



HAL
open science

An almost unlimited energy source potentially hidden behind the "weak" gravity force

Alain Haraux

► **To cite this version:**

Alain Haraux. An almost unlimited energy source potentially hidden behind the "weak" gravity force. 2022. hal-03775699

HAL Id: hal-03775699

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03775699>

Preprint submitted on 12 Sep 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

An almost unlimited energy source potentially hidden behind
the “weak” gravity force

Alain Haraux

Sorbonne Université, Université Paris-Diderot SPC, CNRS, INRIA,
Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, LJLL, F-75005, Paris, France.
e-mail: haraux@ann.jussieu.fr

Abstract

Although the gravitational force is well known for its extremely weak value in the framework of ordinary macroscopic objects at our scale, the generally discredited framework of pushing gravity might lead us to discover a huge source of energy which is mostly lost during the action of the gravific force due to the large distances between nucleons compared with their diameters. In case this energy is identified and partially diverted from its role in gravity, we would benefit from a gigantic reservoir of energy reminiscent of Nikola Tesla's dream of a free unlimited energy source .

Key words: gravitation, gravitons, energy

1 Introduction

It is quite instructive to compare the intensity of the gravitational force between two protons situated at a unit distance $d = 1$ meter from each other with the attractive force between a proton and an electron in the same situation (or the repulsive force between two isolated protons). In practice, of course, both forces are too small to be measured and at such a distance, huge objects compared with the particles could interfere and modify the result. But in theory these forces can be computed using the Newton and Coulomb's formulas: for the gravitational force one obtains $F \sim 1,9 \cdot 10^{-64} N$ and for the electrostatic force $F \sim 2,3 \cdot 10^{-28} N$. The electrostatic force overpasses the gravitational action by a factor greater than 10^{36} . This is why physicists say that the gravitational force is extremely weak. And many scientists tried to find an explanation for this surprising fact.

The weakness of the gravitational force has motivated some modern theories in which it would be some kind of trace or projection of a much larger force operating essentially in hidden additional dimensions. In the past, Nikola Tesla thought that the origin of that force is actually electromagnetic and gravity is not a fundamental force, just a secondary effect of something else.

Another possible explanation was suggested by the conjecture of Fatio de Duillier, and then Lesage, cf. e.g. [1, 2] according to which gravity might be the result of interaction of matter with tiny unseen very fast moving particles, coming from all directions and called "ultra-mundane", pushing, as a consequence of a mutual 3D shield effect, any pair of massive objects towards each other. The "ultra-mundane corpuscles" (sometimes called gravitons, cf. eg. [9]) can be thought as forming a gas of immaterial particles (like photons) possessing however a linear momentum which can be transferred partially to material particles after a shock. Then the gravitational force can be thought as a pressure, the difference with usual gases that we meet in physics being that the graviton gas can cross the matter and the force is proportional to the volume of matter struck by gravitons rather than any kind of surface. And actually this is only approximative (cf. e.g. [2]) since, among other complicated phenomena, successive layers of matter reduce the number of incoming particles by a small proportion, cf. also [7]. In this model, the gravitational constant G can be seen as representing a local pressure per volume of space. And the final formula for the gravitational force will coincide sharply with Newton's law only when a large number of nuclei are involved and the distances are sufficiently large, but not enough to imply a (possible and not excluded a priori) big variation of the gravitational pressure, a circumstance which is usual in our macroscopic but not extra galactic familiar world.

In the last 3 centuries, many well qualified experts tended to disqualify Lesage's theory, cf. eg. the sample (non exhaustive) list of [5], so that the theory is generally considered unrealistic. However, the idea of "pushing gravity" might provide an explanation for the weakness of the gravific force, since the gravitons would interact solely with the nuclei and matter is essentially made of vacuum separating extremely tiny corpuscles.

In this short note, we show that if a variant of Lesage's theory describes properly the origin of gravitational forces, the kinetic energy travelling during a second inside a unit volume of

space under the form of gravitons is extremely large. Would we be able to divert even an infinitesimal portion of it, then the energy problems of our societies would be solved for a very long time, if not forever.

2 Where does our energy come from?

The question of course also arises concerning our matter, which is equivalent to a form of energy via the celebrated formula $E = Mc^2$. At this level, the present scientific consensus is that both come from the stars, and concerning energy, most of it from the sun. But another scientific consensus is that stars are the result of a long and complex collapsing process in which all the energy comes from gravitational forces. In giant stars which produced larger atoms during another complex physical process, the driving energy is also gravitational. So here we can see that, given a sufficiently long time, the “weak” gravitational force has accumulated enough energy to produce all visible activity on our planet and the solar system. In a sense, all our energy comes from gravity. From this perspective, the origin of gravitational forces is, following Albert Einstein, a major one (if not the only one) among basic questions of fundamental physics.

