

October 17, 2023

# Rotating planets in Newtonian gravity

*Christian Fronsdal*

*Dep.t of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Los Angeles, CA, USA*  
nnn aaa

**ABSTRACT** Variational techniques have been used in applications of hydrodynamics in special cases. What is needed is an Action that is general enough to deal with potential flows as well as vortex flows, with rotating fluids in Nature and in the laboratory; it has become available only recently. This paper is one of several that aim to test and develop a new Action Principle for hydrodynamics. Here we study models of rotating planets, compressible fluid bodies in a stationary state of motion, under the influence of a fixed gravitational field. The hope is to account for the shape and the flow velocities, given the size of the equatorial bulges, the angular velocity at the equator and the density profiles. The theory is applied to the principal objects in the solar system, from Earth and Mars, to Saturn with its famous hexagonal flow and its characteristic ring system. Planetary rings are an unforeseen but, as it turns out, a natural and inevitable feature of the dynamics; past cataclysmic events are not needed to explain their existence. Observed stresses may have been created during a period of quasi-static changes as orbital angular momentum was transformed into spin.

This paper is preparation for a systematic application of a new action principle to a detailed study of the planets. The present intention is to test the versatility of the action principle in astrophysical applications, while meeting some objections that can be raised against traditional methods.

fronsdal@physics.ucla.edu

fronsdal.physics.ucla.edu

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Classical hydrodynamics

In this paper a classical approach to hydrodynamics is used to determine the ideal shape of a rotating heavenly body under the influence of its own gravitational field. The development of an effective action principle for hydrodynamics is now close to realization. Applications in different fields are examined in order to gain a wide perspective. We begin with a brief summary of recent developments of the basic concepts.

Classical hydrodynamics comes in two ‘versions’. The most popular one, the ‘Eulerian version’; is defined by the action that was discovered by Lagrange (1760) [1],

$$A_1 = \int dt d^3x \mathcal{L}_1, \quad \mathcal{L}_1 = \rho(\dot{\Phi} - \vec{\nabla}\Phi^2/2 - \varphi) - W[\rho]. \quad (1.1)$$

In this theory the velocity is irrotational  $\vec{v} := -\vec{\nabla}\Phi$ . The scalar field  $\varphi$  is the Newtonian potential.<sup>1</sup> The term  $W[\rho]$  is the input from thermodynamics; it will be shown that, for an isolated system, it can be identified with the internal energy density.

This theory has a normal canonical structure with one pair of canonical variables, the density  $\rho$  and the velocity potential  $\Phi$ . The equations of motion are

$$\frac{\delta A_1}{\delta \Phi} = \dot{\rho} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0 \quad (1.2)$$

and the Bernoulli equation (in integrated form)

$$\frac{\delta A_1}{\delta \rho} = \dot{\Phi} - \vec{\nabla}\Phi^2/2 - \varphi - \frac{\delta W}{\delta \rho} = 0.$$

The gradient of this equation is the Bernoulli equation

$$\vec{\nabla}(\dot{\Phi} - \vec{\nabla}\Phi^2/2 - \varphi) = \vec{\nabla} \frac{\partial W[\rho]}{\partial \rho} = \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} p; \quad (1.3)$$

justified as follow. The thermodynamic internal energy density is  $f(\rho, T) + sT$ ;  $f$  is the free energy density and  $s$  is the entropy density. The basic thermodynamic equations are

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial T} + s = 0, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} - \rho \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} + p = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

The first equation is used to eliminate the temperature; then the internal energy density  $u(\rho, s) = f + sT$  can be identified with  $W[\rho]$ .

Under the assumption that the entropy density  $s$  is a linear function of the density,  $s = \rho S$ , with  $S$  uniform, it follows that

$$\vec{\nabla} \frac{\partial(f + sT)}{\partial \rho} = \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} p, \quad (1.5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The inclusion of gravitation in this equation has been derived from Einstein’s equation for the metric.

where  $p := \rho \partial f / \partial \rho - f$ . Comparison of (1.3) with (1.5) shows that  $W[\rho]$  is identified with  $u(\rho, s) = f + st$ . In view of this result the Bernoulli equation takes the original form (Bernoulli 1743) [2],

$$\vec{\nabla}(\dot{\Phi} - \vec{\nabla}\Phi^2/2 - \varphi) = \frac{1}{\rho}\vec{\nabla}p. \quad (1.6)$$

**Remark.** This derivation of the Bernoulli equation may not be well known. It is important to the author because it elevates a set of equations to a theory with known limitations and conservation laws, with well defined hamiltonian, angular momentum and kinematic potential. It is also important that Eq.(1.6) can be justified only if the specific entropy density  $S$  is uniform; this limits its applicability, a fact that is only occasionally recognized. A hydrodynamic equation of state is an expression for  $u(\rho, S)$  or  $p(\rho, S)$ . Solving the hydrodynamic equations of motion will give us these functions for one value of  $S$ .

Lagrange's action principle has remained popular, in spite of notorious difficulties, some of them summarized by the d'Alembert paradox of 1747 [3]; it states that flight is impossible. A more elementary example is the popular experiment that consists of placing a glass with water on a turntable and observing the shape of the surface. This would be explained by the centrifugal force that is the negative gradient of the kinematic potential,  $-\vec{\nabla}\Phi^2/2$ , except that it appears in (1.6) with the wrong sign! The significance of this has been emphasized by the author (2020) [4].

This is why a second classical theory has been mustered, an 'alternative version' of hydrodynamics, usually credited to Lagrange. Here the velocity is not a gradient, but a time derivative; we shall denote it  $\dot{\vec{X}}$ . The Lagrangian density of this theory is

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \rho \dot{\vec{X}}^2 / 2 - W[\rho], \quad (1.7)$$

It dates from the same period as  $\mathcal{L}_1$ . In this case the kinematical potential has the right sign; this theory is always used to 'explain' the turntable experiment, in spite of the fact that this theory is defective by not including an equation of continuity. The Newtonian potential can be included here as well, but it can not be derived from Einstein's equation.

Thus neither version of the classical theory stands up to scrutiny.

The most elementary, stationary solutions of the two theories are circular flows of two kinds

$$\vec{\nabla}\Phi = \frac{a}{r^2}(-y, x, 0), \quad \dot{\vec{X}} = b(-y, x, 0). \quad a, b \text{ const.} \quad (1.8)$$

Cylindrical Couette flow has always been modelled by a linear combination of both, but the idea that the two theories should be combined in an action principle has been slow to emerge. The first step in this direction was taken by Landau in 1941 [5].

