

[Skip to main content](#)

r/UFOscience X

Search in r/UFOscience



Create



r/UFOscience • 1d ago

AnnualArcher8514

...

## Gyroscopic effect reduces lift force -- more efficient rockets! Also, TicTac UFO!

Science and Technology

<https://x.com/Rainmaker1973/status/2000113350374818290>

Professor Eric Laithwaite shows what happens when a very heavy wheel (20 kg) is spun up to 2,500 rpm.

**Look at the old man in the video.**

**Think of the spinning wheel as a rocket body.**

**Think the old man's hand representing propellant lift.**

- He CANNOT lift it with ONE hand WITHOUT rotation.
- He CAN lift it with ONE hand WITH rotation.

or more precisely,

- He CAN lift it with TWO hands WITH STRUGGLING, WITHOUT rotation.
- He CANNOT lift it with ONE hand WITHOUT STRUGGLING, WITHOUT rotation.
- He CAN lift it with ONE hand WITHOUT STRUGGLING at all, WITH rotation!

Work put in to lift is  $W = F \times d$

The force is clearly \*less\* than when lifting normally.

$$W_{\text{with\_spin}} = F_{\text{with\_spin}} \times d$$

$$W_{\text{no\_spin}} = F_{\text{no\_spin}} \times d$$

$$F_{\text{with\_spin}} < F_{\text{no\_spin}},$$

$$W_{\text{with\_spin}} < W_{\text{no\_spin}}.$$

In the end you lose rotational energy by lifting it this way, and clearly rotational energy was translated into work/lift energy; or, more likely is that **lift inertia was reduced!**

Now imagine your entire rocket is rotating like the wheel (e.g. fuel), and the end of the rod is where the burners are (shooting opposite of where you want to go).

**A spinning rocket/wheel can be lifted with LESS PROPELLANT.**

Again,

- He can NOT lift it with one hand without rotation.
- He CAN lift it with one hand with rotation.
- --> **A SPINNING ROCKET/WHEEL CAN BE LIFTED WITH LESS PROPELLANT!**

[Skip to main content](#)

1

[Create](#)

In the following video Veritasium shows that the weight does not change whether or not a gyroscope rotates.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tLMpdBjA2SU>

<https://youtu.be/GeyDf4ooPdo?t=116> <-- (see how hard it is with one hand!)

And concludes that even though it feels lighter, it is not lighter.

**What he missed is that you need to apply additional \*upwards\* force/jerk beyond the g-force to get the desired lift effect.**

Professor Eric Laithwaite gave it "higher precession" AND jerked it upward and continued pushing.

Veritasium only gave the gyroscope "higher precession" on the scale. There was no additional force beyond the g-scale, there was no extra lift. There was no jerking upwards, no overall upwards movement.

In one, the hand lifts upwards AND the spinning weight. On the scale, the axle does not lift upwards, only the spinning weight.

What Professor Eric Laithwaite did and what Veritasium showed on the scale are different.

-----

Now imagine you have this in space with no gravity.

As for how to get a rocket/wheel to rotate in space in the first place... start with two rocket/wheels and counter-rotate them, now you have two rocket/wheels to work with.

**Why not lift without any propellant?**

<https://x.com/jaekwon/status/2000571260494127526>

-----

<https://x.com/jaekwon/status/2000414075000418399>

<https://imgur.com/a/kUsQ1Ka>

-----

> That's not how it works at all.

> You don't have to apply any \*upward\* force/jerk to get the lift.

> it's the rotation of the man that translates the rotation of the flywheel into a perpendicular force upward.

Nope. As you can see on the scale, the added rotation does not change the weight of the total system.

On the scale the wheel lifts, but the axle remains stationary and therefore the wheel itself rotates (not lifts) upwards.

[Skip to main content](#)

1

[Create](#)

I'm not saying I can explain what is happening with newtonian physics which I am familiar with.

It boggles my own mind. Because I \*CAN\* understand gyroscopic forces somewhat intuitively based on independent component forces applied to parts of the axle--there is force from the axle and this creates counter-force from the wheel and there is some equilibrium.

And yet there absolutely is something here that is not explainable by newtonian physics.

That is what I am pointing at.

Something new.

I understand the reflex to say that there is nothing new under the sun, and all can be explained by newtonian physics.

But we also learned of electromagnetism and quantum mechanics which are BEYOND newtonian physics.

There is something new here with the professor's demonstration.

The best working theory I currently have is that the laws of gravity are modified by a spinning body when the body is rotated-within-rotation (wheel within a wheel, as in Ezekiel's wheels, or Ophanim).

Whether this applies only to gravity (general relativity) or whether it works in space without gravity, I do not know yet.

Gravity is strange because while it does exert a force upon a body (general relativity where gravity is acceleration), usually acceleration comes from another moving body that is affected likewise.

Of course the earth is likewise affected by the wheel, but perhaps the massive disparity in mass between the wheel and earth, and the fact that the wheel rotates relative to the much more stationary earth has an effect of canceling the gravity.

-----

In other words, my top working hypothesis is that this is an exception to general relativity with gravity, but NOT an effect that exists outside of gravity.

You can of course have Newtonian physics without gravity but still have effective gravity by imagining a tether from center of mass to each object. Perhaps in this faux-gravity non-general-relativity Newtonian world this gyroscopic lift effect does not exist.

The other working hypothesis is that this exists even without general relativity. That is, that this lift effect would still be present in outer space as reduction of inertial when exerted correctly.

But it may be the case that it only works in outer space because of the mass distributed throughout the whole universe, and everything moves relative to that frame of reference.

