

Re: GRAVITATION

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-06/msg02331.html>

- *From:* srp <srp2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 25 Jun 2006 17:51:18 GMT
-

Phineas T Puddleduck a écrit :

In article <449E9060.2040505@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, srp <srp2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

This means that if you want to use G in the hydrogen atom, you have to recalculate G with values that are meaningful to the hydrogen atom, and which are

$$r = \text{Bohr radius} = 5.291772083E-11 \text{ m}$$

$$M = \text{mass of the proton} = 1.67262158E-27 \text{ kg}$$

and from the frequency of the Bohr ground state energy ($f = 6.57968391E15 \text{ Hz}$) you can calculate T

$$T = 1/\text{frequency} = 1.519829851E-16 \text{ s}$$

If you recalculate G for the hydrogen atom, you get

$$G = (4 \pi^2 r^3)/(M T^2) = 1.514172983E29$$

Following this on logically, are you saying G is a function of scale?
This is the bit I can't agree with.

I assume nothing at all.

I just apply the logical parameters that G was defined from.
Ref Georges Gamow "GRAVITY"

From that definition, G turns out not to be a constant at all.

Or else, maybe you can put a finger for me on where the mathematical

Re: GRAVITATION

sequence is not proper.

André Michaud

.