# Dr. Milo Wolff and W. Gilmour discuss Wave Density

## If you want Energy from controllable fusion power instead of oil then you better read this!

## You can contact Wolff & Gilmour using the links below:

## Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

Begin forwarded message:

> From: milo wolff <milo.wolff@quantumMatter.com>
> Date: June 14, 2010 10:06:16 PM PDT
> To: W Gilmour <wgilmour@I-zoom.net>,
> Cc: milo wolff <milo.wolff@quantumMatter.com>
> Subject: Re: Speed of C
>
>
> On Jun 14, 2010, at 1:01 PM, W Gilmour wrote:
>
>> Hello Dr Milo Wolff ;
>> Daniel Fitzpatrick suggested that I forward this speculation to you
>> as you may find it interesting.
>>

>> Hi Mr. W. Gilmore and Fitz,
>
> Yes. Very interesting.
>
> In my opinion your coincidences are real properties of the Universe.
> They relate to the fact that:
>  1.) all properties of matter depend on the density of the  "space'
> in which the matter exists.
>  2.) Space density , in turn,  depends on the total of all the
> waves in the Universe.
>
> These 2 properties are two of the 3 basic axioms of the Universe, of
> the Wave Structure of Matter (WSM). They underlie all the Natural
> Laws - the basis of all physics and science. Thus your results are
> important and fundamental.
>
> A neat summary of them is the "Equation of the Cosmos" that you seem
> to have independently found. Congratulations.
>
> You can find the "Equation" in my books: Schroedinger's Universe"
> and "Exploring the Physics of the Unknown Universe." Both are sold
> at Amazon.com
>
> These properties that you have  found also have other consequences
> well worth exploring - Keep up the good work.
>
> Milo.
>
> P.S. IMHO,  'Inflation' and the Big Bang have little scientific
> basis. They are part of Fantasyland.
>
>
>> Here is a simple speculation using Newtonian mechanics.
>>
>> Lets suppose the properties of light  [mass equivalence according to
>> E=mc^2] are set by the value of the mass of the universe as a whole
>> out to the visible horizon [sort of a Machs principle type of
>> argument]
>>
>> Lets suppose that we treat the universe as a potential well [out to
>> the
>> visible horizon] and that the minimum kinetic energy of a photon is
>> exactly equal to the minimum required to raise it out of this
>> potential
>> well.
>> This would require that    mC^2=GMm/R     [where M=Mu mass of

>> Univ (out to Horizon)]
>> Plugging in the values yields. Mu/Ru=1.347x10^27 Kg/meter
>> Mass of the universe divided by the current radius, [both out to
>> the limits of the
>> visible horizon.
>>
>> You might ask, what the heck does Mu/Ru give us? But lets carry on
>> and see where it leads.
>>
>> In order to see if this ratio is even in the right ballpark, we could
>> use this Mu/Ru to calculate a density of the universe and see if
>> it's even
>> close to what is observed and now accepted, i.e. critical density.
>> Using the currently accepted value of the Hubbles constant and latest
>> research indicates a flat universe, we use Euclidean geometry where
>> density=M/4.189R^3.
>> Working out a density yields 10^-29 gm/cm^3.
>>
>> This not only is in the right ballpark, it's bang on, right at the
>> critical density.
>>
>> What else might we do to see if Mu/Ru is correct?
>> We arrived at Mu/Ru by using a photon traveling the maximum
>> distance across the mass of the universe out to the visible horizon.
>> Why not try the other extreme, and use the minimum distance that a
>> photon
>> may traverse and the mass of a photon, and see if
>> this ratio is even close?
>> The plank units come to mind where the plank mass equals
>> 2.1767x10^-8KG and the plank length equals 1.616x10^-35 m.
>>
>> Dividing yields, m/r= 1.347x10^27 Kg/meter
>>
>> It's Identical! The same ratio has returned!
>> We seem to have arrived at the same ratio from three different
>> starting points. Could this just be coincidence?
>>
>> A further speculation suggests a VSL theory.
>> The current contender against Inflationary theory, is a varying
>> velocity of C theory put forward by John Moffat, University of
>> Toronto as well
>> as Dimitri Nanopoulos and Keith Randall of Texas A&M University.
>> So for the final speculation we look to see what the original
>> expression mC^2=GMm/R, has to say about C as a f(n) of time.
>> If we assume the mass of the universe is constant [safe],
>> And that G is a constant [not so safe, I suspect G may change &

>> complicate things].
>> We see that the velocity C squared is a f(n) of the reciprocal of R
>> and thus of time.
>> I.e. C decreases as the universe expands [evolves]
>>
>> Example;
>> At 10^-35 sec [plank time] after the big bang, it would yield a
>> Velocity of C=10^39 m/sec. [At time of decoupling C would be less]
>> Inflation doesn't enter into the equations at this point and
>> complicate
>> things, since VSL theories replace inflation.
>>
>> This value of M/R (if correct) may be significant, since it is
>> determined using hard empirical constants rather than soft
>> observational data.
>> Comments appreciated
>> Thanks
>> W Gilmour
>