The phonon field  $\vec{v}_s$  of superfluids is always assumed to be (locally) irrotational. The idea that the other velocity, the roton field  $\vec{v}_n$ , is governed by  $\mathcal{L}_2$  appeared in 1964, in an important paper by Rasetti and Regge [6].

A familiar analogy will help us appreciate this contribution. Consider the state of electromagnetism before Maxwell managed to combine electricity and

magnetism, a theory of two vector fields with 6 variables. Maxwell's theory was quickly organized around the vector potential and three of the equations were recognized as constraints, solved by setting

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu.$$

Of the remaining equations, one is a gauge theory constraint, which reduces the number of physical degrees of freedom to 2. With the new focus on Lorentz invariance and the demands of unitarity, it did not take long before the first gauge theory was born.

The great merit of the paper by Rasetti and Regge is that they accomplished a parallel development for the field  $\vec{X}$ . The result has found important applications in string theory. (Kalb and Ramond 1974 [7], Zheltukin 2014) [8]. It is a central part of the 2-vector, conservative form of hydrodynamics that is being applied and tested in the present paper.

The result of Rasetti and Regge is an imaginative (but unique) solution to this problem, a solution that embodies all the new aspects of Landau's theory of superfluids. The unique, unitary, relativistic theory that solves the riddle is the 2-form relativistic gauge theory developed by Ogievetski and Polubarinov (1964) [9]. It has only one propagating mode and even this one is irrelevant in most non-relativistic applications.

Seliger and Whitman (1968) [10] made another serious effort to discover an action that would combine the two versions of classical hydrodynamics, in a theory that would have a nondegenerate canonical structure without constraints. Their theory has found few applications and it allows for vorticity only if the specific entropy is not uniform.

The relativistic theory has an antisymmetric tensor field with components  $Y_{\mu\nu}$ , with six components. The three components  $\eta_i = Y_{0i}$  can be transformed to zero by a gauge transformation and there remains only the 3-vector

$$\vec{X}^i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ijk} Y_{jk}.$$

The Lagrangian density of the relativistic gauge theory, with the extra density factor, is  $\rho(dY)^2$  where  $(dY)_{\mu\nu,\lambda}$  is the antisymmetric differential of  $(dY)_{\mu\nu}$ . The field equations that come from variations of the gauge field give rise to the constraint

$$\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{m} = 0, \quad \vec{m} := \rho(\dot{\vec{X}} + \kappa \vec{\nabla} \Phi), \quad (1.9)$$

It is solved by setting

$$\vec{m} = -\vec{\nabla} \tau,$$

where  $\tau$  is a so far arbitrary scalar field.

**Remark.** In the papers on relativistic field theories that have been cited, as in many papers on hydrodynamics, the density was taken to be uniform, which prevents a useful contact with non-relativistic physics.

The unique propagating mode in this theory is  $\mathcal{N} := \rho(\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{X} + \kappa)$ . It is massless ( $\square \mathcal{N} = 0$ ) and it is non-propagating in the context of the present paper,

$$\Delta \mathcal{N} = \dot{\mathcal{N}} = 0. \quad (1.10)$$

We arrive at a simple Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = \rho(\beta \dot{\Phi} - \Phi^2/2 - \varphi) + \rho \dot{\vec{X}}^2/2 + \rho \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi - W[\rho], \quad \beta = 1 + \kappa^2. \quad (1.11)$$

The action principle incorporates traditional hydrodynamics, including the equation of continuity and the Bernoulli equation with a velocity potential that is the sum of the two contributions, and a spin-orbit interaction that is essential, as we shall show now.

The equation of continuity (see Eq.(1.2)) is

$$\dot{\rho} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}) = 0, \quad \vec{v} := \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} - \vec{\nabla} \Phi. \quad (1.12)$$

The vorticity is thus

$$\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{v} = \vec{\nabla} \wedge \frac{\kappa}{\rho} \vec{m} = -\vec{\nabla} \wedge \left( \frac{\kappa}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} \tau \right).$$

The constant  $\kappa$  must be non-zero, otherwise the new theory has only irrotational flows.

**Remark.** The last equation shows that the vorticity is perpendicular to the density gradient. Has this been confirmed by observation?

The theory has been extensively applied; to the stability of cylindrical Couette flow (Fronsdal 2020b) [11], to capillarity and metastable states of thermodynamic fluids, and recently to Gravitational Waves (Fronsdal 2021) [12] and to calculate the speeds of the sounds in superfluid Helium. It provides the first field - theoretic model of rotating, relativistic fluids that respects the Bianchi identity and the equation of continuity.

The principal feature of this paper is the action principle; in other respects it does not go as far as earlier models of planetary dynamics. See for example Beauvalet, Lainey, Arlot and Binzel (2013) [13] or Stute, Kley and Mignone (2013) [14]. A feature that is not always included in planetary dynamics is the requirement that the mass flow velocity field be harmonic, as it needs to be in all stationary or quasi-static models. (See below.) Most important, this restriction reduces the number of adjustable parameters and this increases the value of the action principle as a framework with a greatly improved predictive power.

## 1.2. Summary. The non relativistic model

The gauged-fixed, non-relativistic matter action

$$\mathcal{L} = \rho(\beta \dot{\Phi} - \Phi^2/2 - \varphi) + \dot{\vec{X}}^2/2 + \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi - W[\rho], \quad (1.13)$$

where  $\beta := 1 + \kappa^2$ , is composed of the Lagrangians of the two classical theories. The variables are the density  $\rho$  and the two velocity potentials, the scalar velocity potential  $\Phi$  and the vector potential  $\vec{X}$ . (Compare Schutz 1970 [15].) The  $\kappa$  term is needed; without it the mass flow becomes irrotational, as we have shown. The kinematic potential has terms of either sign ( $-\Phi^2/2$  and  $+\dot{\vec{X}}^2/2$ ), as needed for different, elementary applications. The relativistic relativistic origin of the irrotational part (1.1) is in Fronsdal (2007) [16].