3 Tesla’s dream of an unlimited free energy.

The great precursor of modern electric technology Nikola Tesla is known for having conjectured the existence of an almost unlimited source of free energy. At some point he was interested in the pushing gravity concept, but it seems that he was looking for an electromagnetic origin of the gravitational force. Tesla did not believe in the formulation of gravity as a local curvature property of space-time, as described by Einstein’s equations, cf. [8] .

4 A lower bound for the energy carried by gravitons.

We claim that if the pushing gravity theory represents reality, the energy brought each second by gravitons inside a small volume of space is enormous. Why is it not perceived? This is a question about interaction of gravitons with matter which, in the framework of pushing gravity, is limited to shocks with the nuclei producing gravity effects as described in the introduction.

Computing the total kinetic energy travelling inside a given volume of space by time unit (in other words, the power of gravitons) most probably requires the knowledge of the gravitons velocity and their mass, in case the last consideration makes sense. But it is, on the other hand, easy to get a rough lower bound (probably very underestimated) of the gravitational power under very simple realistic hypotheses, taking account only of what was already measured on earth.

4.1 Basic hypotheses

In order to estimate this total energy from below, we just need some simple hypotheses which are rather independent of the nature of gravitons.

Hypothesis 1. Around each point in space, the gravitons are coming from all directions in a statistically uniform manner, so that at rest they have no global action on masses.

Hypothesis 2. The average scalar velocity $\|v\|$ of gravitons is high compared with usual velocities met in macroscopic mechanics, in other terms, expressed in meters/second, we have $\|v\| \gg 1$.

Hypothesis 3. Let us use the second as time unit and the meter as unit of length. The total kinetic energy travelling inside a given volume of space during a time interval $[t_0, t_0 + \tau]$ is proportional to τ for sufficiently large values of τ , let us say $\tau \gg 10^{-6}$ to fix the ideas, and is proportional to the volume for a simple spatial domain such as a cube or a sphere with diameter d neither too small nor too large, let us say $10^{-3} < d < 10^3$ to fix the ideas.

Hypothesis 4. The total kinetic energy travelling inside a given volume of space during a time interval $[t_0, t_0 + \tau]$ remains essentially the same if the fixed volume is replaced by a moving volume with a moderate acceleration, in particular a volume subject to “free fall” .

The hypotheses 1 and 2 are classical in the framework of “pushing gravity”. Our hypothesis 3 is two-fold: it allows us to make sense of the idea of a constant energetic power crossing a given spatial region, and to base the calculations in a normalized domain such as a unit cube to make calculations simple. We do not assume that all incoming gravitons are identical with respect to momentum and kinetic energy, but we assume that it is the case “in the mean” with respect to time and space at the macroscopic level. Finally, hypothesis 4 means that small accelerations do not basically change the flux of gravitons acting on a solid body, it is intuitively reasonable considering hypothesis 2.

Concerning the interaction of gravitons with matter, we shall need the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 5. Gravitons have no action on the empty space lying between the nuclei and the electronic orbitals of matter. We also neglect, due to the small mass of electrons, a possible action of the gravitons on the electronic cloud, and we assume that a graviton has a mechanical action on matter only when it enters the spatial region called “nucleus”.

4.2 An estimate from below

To estimate the kinetic energy travelling through a spatial volume during one second, we rely on the five hypotheses listed above. Before starting the computation, let us observe that, in the framework of pushing gravity, hypothesis 3 is of course valid locally (maybe not for very distant objects of the universe) and just reflects the fact that the weight of objects does not change with time, is proportional to the volume for a given substance, and the gravity acceleration is locally constant on earth.

Let us now consider a cube of matter with sides 10 cms and density one, so the mass is 1kg. A cube of ice can give a good approximate representation for this. We have in mind a *lower estimate* of the total energy travelling inside the cube in one second. Let us drop the

cube and try to figure out what happens in the next second.

The cube falls down and at time $t = 1$ the velocity is $g \sim 9,81 \sim 10m/s$. If the earth were not there, the flux of gravitons would be perfectly symmetric and the cube would not move. We shall grossly underestimate the action of gravitons and the speed which they communicate to our falling cube if we replace the earth by an absolute, unlimited, compact “graviton shield” which stops all gravitons coming from below and not only part of them. Classical Newton’s theory, since the mass becomes infinite, would in this case give an infinite value for g , but in the framework of pushing gravity theory, it is not clear whether g can become infinite. Of course we would get a larger estimate if we use for instance the value of g on Jupiter, but that value seems to have been computed and not measured, and we want to rely only on proven facts.

