobody to date has developed a real TOE. This modeling mess has kept current physics in a neo-Ptolemaic dilemma, where things are calculated fairly well, but don't properly explain all of anything.

Astrophysical confusion is like machine AI getting better at rendering people, while failing to understand people as real people. In many agentic visual applications sophisticated AI imitation is enough. Reverse engineering hardly explains much below or above reachable linear dimensions nearest to ourselves that we can experimentally manipulate. Therefore, AI beauty only partially reflects the *real beauty* underlying all local 4D universes.

Newton's original gravity is still widely used locally.**[2]** We also use GR spacetime math for certain correlations. Nevertheless, all of Big Gravity, and even local gravity at Earth's surface, can also be causally explained with 21st century push/shadow theory. Physicists can still correlate using *reverse-engineered GR equations* for *as-if* convenience.

Nevertheless, here is another case where we don't experimentally know what we don't know. Even under the best circumstances, experimental science can never fully verify Big G across all multiversal dimensions. It is not enough to sidestep this dilemma with logical positivism. We could and should henceforth embrace a more honest envisioning of the real TOE.

Meanwhile, the consequences of reduced precision on the grand scale for one of the four alleged classical forces could be significant. The recent *Science News* report cited above has this important two-paragraphs caveat:

> "All the other fundamental constants are measured very precisely, and big G is kind of this outlier," says physicist Michael Ross of the University of Washington in Seattle, who was not involved in the new study. For example, the fundamental constant that defines the strength of the electromagnetic force is known with about 100,000 times less uncertainty.

> Narrowing in on G won't affect how we measure the weight of objects in our daily lives. But precisely knowing the fundamental constant is important to ensuring nothing crucial is missing from our understanding of gravity. If disagreements between measurements of G were found to be a reflection of nature, Ross says, it would completely break physics. "That's why we spend so much time really trying to nail down these numbers, because they do really control the whole universe."

In fact, there are disagreements between and among measurements of G which shall remain as long as the underlying nature paradigms are highly flawed and dated. For example, the quaint idea that our local bubble universe (within the overall multiverse) is all there is, highly limits Neo-Ptolemaic astrophysics. Multiple other physics problems persist within stale math correlative paradigms, all of which could be causally reconciled within the full-linear-dimensional TOE soon to appear.

Inside the popular concepts of gravity persisting to this day, there is profound confusion. The most precise measurements of Big Gravity (G) now are *less certain* than previous numbers. Measurements of G have now become more precise. However, these new numbers appear to have lower levels of confidence than earlier data within the same antique gravity models. In theory at least, better data precision should reinforce correct causative models, not question them — *unless the very models themselves are the problem.*

Isaac Newton, a great genius, developed his universal gravity constant for all dimensions. His model reflects what was "known" during the late 17th century. Amazingly, the modern paradigm for how large our local universe truly is has only emerged since the 1920s, when Andromeda was discovered to be a separate giant neighbor galaxy, not just another "spiral nebula" inside our own Milky Way. The popular view of astrophysics and GR maths virtually ignores *the multiversal universe of local bubble universes.*

In the proper full view of everything, *the smallest and largest physics dimensions are all unified by dialectical emergents of primal yin/yang Coulombic spheres strung together. In essence, the real TOE boils down to this awesome emergent symphony of simultaneous energy and matter. This simultaneity of overall cause and effect is known as "renge" in Nichiren Buddhist theory.*

A key to Newton's physics was how its zero reference points were measured by Cartesian lines between and among related kinetic masses. His junior associate, Nicolas Fatio, saw another reality involving net push/shadow gravity. Fatio was equally restricted by what was scientifically known at the time. Fatio's model was fatally flawed when his push/shadow "impactors" proved to be far larger and dangerous than he first envisioned. Nevertheless, his general idea was revolutionary, awaiting our century.

Only the currently emerging version of push/shadow net gravity works, starting with sub-Planck-dimensional Coulombic yin/yang spheres having primary and dipolar electromagnetism, individually at the linear negative dimension of approximately minus 38 meters from our own chosen zero-point reference-frame dimension. Fundamental Coulombic spheres are vastly smaller than anything Newton or Fatio could envision in the naive 17th century. A popularizer of Fatio's net kinetic model, Georges-Louis LeSage, equally failed in the still-naive 18th century.

Here is an exquisite example of a change in *perceptual quantity yielding a change in "gravity" quality — emerging from an as-if tractor beam attracting force, into real net push/shadow "apparently attracting force" in all multiversal linear dimensions. Gravity is thus not a tractor beam force, but dipolar magnetism can be at some distance. Gravity is a net push/shadow force resulting from omnidirectional multiversal yin/yang flows among local universes, along with distant electromagnetic effects. Understanding this critical difference is a key to understanding real 4D multiversal physics.* It also models how as-if Dark Energy is naively conceived.

I have written multiple essays on this general topic. Here are a couple theses, starting with basic push/shadow gravity **[3]** — and all the way up to the most distant multiversal scales **[4]**. Along the way, other mysteries are resolved, such as why the speed of light in a virtual vacuum is exactly so; and what happens at vast multiversal scales to the scary Second Law of Thermodynamics.

References

[1] https://www.sciencenews.org/article/gravity-fundamental-constant-new-measurement

[2] https://www.animations.physics.unsw.edu.au/jw/gravity.htm#context

[3] https://astronomy-links.net/LightSpeed.pdf

[4] https://astronomy-links.net/beyond.the.multiverse.pdf