The relation of the gauge fixed Lagrangian (1.11) to the complete set of field equations is as follow. 1. The gauge field  $\eta$  has been fixed, so the main constraint (1.9) is a typical gauge theory constraint. 2. The condition (1.10) excludes travelling waves in the non-relativistic sector. 3. The equation of continuity,

$$\dot{\rho} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0, \quad \beta \vec{v} := \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} - \vec{\nabla} \Phi, \quad (1.14)$$

comes from variation of (1.11) with respect to  $\Phi$ . 4. Variation of  $\vec{X}$  gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{m} = 0. \quad (1.15)$$

5. Finally, variation of the Lagrangian density with respect to the density gives the Bernoulli equation in the form

$$\vec{\nabla}(\beta \dot{\Phi} - K - \varphi) = \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} p, \quad (1.16)$$

where  $K$  is the kinematic potential.

$$K := -\dot{\vec{X}}^2/2 - \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi + \vec{\nabla} \Phi^2/2.$$

The theory is a combination of the two classical theories ('phonons' and 'rotons'). The kinetic potential has terms of both signs, as needed in elementary applications. The negative sign of the first term means that it must be interpreted as stress.

The on-shell value of the Lagrangian density is the thermodynamic pressure; as prophesized with rare insight by Taub (1954) [17].

The incorporation of two velocity fields is an essential feature of the theory, and of hydrodynamics: what is both novel and effective is that they give it the minimal number of dynamical variables: four including the density. The Lagrangian has one free parameter  $\kappa$ ; it is inversely related to the compressibility of the fluid.

The action is not completely new; parts of it appeared in a classical paper by Hall and Vinen (1956) [18] on superfluids and in a more recent review by Fetter (2009) [19] on rotating Bose-Einstein condensates.<sup>2</sup> In those papers  $\vec{X}$  is not a local, dynamical field variable but a fixed background feature that accounts for a rigid rotation of the whole system. The dynamical, irrotational velocity was clearly insufficient and another degree of freedom was needed, but

---

<sup>2</sup>The equations of motion in the paper by Hall and Vinen are widely quoted; the action principle has been completely ignored.

the way to avoid an excessive number of new degrees of freedom by means of constraints was not widely known.

A stationary flow is one that evades the dissipating effect of viscosity. In traditional hydrodynamics viscosity is included as an additional term in the Navier-Stokes equation,

$$\dot{\vec{v}} + (\vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla})\vec{v} = \frac{-1}{\rho}\vec{\nabla}p + \bar{\mu}\rho\Delta\vec{v}, \quad (1.17)$$

where  $\bar{\mu}$  is the kinematic viscosity. Viscosity normally implies dissipation and cannot be accommodated within an action principle, but its effect can be acknowledged by replacing the conservation law (1.15) by

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\rho\vec{v}) = \bar{\mu}\rho\Delta\vec{v}.$$

In this way a theory based on conservation laws can be distorted to include a type of dissipation, as in the familiar approach with Eq.(1.16). In both theories, stationary motion is possible only when the field  $\vec{v}$  is harmonic.

### 1.3. Planetary rings

The biggest surprise to emerge from this work is the spontaneous appearance of planetary rings, of the type observed on minor planets. Solitary rings are predicted, not just confirmed; they are prominent features of the simplest solutions of the equations of motion.

The first planetary ring was found on the minor planet Chiron in 1993. (The minor planet was discovered in 1977.) Haumea's less spectacular ring was first seen in 2004. The third and last of these rings was observed on Chariclo on 26 March 2014. The first version of this paper was completed in December 2017 and submitted to arXiv.org on 20 May 2018, too late to claim a real prediction. (Source Wikipedia)

These are the only isolated planetary rings found so far in the Solar system. The rings were discovered as a highly unexpected byproduct of a calculation of planetary shapes. It is perhaps the most spectacular confirmation of the aptitude of Conservative Hydrodynamics and the Lagrangian (1.10) so far.




Figure 1: One of the first rings that appeared, unexpectedly, in this investigation.




Figure 2: the First ring observed on the minor planet Chivron, in 1993.

It is suggested that the parameter  $N$  in Eq.(2.9) is related to evolution, that all the planets may have had rings at one time, that the planet Mars, in particular, may have had a ring at relatively recent times and that all the planets will eventually lose their rings.

Extended ring systems, such as seen on the Jovian planets (Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune), are located very close to the equator. This suggests a flow pattern with high angular momentum. Harmonic flows concentrated on the equatorial plane are described in terms of the gradients of separated harmonic functions

$$\vec{\nabla} J_0(kr) \sinh(kz),$$

where  $r$  and  $z$  are cylindrical coordinates. See Fig 16.

The dimensional parameter  $1/k$  determines the order of magnitude of the average spacing between the rings as well as their thickness; but the actual spacing is irregular.

**Remark.** Chiron is said to have “rings like Saturn”. This suggests that the latter may be susceptible of modelling without much more effort than those of Chiron and Chariclo.

#### 1.4. The Cylindrical Couette Problem

The most familiar systems treated in Newtonian gravity as well as in General Relativity have spherical symmetry. But most heavenly bodies are rotating around an axis that is more or less fixed, with approximate cylindrical symmetry. Much of the inspiration for our work comes from a laboratory experiment with similar properties, cylindrical Couette flow. Taking the advice of Homer Lane (1870) [20], as is traditional in astrophysics, we apply to astrophysics what we have learned in terrestrial laboratories. The problem examined by Couette (1888-1890) [21] and Mallock (1888, 1896) [22-23] is a fluid confined between two concentric cylinders that can be rotated independently around the vertical axis. In classical hydrodynamics the balance of forces is expressed by the Navier-Stokes equation. Boundary conditions are assumed to be non-slip and the fluid is compressible. At low speeds any stationary motion has been described by the following vector field

$$\vec{v} = \frac{a}{r^2}(-y, x, 0) + b(-y, x, 0), \quad r := \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}, \quad a, b \text{ constant.} \quad (1.18)$$

The first term is irrotational for  $r \neq 0$  and both are harmonic.

The new action principle was used to account for the stability of basic, cylindrical Couette flow.

The study of Couette flow has revealed one aspect of the physical interpretation: it is responsible for fluid stress and some metastable configurations, and it is indispensable for the analysis of capillary action and other surprising properties of water.



## 2. A compressible fluid rotating in a fixed, central gravitational field

Our model of a planet is an isolated system with a liquid or solid core in thermodynamic equilibrium with a gaseous atmosphere, in a stationary, rotating state and described by the Lagrangian (1.11). It consists of a single substance in two phases. The condition of thermodynamic equilibrium at the phase boundary is that the pressure  $p$ , the temperature and the chemical potential  $\mu$  be continuous across the surface. In the case of a thin atmosphere this implies that the pressure and the chemical potential are constant on the surface. The surface is thus a locus of the function  $K + \varphi$ ; see Eq.(1.16).

$$C(\vec{x}) := \dot{\vec{X}}^2/2 + \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi - \vec{\nabla} \Phi^2/2 - \frac{-GM}{R}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$R = \frac{r}{|\sin \theta|} = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}.$$

We are using the Newtonian approximation for the attractive gravitational potential. It is an expedient shortcut of the present treatment, as in the simplest version of the traditional approach, and one that we hope to remove later. It may be a valid approximation so long as the departure from spherical symmetry is small.