Replacing the earth by that absolute shield, the motion of our ice cube is due to only the “upper” half of the gravitons, since nothing can come from below. We also forget the gravitons rebounding from the ground since they play against the free fall and their contribution would even reinforce our inequality. In addition, only the vertical part of the velocity of gravitons gives rise to a vertical push. So, if we average the kinetic energy with respect to the angle θ with the vertical line, the mean value of the function $\sin^2 \theta$ on the interval $(\pi/2, +\pi/2)$ will appear in factor of the total energy, diminishing the effective energy by a factor $1/2$. Combined with the fact that half of the gravitons are ineffective, we end up with a “reducing” factor $1/4$.

As a consequence of hypothesis 5, the number of gravitons which actually interact with matter following any particular initial direction is the total number multiplied by the small number $\rho = (r/R)^2$ where r is the radius of the nuclei and R that of an atom. A rough estimate is $\rho \sim 10^{-10}$. Summarizing all the previous considerations, we end up with the result that, during an interval of time $[t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon]$, the total energy used to push the ice cube downwards is less than

$$\frac{\rho}{4}E(\varepsilon)$$

where $E(\varepsilon)$ denotes the total energy “travelling” inside the cube during ε seconds. That energy is responsible for the increase of the falling velocity of the cube from value 0 to $v(\varepsilon) = g\varepsilon$.

We therefore end up with the inequality

$$\frac{\rho}{4}E(\varepsilon) \geq \frac{1}{2}g^2\varepsilon^2.$$

Here we make an hypothesis with seems to be realistic: we assume that the velocity of the free fall is much smaller than the velocity of gravitons. Then everything happens as if the cube, although in an accelerating process, was not moving at all from the point of view of gravitons. The inequality is certainly valid for $\varepsilon = 1$. So that we obtain

$$\frac{\rho}{4}E(1) \geq \frac{1}{2}g^2.$$

This yields

$$P = E(1) \geq 2\rho^{-1}g^2 > 10^{12}.$$

Reducing the size of the cube by 10, hence the volume by 10^3 , **we conclude that the total power of gravitons travelling inside a volume of 1 cm^3 is above 1 gigawatt,**

hence comparable to the power of a classical nuclear plant! And this seems to be a very low estimate for the following reasons: we could have taken ε much larger, getting a quadratic growth with respect to time instead of linear as long as we remain below the graviton's velocity, the effective gravitons do not convert all their energy (probably by far) to motion of the atoms, and we replaced the earth by an absolute graviton shield, moreover neglecting the effect of gravitons rebounding from the earth's surface.

5 Some elements of reflection

After the considerations of the previous section, some elements of reflexion are in order.

5.1 Stronger estimates and their limits

In our calculation, we used the earth, replaced by an absolute gravity shield, because on earth a measure of g is available. Nothing prevents us to replace it by a much larger planet on which g would be at least as large, even far from the surface, allowing our cube to fall down freely until it reaches a very high speed. For instance if we assume that the gravitons are superluminal, which is usually supposed, the mathematical calculation is essentially valid as long as $v = gt \leq c/3$. This corresponds to $\varepsilon = 10000000s = 10^7s$. In that case, we get $E(10000000) \geq 10^{26}$ and

$$P \geq 10^{19}$$

corresponding to a power of 10 billions of nuclear plants: one for each human being, using only the energy inside a small cube...But here we might be faced with the main difference between Maths and Physics. Such a speed of $c/3$ has never been observed for a macroscopic material object, which might mean that our calculation is not justified in this framework. Then our reinforced estimate is no longer valid.

5.2 Possible attitudes after such a result

We already knew that the "weak" gravity force, acting during millions or billions of years, resulted in the accumulation of huge quantities of energy, however scattered in very small regions of our universe, since at least visible matter is concentrated near lower dimensional manifolds such as bubbles or filaments. But the previous calculations suggest that the vacuum is filled with quantities of energy many orders of magnitude above what we observe in real life. After such an incredible result, several attitudes are possible, among which the following two extremes.

Attitude n°1. This simply shows that gravitons are a myth and confirms the negative conclusions of most experts.

Attitude n°2. Even if the probability is infinitesimal, if gravitons exist we should find them and try to exploit their existence, because then all our energy needs would be easily fulfilled.

For those who are ready to follow the most crazy research tracks, we could add

Attitude n°3. Who knows how much energy we shall need in 1000 years from now? If the gravitational energy becomes too small for us, we should look for an electromagnetic analogue. Because electro-magnetic forces are 36 orders of magnitude above gravity, electromagnetic energy should be even more gigantic. Except if the huge value of the graviton's energy was in fact due to a velocity much above the speed of light, which was among the hypotheses formulated in the Fatio De Duillier-Lesage original theory.

