Gravity Has No Off Switch: A Survey of Patent-Office Antigravity Claims

Flyxion
Independent Researcher

Abstract

Patent offices across multiple jurisdictions have, over the past century, granted patents for devices described as gravity shielding, gravity generating, or antigravity propulsion apparatus, despite the patent examination process not requiring proof that a described invention actually works. This paper surveys the general pattern common to these filings, argues that patent grant is being systematically misread as a form of scientific validation it was never designed to provide, and situates the recurring vagueness of these patents' operative mechanism sections against an entropic account of gravity in which no coherent local mechanism for the claimed effect could exist regardless of how the patent's language is arranged.

1 Introduction

A recurring category of claim in antigravity discourse involves pointing to a granted patent, often filed decades earlier, as evidence that some agency with technical expertise has certified the underlying device as workable. Patents for gravity shielding devices, gravity wave generators, and inertia-reduction apparatus have indeed been granted in the United States, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere, and the existence of these documents is frequently treated as more significant than it actually is.

2 What Patent Examination Actually Certifies

Patent examiners assess novelty, non-obviousness, and whether the application adequately describes the invention for a person skilled in the relevant art to construct it, called enablement. They do not, as a matter of practice or of law, verify that the described device functions as claimed. A patent for a perpetual motion machine can be, and periodically has been, refused specifically on physical-impossibility grounds where the impossibility is well established and elementary, but examiners lack both the mandate and the resources to independently test every claimed mechanism against current physical theory, and a sufficiently vague or sufficiently novel-sounding claim, particularly one invoking exotic or poorly understood phenomena, can pass examination without anyone at the patent office confirming the device does anything at all beyond existing as a described object. A granted patent, in short, certifies that an application was filed and processed correctly. It does not certify that the invention works.

3 The Recurring Structure of These Filings

Antigravity patents share a characteristic structure: a detailed, often genuinely careful description of the physical apparatus, its materials, its dimensions, and its assembly, paired with a compara-

tively vague account of why the described arrangement should produce the claimed gravitational effect, frequently invoking terms borrowed from legitimate physics, field, resonance, coupling, polarization, without specifying a mechanism precise enough to be tested or falsified. This asymmetry, rigorous engineering description paired with hand-waved physical justification, is exactly what one would expect from an inventor who has built something real, observed an ambiguous or null result, and filled the resulting explanatory gap with borrowed vocabulary rather than a specified causal chain, because the patent examination process does not require the gap to be filled with anything more rigorous than that.

4 Why No Filling of the Gap Is Available

On an account of gravitation as the large-scale bookkeeping of an ordered configuration's redistribution, tracked geometrically rather than transmitted as a locally sourced field, the vagueness common to these patents' mechanism sections is not a correctable drafting failure. There is no more precise mechanism available to specify, because the category of device being described, benchtop apparatus using magnets, capacitors, rotating masses, or resonant cavities, has no channel into the scale of ordered-configuration redistribution that produces measurable curvature in the first place. A more rigorously worded patent application describing the same devices would not close this gap; it would simply make the absence of a mechanism more visible, which is presumably why the vagueness persists.

5 Objections

It might be argued that patent offices occasionally do get ahead of settled science, granting protection for mechanisms later vindicated, and that dismissing all such filings by category risks dismissing a genuine future exception along with the rest. This is true in the abstract but does not describe the antigravity patent record specifically, where the pattern across a century of filings has been consistent unverifiability rather than occasional vindication, and where the mechanism-vagueness described above is not a feature of early or unfashionable but eventually correct physics, it is a feature of applications describing devices with no available channel to the phenomenon they claim to affect.

6 Conclusion

A granted patent for a gravity-shielding or antigravity device demonstrates that a filing satisfied procedural requirements for novelty and description, not that the underlying physics works, and the persistent vagueness of these patents' causal mechanisms reflects a genuine absence of an available mechanism rather than an oversight correctable by better drafting.