This model should be appropriate for Earth and Mars and possibly for the frozen planets Neptune and Uranus, less so for the gaseous planets. To determine the appropriate velocity fields we begin by examining the simplest solutions.

If the velocity is irrotational, and  $\dot{\vec{X}} = 0$ ; then the shape is determined by

$$C_1(\vec{x}) = -\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{GM}{R} = \text{constant},$$

$$r := R|\sin \theta| = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}.$$

A plot of the loci of this expression for several values of the parameter  $a^2$  reveals, instead of an equatorial bulge, a polar depression. This attempt, postulating an irrotational flow, evidently fails.

Solid-body flow is the complementary case in which  $\vec{\nabla} \Phi = 0$  and the angular velocity  $\omega = b$  is a constant. As in the traditional approach; the condition of equilibrium is

$$C_2(\vec{x}) = \frac{\omega^2}{2} r^2 + \frac{GM}{R} = \text{constant}.$$

There is a bulge. The number usually quoted is

$$\epsilon := \frac{R_{eq.}}{R_{pole}} - 1 = \frac{\omega^2}{2MG} R_{eq.}^3,$$

where, to a good approximation,  $R_{eq}$  can be replaced by 1 on the right hand side. For Planet Earth the number is  $MG = R^2 g$ ,  $g = 980 \text{ cm/sec}^2$ , and the approximate value of  $\epsilon$  is predicted by this model to be

$$\frac{\omega^2 R^3}{2MG} = \frac{R\omega^2}{2g} = \left( \frac{2\pi}{24 \times 3600} \right)^2 \frac{6.357 \times 10^8}{2 \times 980} = .0017. \quad (2.2)$$

Solving Eq. (2.1) for the azimuthal angle we find that  $(b^2/2)R^2 \sin^2 \theta = C - GM/R$  and we conclude that, with the solid body hypothesis

- a. the radius is minimal at the poles and
- b. the locus of (3.1) always has a non-compact branch.

The observed value of  $\epsilon$  for Earth is .00335, twice the prediction (2.2). The classical theory can be improved by taking into account the effect of the bulge on the potential; for example, by assuming that the shape is an ellipsoid, and that the density is uniform. That results in a value for  $\epsilon$  of .0042, which is too large (Fitzpatrick 2018) [24]. A further improvement results from taking the partly known density distribution into account; this has the effect of diminishing the effect of the shape on the potential.

**Remark.** This is the classical result, but the traditional calculation does not get it from an action principle; instead it postulates a kinetic potential  $-\vec{v}^2/2 = -(\omega r)^2/2$ . In this case the Bernoulli equation is *ad hoc* and the continuity equation cannot be justified. This disregard for rigor is commonly repeated, even in General Relativity. It is especially deplorable in an educational setting when rigour yields to simplicity.

### 2.1 The general case, 2 flows

We look for the general solution of the equations of motion. Again

$$\varphi = -\frac{GM}{R}, \quad \mathcal{R} := \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}, \quad G = \text{constant}. \quad (2.3)$$

The full set of equations includes the equation of continuity and

$$\vec{v} := \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} - \vec{\nabla} \Phi, \quad \Delta \vec{v} = 0, \quad \vec{w} := \dot{\vec{X}} + \kappa \vec{\nabla} \Phi = \frac{-1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} \tau, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\dot{\vec{X}}^2/2 + \kappa \dot{\vec{X}} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi - \vec{\nabla} \Phi^2/2 + \frac{GM}{R} = \mu[\rho], \quad (2.5)$$

All the vector fields can be expressed in terms of the two scalar fields  $\Phi$  and  $\tau$  and the density. The simplest possibility is that the two flows are in planes perpendicular to the axis of rotation,

$$-\vec{\nabla} \Phi = \frac{a}{r^2}(-y, x, 0), \quad -\vec{\nabla} \tau = \frac{b}{r^2}(-y, x, 0). \quad (2.6)$$

These are gradient-type vector fields with angular momentum  $L_z = \pm 1$ . They would not be sufficient for an ambitious attempt to construct realistic models, but they may be enough for our main purpose, to establish the versatility of the action principle. Other solutions will be used to account for the extraordinary ring systems of the Jovian Planets.

Eq.s (2.4) and (2.6) give the velocity of mass flow

$$\vec{v} = \kappa \vec{w} - (\kappa^2 + 1) \vec{\nabla} \Phi = \omega(-y, x, 0), \quad (2.7)$$

with the angular velocity

$$\omega := \frac{1}{r^2} \left( \frac{\kappa b}{\rho} + a(\kappa^2 + 1) \right). \quad (2.8)$$

The most general harmonic vector field of this form is a series of spherical functions with higher angular momenta. There is evidence of higher angular momenta in the flow velocities of Venus, Pluto and, most notably, Saturn, to be discussed later. Here we reduce the series to the simplest terms, the normalized inverse density taking the form

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = 1 + NR + \eta r^2 + \nu \frac{r^2}{R^3}, \quad N > 0, \quad \eta > 0, \quad (2.9)$$

with constant coefficients  $N, \eta, \nu$ . This type of solution is strongly indicated in the case of the Earth and the other planets with a rigid surface. The first two terms have  $\ell = -1$ , the others  $\ell = 1$ . Higher harmonics are needed in the case of Saturn, since this planet shows a distinct, hexagonal flow pattern.

A non-zero value of the last term in (2.9) would give rise to a hole, shaped like a donut, near the center of the planet; see Fig.3. It may serve as a regularizing device, but it is hardly relevant for the evaluation of the shape of the surface. We adopt the expression (2.9), with  $\nu = 0$ , as a plausible first approximation to the density profiles of Earth and Mars and, very tentatively, to those of the other planets.




Figure 3: The effect of including the 4'th term in (2.9); a hole appears at the center, as well as a ring in the equatorial plane. Shown here is a locus of the function  $C$  in Eq.(2.1).

Eq.s (2.8-9), with  $\nu = 0$ , is our simplest model planet. It is intended, in the first place, to serve as a model for Earth and Mars and perhaps for Uranus and Neptune. A more detailed model would need a general harmonic expansion for the flow vector field  $\vec{v}$ .

## 2.2. Units

The unit of density is the central density. The unit of length is the polar radius.