[Skip to main content](#)

1

[Create](#)

If what I'm saying has any sense to it, unless the energy of the wheel is being transferred to lift (which I don't believe is the case because the bearings are probably good), it means we may be able to get "free" energy by lifting a wheel up, and then dropping it again ad infinitum.

It may not actually be "free" however; e.g. it could affect the rotation of the earth and slow it down. Conservation of energy is still possible.

So here is a refinement of my hypothesis:

That it works because the earth rotates around the Sun (or rotates relative to the observable universe); this is intuitively interesting because the wheel is also rotating within rotation as well.

So it may be some effect of energy transfer from dual-rotating bodies, to another dual-rotating body.

The Dzhanibekov Effect comes to mind but it seems different as that affect is still zero sum energy locally.

Or, perhaps a dual-rotating body such as the wheel creates its own frame of inertial and reduces the effect of gravity upon it. This would be much more surprising, but is related to the US UFO patent that expired; though in that patent there is only single-rotation, so maybe that's enough.

But that patent alleges a high amount of required energy. If it actually works, it might be optimized for lower energy with dual rotation. Or, maybe high energy of single-rotation is required to affect surrounding objects, while dual-rotation of an object is more effective for itself but limited to itself.

The difference between the situation of the weight+bar vs that on the scale is that on the scale there exists an orthogonal rotation (\*vertical\* rotation of the axis itself, not the wheel), which makes all the difference in gyroscope dynamics (as we all know).

Also, I re-watched the Veritasium video, and when he lifts the weight at constant velocity at :12~13 seconds, during the time that the lift is constant, you can actually see that the total weight is LESS than the initial total weight when he was stationary.

**His own video proves my point. He just missed it because he is biased.**

**QED.**



Sorry, this post has been removed by the moderators of r/UFOscience.

Try posting to a community that's a better fit



r/RocketLab

Fan-run subreddit for Rocket Lab, the end-to-end space company



r/spaceflight

A subreddit for articles, images, videos and discussion about spaceflight.



[Skip to main content](#)

1

[Create](#)

0

[13](#)[Share](#)[Join the conversation](#)

Sort by: Best ▾

 Search Comments**UFOscience-ModTeam MOD** • 1h ago • 🔒 ➕

Posts must be related to science and evidence based reasoning. Posts from known tabloid sources will be removed.

[↑ Vote](#)[↓](#)[Share](#)

...

**gerkletoss** • 1d ago

He can NOT lift it with one hand without rotation

Yes he can.

[⊖](#)[↑](#)[↓](#)[Reply](#)[Share](#)

...

**AnnualArcher8514 OP** • 1d ago

You're saying the professor is lying?

Look at him, he struggles to lift it with two hands without rotation.

With rotation he lifts it rather easily with one hand.

[⊖](#)[↑](#)[↓](#)[Reply](#)[Share](#)[🕒 90](#)

...

**gerkletoss** • 1d ago

No, because he didn't say he couldn't lift it with one hand.

Though it is easier to grip a horizontal bar than a vertical one.

This is a demonstration about torque and gyroscopic precession.

[⊖](#)[↑](#)[↓](#)[Reply](#)[Share](#)

...

**AnnualArcher8514 OP** • 1d ago

Again, he STRUGGLES to lift it with TWO hands without rotation.

He clearly CANNOT lift it with ONE hand WITHOUT STRUGGLING.

[Skip to main content](#)

1

[Create](#)

[Θ](#) [Up](#) -1 [Down](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#) [72](#) ...

**gerkletoss** • 1d ago • Edited 1d ago

Have you ever read a physics textbook?

If he was qctuall demonstrating what you think he's demonstrating he would it out at arm's length instead of doing it qs q one handed clean and jerk

[Θ](#) [Up](#) 2 [Down](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#) ...

**AnnualArcher8514 OP** • 1d ago • Edited 1d ago

AP Physics I & II 5.0 in high school.

USAMO, represented the state of Georgia.

Putnam competitor.

Software inventor, solved proof-of-stake.

IQ 145+.

I can't parse your sentence, please reword.

---

In the following video Veritasium shows that the weight does not change whether or not a gyroscope rotates.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tLMpdBjA2SU>

And concludes that even though it feels lighter, it is not lighter.

**What he missed is that you need to apply additional force beyond the g-force to get the desired lift effect. A jerk.**

[Θ](#) [Up](#) 0 [Down](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#) [60](#) ...

**gerkletoss** • 1d ago • Edited 1d ago

What he missed is that you need to apply additional force beyond the g-force to get the desired lift effect. A jerk.

So veritasium said I was right while you were looking for proof that I was wrong, and your response to that is double down with a further unsubstantiated claim that isn't made in the original video?

[Θ](#) [Up](#) 2 [Down](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#) ...





X

1

Create



continued pasting.

Veritasium only gave the gyroscope "higher precession" on the scale. There was no additional force beyond the g-scale, there was no extra lift. There was no jerking upwards, no overall upwards movement.

In one, the hand lifts upwards AND the spinning weight. On the scale, the axle does not lift upwards, only the spinning weight.

What Professor Eric Laithwaite did and what Veritasium showed on the scale are different.

0 upvotes 42 downvotes Share ...

**gerkletoss** • 1d ago

Laithwaite did not claim what you're claiming

1 upvote 0 downvotes Share ...

**AnnualArcher8514 OP** • 1d ago

Dude look at how hard it is even for the youtuber.

<https://youtu.be/GeyDf4ooPdo?t=116>

1 upvote 31 downvotes Share ...

More replies

**AnnualArcher8514 OP** • 1d ago

With rotation there is no struggle, he does less work in lifting.

Even the Veritasium video says that Professor Eric Laithwaite claimed the gyroscope's properties couldn't be fully explained by Newton's laws of motion.

0 upvotes 30 downvotes Share ...