Maybe, Nikola Tesla was already involved in Attitude n°3...

5.3 Which perspectives for research?

This short note was written as an attempt to attract the attention towards a possible source of invisible "free energy" which might coexist with us in our space. Of course it is not the first investigation in the direction of appraising the vacuum's energy, but here we refer to a very special kind of energy which might be the source of gravitation, having a visible action on our familiar world. There are now two possible directions of research for the future:

1. Tracking the gravitons. As usually in Physics, we cannot prove the existence of anything because an experiment can always have several interpretations. But the idea would be to search for some phenomena which would be unexplainable in the framework of Newton's and Einstein's theories. For instance, in the framework of pushing gravity, the weight of a rigid body should change slightly with its position in space except if it is exactly spherical. It should be possible to compute the variation, but for this we need an exact mathematical formulation of pushing gravity, which seems presently still out of reach, after three centuries of reflection. It would be very useful to produce a continuous approximation corresponding to averaging of graviton's action, something similar to continuum hydrodynamics. The fact that gravity acts on volumes and not on surfaces makes it very difficult to build such a model. However the results of [7] suggest that it should not be impossible. Another difficulty is that the variation is probably too small to be verified using our measure instruments.

2. Free energy. Of course if we were able to divert some of the lost energy (not used for gravity) of gravitons to our advantage, this would be a kind of proof, and in a sense we could forget philosophical questions about existence. The problem here is that the only thing we know about gravitons (assuming that they exist) is their gravitational action. A simple idea would be to modify a piece of material in such a way that it receives more gravitons per second, allowing its weight to grow larger during some short intervals of time. This variability of the weight could be used to produce energy, for instance electricity, using quite simple devices. The author thought about a procedure to do that, by moving horizontally a heavy metal plate coupled with a control system, taking advantage of the probable irregularities of the graviton flow. Unfortunately, such a device, due to averaging phenomena, would probably be inefficient at the macroscopic level, and producing microscopic quantities of energy is not so interesting. Implementing a feedback control system at the ultramicroscopic level seems to be out of reach with our present technology. A distributed control device similar to microcircuits or microprocessors might be a solution, but the author is afraid that this would not be for tomorrow morning, since we also need the local (probably electromagnetic) mechanism producing the local motion to be designed at the ultra-microscopic level...

6 Conclusion.

We concluded the paper [6] by saying that the (initial) origin of energy might be the ultimate problem that physical science will never be able to solve, the final axiom of natural philosophy, and the “supreme being” of physicists! In technology, we do not need to solve the problem of origins, but to find new sources of energy which will make human life easier. It will be funny for our successors on this planet if, in a presumably rather distant future, a somewhat forbidden theory of the past finally solves their energy problem when all classical solutions connected with renewable energy will have found their limits.

References

- [1] H. CHABOT, Georges-Louis Lesage (1724–1803): a theoretician of gravitation in search of legitimacy, *Arch. Internat. Hist. Sci.* 53 (2003), no. 150-151, 157–183.
- [2] H. CHABOT, Nombres et approximations dans la théorie de la gravitation de Lesage, d'alembert.academie-sciences.fr.
- [3] M.R. EDWARDS, Pushing gravity: New perspectives on Lesage’s theory of gravitation *Apeiron*, 2002, In: Revue d’histoire des sciences, tome 58, n°2, 2005. pp. 519–520.
- [4] M.R. EDWARDS, Photon-graviton recycling as cause of gravitation *Apeiron*. **14**, 3 (2007), 214–230.
- [5] A. HARAUX, About Dark Matter and Gravitation, *Preprints* **2020**, 2020070198 (doi: 10.20944/preprints202007.0198.v1).
- [6] A. HARAUX, A Surprising Potential Connection between Newton’s Fundamental Principles and the Dynamical Aether of Pushing Gravity. *Preprints* **2022**, 2022020168 (doi: 10.20944/preprints202202.0168.v1).
- [7] B. MINGST, PAUL STOWE, Deriving Newton’s Gravitational law from a Le Sage Mechanism, in *Pushing Gravity: new perspectives on Le Sage’s theory of gravitation*, Matthew R. Edwards Editor, *Apeiron, Montreal* (2002).
- [8] A.M. ROVAYO MARTÍNEZ, G. C. JON TAY, Nikola Tesla: The Great Truth About Gravity, Published November 30, 2020
- [9] T. VAN FLANDERN, The Structure of Matter in the Meta Model (An extension of the gravity model into quantum physics), *Meta Research Bulletin* of 2003/12/15.