### 2.3. The flow

The flow is very close to that of a solid body. Combining (2.8) and (2.9) with  $\nu = 0$  gives

$$\omega := \frac{1}{r^2} \left( \kappa b(1 + NR + \eta r^2) + a(\kappa^2 + 1) \right). \quad (2.10)$$

This becomes regular on the axis of rotation ( $r = 0$ ) if

$$a(\kappa^2 + 1) = -\kappa b(1 + N). \quad (2.11)$$

This makes  $\omega$  constant and is therefore strongly indicated for Earth.

That  $a$  and  $b$  have opposite signs implies that the direction of rotation may change sign within the planet.

### 2.3. Regularity at the poles

Take the polar radius to be the unit of length and let the central density be the unit of density. Both  $N$  and  $\eta$  have to be positive, as we shall see.

Let us begin with a star that is spherically symmetric ( $\eta = 0$ ) with polar radius 1 and density ratio

$$\frac{\rho_{center}}{\rho_{pole}} = N + 1;$$

then we allow for a modest violation of spherical symmetry by increasing the parameter  $\eta$  from zero.

With Eq.s (2.1), (2.7) and (2.8) the equation  $C(\vec{x}) = \text{constant}$  for the surface takes the form,

$$\frac{1}{2r^2} \left( b^2(1 + NR + \eta r^2)^2 - a^2(1 + \kappa^2) \right) + \frac{GM}{R} = \text{constant}.$$

To avoid getting a dip at the poles (from the denominator  $r^2$ ) we must have

$$a^2(1 + \kappa^2) = b^2(N + 1)^2. \quad (2.12)$$

Then the equation takes the form

$$\frac{b^2}{2r^2} \left( (1 + NR + \eta r^2)^2 - (N + 1)^2 \right) + \frac{GM}{R} = \text{constant}. \quad (2.13)$$

The choice (2.12), like (2.11), is also strongly favored for Earth. Both together implies that  $\kappa \gg 1$ , which is consistent with the rigidity of a large part of the earth's crust.

Finally the shape is determined by

$$f(R, r) := \frac{(1 + NR + \eta r^2)^2 - (N + 1)^2}{r^2} + \frac{\xi}{R} = \text{constant}, \quad (2.14)$$

where  $\xi$  is the constant

$$\xi = \frac{2GM}{b^2} \quad (2.15)$$

with the dimension of inverse length. For Earth the number is

$$\xi = \frac{2MG}{R^3} \frac{R^4}{b^2} = \frac{1.357}{1980} 10^8 \frac{R^4}{b^2} = 67986 \left(\frac{R^2}{b}\right)^2 \quad (2.16)$$

Solutions of (2.14) extend to very large  $R$  only if there is an effective cancellation between the terms of highest power, in  $NR + \eta r^2$ . If  $\eta N$  is positive there can be no cancellation, at any azimuth; hence all the solutions are compact when we pose

$$\eta N \geq 0.$$

We shall find that both parameters are positive.

### 2.5. Angular velocity at equator

The value of the visible angular velocity at equator is found from Eq.(2.10). To an accuracy that neglects terms of relative order  $\epsilon/R$ ,

$$R^2 \omega = \kappa b(1 + N + \eta) + a(\kappa^2 + 1).$$

With (2.12),

$$\omega = \frac{b}{R^2} \left( \kappa(1 + N + \eta) - \sqrt{\kappa^2 + 1}(N + 1) \right), \quad (2.17)$$

where  $R$  is the polar radius and for,  $\kappa \gg 1$ ,

$$\omega \approx \frac{b}{R^2} \kappa \eta. \quad (2.18)$$

e

### 2.4. Overview of results

The two parameters  $N$  and  $\xi$  form a 2-space with the latter as abscissa; it divides into a lower region (roughly  $N < 1$ ) where the planets have a ring, and a complementary upper region where they do not, separated by a “ring-no-ring” boundary. See Fig.4, where three versions of this dividing line are shown, for  $\epsilon = 1/300$  and with  $\eta = .01, .05$  and  $.1$  from high to low. In the same figure we have shown nearly vertical lines of dots, a “trajectory” for each of four planets. The coordinates of the dots on each of the planetary trajectories give a near-perfect fit to the measured ellipsoid of the respective planet.




Figure 4: The abscissa is the parameter  $\xi$  and the ordinate is  $N$ .

Fig. 4 shows the result of calculations as points in the plane of the parameters  $\xi$  and  $N$ , each dot representing a near perfect fit to the ellipsoid. Each line of dots consist of points with coordinates that give perfect fits to the shape of the respective planet, without rings on the upper part. Results of the calculation are tabulated in the Appendix.

It may be permissible to think of this diagram as an **evolution diagram**, each planet evolving upwards towards a state of greater compression, and loosing its rings as it crosses the ring-no-ring dividing line. Earth lost its rings long ago; it is to be placed on the upper part of its trajectory, well above the  $\eta = .1$  line.

Increasing  $N$  means higher compressibility at the center; Earth may have  $N$  as high as 2 while Mars is less compressed and may have  $N = 1$  or less. Since planets are likely to become more compressed over time we expect planets to evolve upwards. This is in accord with speculations that Mars may have had a ring in the evolutionary recent past. Uranus and Neptune still have rings and must have  $N \leq .3$  if our model is applicable to them. This means that they are more compressible than Mars and much more compressible than Earth, in agreement with observation. Results for Earth are listed in Table 1.

Other aspects of the model, including the equation of state, will be taken up in the connection with the gaseous planets, [Table 1 on Earth](#)

Parameter	$N = .1$	.3	1	1.2	1.5
$\xi$	3.075	3.23	3.28	3.36	3.50
$\xi_0$	.6	2.7	.28	4.9	7.8
$\kappa\eta$	3.075/.6	3.23,2.7	3.28	3.36/4.9	3.50/7.8

### 3. Earth and Mars

The polar radius is our unit of length. We are mostly interested in shapes that are almost spherical (leaving aside the planetary rings for the moment), with a small equatorial bulge. To find surfaces that include a point on the equator with radius  $s = 1 + \epsilon$  we write Eq.(2.14) in the form

$$B(R, r) := f(R, r) - f(s, s) = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

Note that  $f(s, s)$  is a constant. The equatorial radius is a zero of the function  $B(r, r)$  and after division by  $r - s$  this equation reduces to a cubic. For planets without rings this cubic does not have positive roots.

