



ERS PUBLISHING

JERSY

Journal of the European Royal Society
BIOLOGY – CHEMISTRY – GEOLOGY – PHYSICS

ISSN 2166-2444
print
ISSN 2166-2452
online

volume 4

issue 1

2 0 1 5



J. Eur. R. Soc. (JERSY)

WWW.EUROPEANROYALSOCIETY.ORG



Letters to the Editor

Theoretical value of Newtonian constant G confirmed by the International Bureau of Weights & Measures in Paris, France

HM Mensur Omerbashich, the King of Bosnia

The Bosnian Royal Family, P.O. Box 1, Sarajevo, Bosnia

hm@royalfamily.ba, dvor@bosnianroyalfamily.org

Published: 10 January 2015

Dear Editor:

World oldest authority for scientific constants and the keeper of the original metre standard, the International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM) in Paris, France has accomplished a historic confirmation of my (first-ever) scientific prediction of value of the Newtonian gravitational constant. Known also as the Universal gravitational constant G, it is used for calculating gravitational attraction between two bodies so that value of G determines intensity of the gravity force. Until now, G was the least understood scientific constant of all. From experiment to experiment, and lab to lab, its value varied drastically since the 18th century's estimate by Cavendish, who opened an era of hunt for G.

I computed my value of G absolutely, meaning to the significant accuracy of experiments used for estimating the values of G, as well as for both macroscopic (everyday-to-cosmic) scales (to E-14) and quantum scales (to E-42). For obvious reasons, I do not state confidence intervals.

After converging on it for years, the BIPM has now experimentally matched my theoretical value $6.675\text{E-}11$,¹ as $6.6754\text{E-}11$ – or 0.0000000000675 .² The BIPM had published their new value in 2013, followed by an erratum in 2014, thus updating their new value to $6.6755\text{E-}11$.² Importantly, the 2013 value and its 2014-update differ by no more than ± 1 significant digit (at E-14). The 2013 value,

of $6.6754E-11$, was obtained by averaging results from Cavendish and servo methods.² Importantly also, the Bureau's past estimates have been converging in the significant digit on my G : their preceding, 2001, estimate was $6.6756E-11$.² Curiously, their 2013 value at the same time equals the simple (here the least arbitrary of all) mean of the weighted and simple means of the BIPM 2014-updated estimates from the two classical methods.

Besides being identical to my theoretical value beyond any reasonable doubt and continuously, the BIPM's results and methodology represent the only classical modeling among all experimentalist groups that is capable of taking into account most of the effects of magnified mass resonance as arising normally within the georesonator³ settings. As no significant objections have been raised in a subsequent year their 2013/2014 value(s) can now be regarded as the BIPM official value. Both agree significantly with my theoretical value.

Remarkably, my value of G scales well together with value of another physical constant too – the velocity of light, c .¹ Since my equations¹ describe gravity (by virtue of describing values of G as a function) in absolute terms, i.e., while being independent of either scale (energy) or time, it turns out that Multiverse is indeed real, but not necessarily of an inflationary type. This follows from possible incompleteness of my equations. Expressing the value of one physical constant via another's enables generally and for the first time independent testing of the experimental setups that are used for estimating physical constants.

My discovery¹ also revealed that fundamental oscillation frequency of a mass-body (grave-mode period of its vibration) is not a random number as

previously believed. Instead, masses are precisely tuned to their environment via ratios of G and c .

The BIPM confirmation has broad implications. Namely in the past, science relied on preconceived notions about laws and constants, including a belief that fundamental constants such as G are nondeducible. Given my result's uniqueness (one of the kind), scalability (expressions for values of both G and c can be given for macroscopic and quantum scales alike), and a radically independent confirmation which has been also converging (see above), coincidences can be safely ruled out. Thus, as it is normal in science, my theoretical value of G renders the BIPM's 2013/2014 experimental value and approach as the only correct ones, while those obtained/used by other experimentalist groups are invalid and erroneous. Since both the theory to predict the value of G , as well as the correct experimental setup to verify that theory, are now known, attempts to "improve experimental setups for estimating value of G ", such as for example⁴, are unjustified. They would be equivalent of the attempts to prove innately vague theories, such as for example proving Inflationary Theory via BICEP experiments, or in any other way for that matter.

The dimensions in physics thus seem to be a mere remnant of the long-abandoned geocentric philosophy that allowed Newton and his pupils to freely attach (otherwise nonsensical) units to G in order to close Newtonian physics mathematically.

The BIPM's verifications of my value of G since 2001, also support Hyperresonance Theory⁵, now the main candidate for replacing falsified Quantum Field Theory and failing String Theory. Amazingly, centuries since established, the BIPM remains the physics authority for constants and units.

[1] Omerbashich, M. (2006) Springtide-Induced Magnification of Earth Mantle Resonance Causes Tectonics and Conceals Universality of Physics at All Scales. Online: <http://lanl.arxiv.org/abs/physics/0608026>, p.18.

[2] Quinn, T., Parks, H., Speake, C., Davis, R. (2013) Improved Determination of G Using Two Methods. Online: <http://journals.aps.org/prl/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.101102>; Erratum: Quinn et al. (2014) Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 039901 (2014). Online: <http://journals.aps.org/prl/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.039901>

[3] Omerbashich, M. (2007) Magnification of Mantle Resonance as a Cause of Tectonics. Geodynamica Acta 20 (6):369-383. Online: <https://sites.google.com/site/omerbashich/GeoActa.pdf?attredirects=0>

[4] Rosi, G., Cacciapuoti, L., Sorrentino, F., Menchetti, M., Prevedelli, M., Tino G.M. (2015) Measurement of the Gravity-Field Curvature by Atom Interferometry. Physics 8, 1 (2015). DOI:10.1103/Physics.8.1.

[5] Omerbashich, M. (2012) Hyperresonance Unifying Theory and the Resulting Law. J. Eur. R. Soc. (1)1:5-11. Online: <http://journal.theroyalsociety.eu/index.php?journal=JERSY&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=E22451112HA>
Annotated: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00808674>