

## Throwing a bit more light on R.T. Cahill's Quantum Foam theory

I accept the mathematical proof of T. D. Martin that clearly shows the underlying flaw in Reginald T. Cahill's Quantum Foam theory

<http://www.gravityresearch.org/pdf/GRI-030810.pdf>

however

R. T. Cahill does begin with two assumptions that are clearly correct:

*1. He has the speed of gravity down correctly.*

*This is important because today half the scientists believe in one speed but the astronomers all believe in the faster speed that Cahill assumes.*

**The speed of light is  $3 \times 10^8$  meters per second.** The problem with a  $3 \times 10^8$  meters per second gravitational speed is that it is far too slow for astronomers because they all know that with this *slow* speed of gravity, our universe can't be stable.

Tom Van Flandern, cited by Cahill, showed that since gravity had no aberration and light did, then the speed of gravity had to be much, much faster than the speed of light and almost an instantaneous velocity. This was

Newton's assumption as well.

In my e-mails to Tom Van Flandern, before he died, he agreed that a gravitational velocity of  $9 \times 10^{16}$  meters per second was an acceptable velocity as far as the astronomical group was concerned because at this velocity the universe would indeed be stable and this speed would also give gravity no aberration.

Tom Van Flandern did not like the term  $c^2$  at all saying, "You cannot square a speed!"

But nevertheless a speed of  $9 \times 10^{16}$  meters per second would appear to us as  $c^2$  or the **speed of light** ( $3 \times 10^8$  meters per second) **squared**.

A speed of gravity, astronomers can live with, therefore, is  $9 \times 10^{16}$  meters per second.

A velocity of  $9 \times 10^{16}$  meters per second is an almost instantaneous velocity that is well within the parameters of what the astronomical section of Van Flandern's Yale University; most other astronomical departments in other universities and [Van Flandern](#) would accept.

- 2. Cahill assumes the surroundings, in the background, are affecting our gravity. This too is absolutely correct. This is Mach's principle. But the problem with using this background data is that until you understand exactly why these spiral galaxy arms are exceeding their escape velocity then you must not depend on the accuracy of this background data because there is simply more happening there that you are still not aware of at this present time.*

Even though T. D. Martin gave Reginald T. Cahill a failing grade, I'm giving his efforts a *Shakespeare era rating* of "passing fair" because Cahill's thinking is far

ahead of the affenstahl group that dictates our present science beliefs: He is indeed correct on these two important points that I've pointed out herein. **R. T. Cahill** is one of the very few today who can actually think.

**For more about where this quantity  $c^2$  is coming from**  
**see:** <http://www.amperefitz.com/assymfree.htm>

Be sure to read: <http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm>

See this short, clear picture: <http://www.amperefitz.com/principle-of-equivalence.htm>

Also <http://www.amperefitz.com/aphaseuniverse.htm>

And <http://www.rbduncan.com/schrod.htm>

There's a lot more too.

And this you can find out by buying my latest book *Universities Asleep at the Switch* at Amazon.com or by reading it FREE simply by clicking the following links:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/unvasleep.htm> (This link is faster if you have dial up.)

[http://www.amperefitz.com/ua\\_20071020\\_ck\\_ds\\_jm\\_ds.pdf](http://www.amperefitz.com/ua_20071020_ck_ds_jm_ds.pdf) (This is the book FREE in Adobe.)

Over 4 Decades of Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers & Thoughts <http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.htm>

Web pages are at: <http://www.amperefitz.com> & <http://www.rbduncan.com>

Thanks for reading this. Let me know what YOU think. e-mail is [Thlnker@indiainfo.com](mailto:Thlnker@indiainfo.com)

This page can be copied and published by anyone as long as it is copied and published in its entirety.

Feb. 2, 2010

[Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)