The measurable parameter  $\epsilon$  has replaced the value of the function  $f$ . However, there are still 3 parameters left,  $N, \eta$  and  $\xi$ , and it is difficult to survey all possibilities. We shall try to find our way around this difficulty by looking at individual planets.

If Earth is an ellipsoid with eccentricity  $\epsilon$  and the polar radius is normalized to unity, then the shape is

$$R - 1 = \epsilon \sin^2 \theta; \quad R_{eq} = 1 + \epsilon,$$

with  $\epsilon = .00335$ . With  $s = 1.00335$ , the locus  $B(R, r) = 0$  passes through the equator at  $R = r = s$ , and through the pole. Fittings of shapes are relative to this ellipsoid, with the observed value of  $\epsilon$ .

### 3.1 The quality of the fits, examples

Very good fits to the ellipsoid are achieved with  $N = 2$  and both of the following  $\eta = .092$ ,  $\xi = 3$ ,  $\eta = .1$ ,  $\xi = 3.5$ . The value  $N = 2$  was suggested by the measured density profile shown below, in Fig.5.

We tried  $\eta = .1$  and  $N = 2$ , leaving only  $\xi$  to be varied. The locus is a curve that, at a small scale, resembles the geoid, the fit is perfect at the pole and at the equator. We examined the error at nine intermediate azimuths and found that a perfect fit would require  $\xi$  to vary from 0 to 3. But if we fixed  $\xi = 3$  the relative error was never larger than  $10^{-4}$ .

The conclusion is that the identification of the planetary shape with a locus of  $C$  through the pole and the equator appears to be natural and that the precise determination of the parameters applicable to each planet remains available for the fitting to additional data.

### 3.2 Density profile, range of $N$

Earth is unique among the planets in that the density profile has been reliably estimated, see Fig. 5. A good fit to the central core is not possible since both  $N$  and  $\eta$  must be positive. This can be understood since the constitution of the earth is far from uniform; the model assumption that the interior is a single phase is therefore an over-simplification. A fair approximation to the observed density suggests that  $N$  lie in the interval

$$1.5 < N < 2.5. \quad (3.1)$$




Figure 5: Observationally estimated density profile of Earth.




Figure 6: Model equatorial density profile of Earth for two values of the principal parameter  $N$ . Heavy lines  $\eta = .01$ , lighter lines,  $\eta = .2$

### 3.3 Rings, or not

Random sampling of the parameters of the theoretical configurations reveal that the expected, nearly spherical shape of the body is not always realized. For example, in the case that  $\eta = .1$ ,  $N = 1.2$  we get a good approximation to the ellipsoidal shape of the Earth with  $\xi = 3.3$ . But if the value of  $\xi$  is increased to 3.525, then a planetary ring appears, as shown in Fig. 4, moving horizontally towards the right. For still larger values of  $\xi$  the ring eventually dwarfs the planet.

in Fig. 7. We have crossed the ring-no-ring divider in Fig. 4, moving horizontally towards the right. For still larger values of  $\xi$  the ring eventually dwarfs the planet.




Figure 7: Ring around Earth; about to disappear. Parameters  $N = 1.2, \xi = 3.525$ . For smaller values of  $\xi$  there is no ring.

Nothing in our model relates to the hemispheric asymmetry of Mars; that is, the depression of the northern hemisphere. But we do know the bulge ratio,  $\epsilon = 1/135$ , and elaborate models of the planet suggest a plausible density profile, shown in Fig. 5. We obtain excellent fits to the ellipsoid from  $N = .7, \xi = 1.5$  to  $N = 3, \xi = 1.75$ .




Figure 8: Density profile of Mars has a thick mantle and a metallic core.




Figure 9: Density profile for Mars from Eq.(2.8), with  $N = 1.7$ .

The idea of a ring around Earth can not be entertained, but the planet Mars is another matter. The trajectory for Mars was calculated with the equatorial bulge ratio  $\epsilon = 1/135$ . We fixed the value of  $\eta$  at .1 as for Earth and for each of a sequence of values of  $N$  we searched for the value of  $\xi$  that gives the best approximation to the idealized shape of planet Mars. The lowest value of  $N$  for which such a fit exists is  $N = .8$ .

It is notorious that Mars shows clear evidence of having once been furrowed with large gulleys by the action of water (on the southern hemisphere). It has been widely interpreted in terms of a cataclysmic event, eons past. Our calculations suggest that the value of  $N$  was once lower, that a ring actually did exist around Mars, and that the ring (consisting mostly



of water or ice) disappeared as a result of the slow increase in  $N$ . The alternative, that the ring may have fallen as the result of a passage very close to Earth, is less appealing, since we regard the ring as natural and expect it to resume its original shape after a shock. If it did not, then it means that the property  $N$  has evolved and that the equations of motion no longer supports a ring. The absence of surface features on the northern hemisphere also supports the idea that the fall of the ring was relatively non violent. For information about the Geology of mars see Carr and Head (2010) [25] and Carr, M. [26].

#### 4. Neptune and Uranus. Venus and Pluto

The shapes of Uranus and Neptune are quoted in the literature but actually they are poorly known (Bertka and Fei 1990) [27]. If we treat them as close analogues of Earth and Mars, then they would appear far to the left in Fig. 4, as shown. The progression of values of the parameter  $N$  from Neptune to Earth suggests increasing compression.

Pluto is far out among the outer planets but its small mass is a more relevant parameter (Helled, Anderson and Schubert 2010) [28]. Venus has a complicated structure and winds that are not parallel to the equatorial plane. Both are essentially spherical but Venus has a small bulge “that is induced by winds”. Venus also has a very dense atmosphere with a pressure of about 92 Earth atmospheres. For all these reasons neither Venus nor Pluto should be included in this study. Nevertheless, we assigned very small bulges and got good fits to the ellipsoid shape, some of which are recorded in Table 1 and plotted in Fig. 10.




Figure 10: Speculative development of Venus and Pluto. The solid line is the ring-no-ring boundary. This would show why Venus and Pluto do not have rings.

While  $\eta \approx .1$  works well for most of the planets, Venus and Pluto require a value closer to .01. In this figure both are plotted with this value of  $\eta$ . All planets except Saturn and Jupiter have “trajectories” determined by a best fit to the respective ellipsoid.

#### 5. Saturn and Jupiter. The Sun. Haumea

The search for a simple model for Saturn, initially with no expectation of accounting for anything more than the equatorial bulge, revealed that rings are a dominant feature of our model. The existence of rings gives us an additional measurable parameter, the mean radius standing in for the parameters of a complicated ring system. The radius and the width of the ring can be chosen within wide limits, but the model has not accounted for the flat ring system that is actually seen. The radius of a ring is closely related to the value of  $\eta$ .

In the case of Saturn, we began our study by looking for a fit to the main body, ignoring the extravagant system of rings. Attempts to fit the model to ellipsoids without rings, with

an equatorial bulge ratio of 1:10 failed. We did not persist in this, because: 1. Observation of the gaseous giants does not favor our model of a phase transition at the surface. 2. The surface of a gas sphere is not well defined: experimental data usually refer to isobars. See for example Marsh (2017) [29] and Lindal, Sweetnam and Esleman (1985) [30].

A photograph taken by NASA above the North Pole of Saturn, shows a hexagonal flow and 6 predicted positions for future whorls, Fig 11. This phenomenon has been characterized as a Rossby wave (Marsh 2017 [31], Rossby 1939) [32].




Figure 11: This photograph taken by Voyager of the North pole of Saturn shows a regular hexagon flow as well as a remarkable, solitary, internal moon. It shows a remarkable similarity to the shape with six whorls of the symmetric model in the next figure.




Figure 12: Flow lines of the function (5.2) with  $a = k = 1, A = .5$ . This flow is a **stationary solution** of our model; a **prediction** for future observations.

Refer to the general expression (2.4) for the velocity. To produce the picture in Fig. 12 we assumed a purely irrotational flow ( $\tau = 0$ ) with 6-fold two-dimensional rotational symmetry:

$$\Phi = \Im \left( a \ln z + A(1 + (kz)^6)^{-1} \right), \quad A = \text{constant.}, \dots z := x + iy. \quad (5.1)$$

The first term is the elementary flow  $a \vec{\nabla} \theta = (A/r^2)(-y, x, 0)$  with unidirectional, circular flow; the remainder has six-dimensional rotational symmetry. The gradient of  $\Phi$  is

$$d\Phi = \left( a + \frac{A(kr)^6}{D^2} \left( (1 + (kr)^{12}) \cos(6\phi) + 2(kr)^6 \right) \right) d\phi + \frac{A \sin(6\phi)}{D^2} (1 - (kr)^{12})(kr)^5 kdr.$$

where  $1/D = |1 + (kz)^6|$ . For the square we get the surprisingly simple formula

$$(\vec{\nabla}\Phi)^2 = \frac{a^2}{r^2} + \frac{2a}{r^2} \frac{A(kr)^6}{D^2} \left( (1 + (kr)^{12}) \cos(6\phi) + 2(kr)^{12} \right) + \frac{(kA)^2 (kr)^{10}}{D^2}.$$

To first order in the perturbation the modified expression for the function  $f$  in Eq. (2.14) becomes, for some constant  $\alpha$ ,

$$f(R, r) := \frac{(1 + NR + \eta r^2)^2 - (N + 1)^2}{r^2} + \alpha \frac{r^4}{D^2} \left( (1 + (kr)^6) \cos(6\phi) + 2(kr)^6 \right) + \frac{\xi}{R}.$$

It turns out to be possible to produce hexagonal rings, but no further contact with observation was discovered, so far. However, with the extra term it becomes possible to imitate the ellipsoidal shape of Saturn.

The hexagon pattern on Saturn has been alternatively described as a Rossby wave. [32].

Jupiter presents some of the same difficulties for analysis, but lacks the interesting hexagonal feature of Saturn. We have not constructed a model for the largest planet.

The Sun is still further from our present objective, and so are galaxies. We present, however, in Fig. 5.3, an object that recalls, by its flatness, the shape of some galaxies; the aspect ratio is about  $10^9$ .




Figure 13: A shape produced by the model, suggesting an application to galaxies (cut off at the left)

Finally, here is a portrait of one of the smallest object in the solar system, Haumea is a small moon or mini-planet in the outer Kuiper belt, remarkable for its odd shape.




Figure 14: A model likeness to Haumea.

And here is the real Haumea.




Figure 15: A photograph of Haumea taken by Voyager. The ring is barely visible on the original photograph.

## 6. Summary and conclusions

The most significant result of this paper is that an action for hydrodynamics actually provides an effective approach to real, astrophysical problems. The discovery that the rings seen on minor planets are natural within the formalism is a real surprise and source of encouragement. It is interesting to invent a special historical event sequence for each ring system, but we can now expect that some of them may be the result of a natural development.

All the models presented in this paper, except for the case of Saturn, postulate the simplest possible flows. The rings of the Jovian planets, with their system of multiple and very thin rings, present a challenge. Figure (16) shows a part of a model with a very different flow, with

$$\Phi = \tau = J_0(kr) \sinh(kz), \quad \vec{X} = 0. \quad (6.1)$$




Figure 16: An attempt to imitate the rings of Saturn, showing a portion of a thin neighborhood of the equatorial plane, with a system of rings at semi-regular intervals. The parameter  $k$  sets the scale, the same in both directions. The thickness of the rings is reduced by increasing  $k$ ; in the illustration  $k = 2$ .

1. The equatorial bulge of a planet changes the gravitational field and this affects the calculations, though often to a minor degree. For each of the objects in the solar system

it is important to consider other complications that have hardly been mentioned in this paper, including the following.

2. The atmosphere was treated as empty; that leaves room for improvements. For the gaseous planets another model, without a surface or with a discontinuous density of the van der Waals type, may be indicated. The effect of magnetic fields and radiation must be included. We may attempt to extract an equation of state from the calculations in Section 2.3. Without a determination of the entropy this can only amount to an evaluation of the value of the internal energy density. If we could eliminate the coordinates from Eq.(2.13) in favor of the density, then that would give us the function  $u(\rho, s)$ . But since the left side of that equation depends on two of the coordinates this would give a result that, at best, can be interpreted in terms of a variable composition which is not envisaged by the model. However, this program cannot lead to a homogeneous equation of state.

3. Angular momentum conservation is a subtle issue that merits a separate investigation. It is the sum of two parts, involving an orbital part  $\vec{x} \wedge \vec{v}$  and the spin  $\dot{\vec{X}} \wedge \vec{m}$ . Only the sum is conserved but the first part is more likely to be observed. Even though the solutions found are stationary in the usual sense we have found a linear dependence on  $t$  in each of the two parts.

4. A problem that can be approached in the same spirit is the shape of galaxies. The inclusion of stress has a sensible effect on the famous anomalous velocity curves.

## Acknowledgements.

An early version of this paper was posted on arXiv.org in May 2018 as arXiv 1803.09625 gen-ph and included in the book (Fronsdal 2020a). Copyright Christian Fronsdal.

Data available from the author.

## References

- [1] Lagrange, J.M., Taurinensia, ii., Oeuvres, Paris, 1867-92 (1760)
- [2] Bernoulli, D., "Hydrodynamica", Dulsecker, Argentoratium (1738)
- [3] D'Alembert, J., "Essay d'une Nouvelle Theorie de la Resistance des Fluides. Acad. R. des Sciences de Paris (1747).
- [4] Fronsdal, C., *Adiabatic Thermodynamics of Fluids. From Hydrodynamics to General Relativity*. World Scientific (2020a)
- [5] Landau, L., "Theory of Superfluid Helium II", Phys. Rev. **60**, 356-358 (1941)
- [6] Rasetti, M., Regge, T.: "Quantum vortices and diff (R3)." In: *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Volume 20. Physica **80 A**, 217 (1973)
- [7] Kalb, M. and Ramond, P. "Classical direct interstring action". Phys. Rev. **D 9** (8): 2273-2284 (1974)
- [8] Zheltukin, A., "On brane symmetry", arXiv.1409.6655.
- [9] Ogievetskij, V.I. and Palubarinov, V. "Minimal interactions between spin 0 and spin 1 fields", J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys. (U.S.S.R.) **46** 1048-1055 (1964)
- [10] Seliger, R.L. and Whitman, G.B, "Variational principles in continuum mechanics", Proc.Roy. **A 305**, 1-25 (1968)

- [11] Fronsdal, C., “Stability analysis of Cylindrical Couette flow of compressible fluids, *Phys. of Fluids*”, **32** 126117 doi 10.1063/5.0031200 (2020)
- [12] Fronsdal, C., “Hydrodynamical Sources for Gravitational Waves”, in progress.
- [13] L. Beauvalet, L., Lainey, V., Arlot, J.-E. and Binzel, R. P.  
“Dynamical parameter determinations in Pluto’s system,  
Expected constraints from the New Horizons mission to Pluto code”,  
*A&A* 540, A65 DOI: 10.1051/0004-6361/201116952 (2012)
- [14] Kolb, S.M., Stute, M., Kley, W. and Mignone, A. “Radiation hydrodynamics integrated in the PLUTO ‘code’”. *A&A* 559, A80  
DOI: 10.1051 / 0004-6361 / 201321499 (2013)
- [15] Schutz, B.F. Jr., “Perfect fluids in General Relativity, Velocity potentials and a variational principle”, *Phys.Rev.* **D2**, 2762-2771 (1970)
- [16] Fronsdal, C. “Ideal stars in General Relativity”,  
*Gen. Rel. Grav.* **39**, 1971-2000 (2007)
- [17] Taub, A.H., “General Relativistic Variational Principle for Perfect Fluids”,  
*Phys. Rev.* **94**, 1468 (1954)
- [18] Hall, H.E. and Vinen, W.F., “The Rotation of Liquid Helium II. The Theory of Mutual Friction in Uniformly Rotating Helium II”, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 23,  
doi: 10.1098/rspa.1956.0215 (1956)
- [19] Fetter A.I., “Rotating Trapped Bose-Einstein condensates”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** 647 (2009)
- [20] Lane, J.H., “On the Theoretical temperature of the sun; under the hypothesis of a Gaseous Mass maintaining its Volume by its internal Heat, and depending on the Laws of Gases as known to Terrestrial experiment”,  
*Am.J.Sc.&Arts*, **50** 57-74 (1870)
- [21] Couette, M., “Oscillations tournantes d’un solide de révolution en contact avec un fluide visqueux,” *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **105**, 1064-1067 (1887)
- [22] Mallock, A., *Proc.R.Soc.* **45** 126 (1889)
- [23] Mallock, A., *Ohilos.Trans.R.Soc.* **187**, 41 (1896)
- [24] Fitzpatrick, R. “Newtonian Mechanics”, Lecture notes, University of Texas, available on Prof. Fitzpatrick’s web page (2020)
- [25] Carr, M. and Head, *The geological history of Mars*, 2010
- [26] Carr, M. (2006). *The surface of Mars*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-87201-4 (2006)
- [27] Bertka, C.M. and Fei, Y., “Density profile of an SNC model Martian interior and the 25-moment-of-inertia factor of Mars”, *EP Sci.Lett.* **157** 79-88 (1990)
- [28] Helled, R., Anderson, J.D. and Schubert, G. “Uranus and Neptune: Shape and rotation.” *Icarus* **210** 446-454 (2010)
- [29] Marsh, G. E., “Enigma of Saturn’s North-Polar Hexagon”, PACS, 96.30.Mh 96.15 Hy; 96.15.Xy arXiv:1711.00338 17 [physics.ao-ph] (2017)
- [30] Lindal, G.F., Sweetnam, D.N. and Esleman, V.R. “The atmosphere of saturn: an analysis of the voyager radio occultation measurements”.  
*The Astronomical J.* **90** (6) 1136-1147, June (1985)
- [31] Rossby, C.-G., 1939: “Relation between variations in the intensity of the zonal circulation of the atmosphere and the displacements of the semi-permanent centers of action.”, *J. Mar. Res.*, **2**, 38–55 (1939)

## Appendix 2. Tables

Table 2: The solar system

Body	Radius Km	Mass $10^{23}$ g	Density $gcm^{-3}$	Bulge ratio	Period Days
Moon	1738	735	3.34	small	28
Pluto	1188	318E	2.03	1:3 300	1.4
Mercury	2,440	3,300	5.4	small	59
Mars	3376	6,419	3.93	1:136	1.026
Venus	6500	5680	5.2	1:3,200	243
Earth	6,357	60,000	5,515	1:300	1
Uranus	24,973	8.66E+5	1.318	1:44	370
Neptune	34,342	1.03E+6	1.638	1:59	367
Saturn	54,364	5.69E+6	.687	1:10	.44
Jupiter	66,854	1.9E+7	1.326	1:14	.414
Jupiter	66,854	1.9E+7	1.326	1:14	.14
Sun	.7E+6	2.0E+10	1.41	0	24

Table 3: The parameters

Body	Radius	2GM	Period	N	$\xi$	$\sigma$	$\kappa$
Earth	1	1	1	1.5	3.4	2.8	8.2
Mars	.53	.11	1.03	.8	1.5	2.4	2.1
Neptune	3.9	17.2	.67	.2	.68	4.0	27
Uranus	4.01	14.6	.72	.2	.55	4.2	33
Venus	.95	.82	243	.3	.23	9.6	7380