https://doi.org/10.65166/pfav8b78

Journal of Frontier Science and Futures
Volume I, Issue 1, July 2026
https://journal.ijhba.com/index.php/jfsf
https://slsipress.com

From Crystals to the Cosmos: A Theoretical, Material, and Futures Assessment of Mach-Effect Propulsion

Ramon George Atento, PhD[1], Andrea Gwyneth Atento[2]

[1]First Asia Institute of Technology and the Humanities, Philippines
[2]SLSI Press, Philippines
Corresponding Author: roatento@firstasia.edu.ph

Abstract

Propellant requirements remain a fundamental constraint on deep-space mission design, motivating continued investigation of propulsion concepts that do not rely on the continuous expenditure of reaction mass. This study evaluates the Mach-Effect Gravity Assist Drive as a contested frontier-propulsion concept and compares it with the Electromagnetic Drive across theoretical, experimental, material, and futures-oriented dimensions. A structured comparative review was conducted using literature on gravitational theory, experimental propulsion research, piezoelectric materials, mineral availability, technology readiness, and space mission architecture. The analysis indicates that the Mach-Effect Drive and the Electromagnetic Drive should not be treated as scientifically equivalent. The Electromagnetic Drive lacks a generally accepted mechanism compatible with momentum conservation, while controlled investigations have attributed reported thrust signals largely to experimental artifacts. The Mach-Effect Drive remains theoretically disputed and experimentally unvalidated, with independent studies identifying vibration, thermal, and electromechanical effects as possible explanations for observed force signals. Nevertheless, its proposed operating mechanism arises from a recognizable, although non-mainstream, Machian gravitational framework. Its principal material, lead zirconate titanate ceramic, is industrially established and composed of widely available elements, although lead toxicity, high-frequency performance, fatigue, thermal stability, and radiation tolerance remain relevant engineering concerns. Scenario analysis suggests that validated thrust at low efficiency could support limited station-keeping applications, whereas primary deep-space propulsion would require substantial improvements in force generation, power efficiency, experimental reproducibility, and device architecture. The study concludes that continued investigation may be justified only through rigorously controlled, falsification-oriented experimentation and clearly bounded futures assessment.

Keywords: *Mach-Effect propulsion; propellantless propulsion; piezoelectric ceramics; frontier science; space propulsion; technology futures*

Article History: Received: March 16, 2026 Revised: June 13, 2026 Accepted: June 30, 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

The capacity of a spacecraft to travel beyond Earth remains fundamentally constrained by the requirement to carry and expend propellant. Under the Tsiolkovsky rocket equation, changes in spacecraft velocity depend logarithmically on the ratio between initial mass and final mass, producing increasingly demanding propellant requirements as mission velocity and range increase (Tsiolkovsky, 1903; Sutton & Biblarz, 2016). This constraint has shaped nearly every modern space mission, influencing launch mass, payload allocation, trajectory design, mission duration, and the selection of achievable destinations. Although advances in chemical, electric, and nuclear propulsion have expanded mission capabilities, these systems continue to require reaction mass and therefore remain subject, in varying degrees, to the same underlying limitation.

Electric propulsion systems, including ion and Hall-effect thrusters, have substantially improved propellant efficiency by producing high specific impulse over extended operating periods. Such systems have enabled missions that would have been difficult or impractical using chemical propulsion alone, particularly where low but continuous thrust is operationally acceptable (Rayman et al., 2006; Kawaguchi et al., 2008). Nuclear thermal and other advanced propulsion concepts may provide further improvements in performance, particularly for high-energy missions, but they remain constrained by technological maturity, cost, regulatory requirements, thermal management, and the need to carry propellant or reaction mass (Borowski et al., 2012). Consequently, the possibility of producing useful thrust without continuously expelling propellant has remained a persistent objective in advanced propulsion research.

Propellantless propulsion refers broadly to propulsion concepts in which a spacecraft generates or acquires momentum without consuming stored reaction mass in the manner of a conventional rocket. The category includes physically established systems, such as solar sails and electrodynamic tethers, which exchange momentum with external radiation or electromagnetic environments. It also includes highly contested devices that claim to generate thrust through internal electromagnetic, inertial, or gravitational interactions. These latter concepts require particularly careful examination because apparent laboratory forces at nano- or micronewton levels can be produced by thermal expansion, electromagnetic coupling, vibration, cable forces, residual gas effects, and measurement-system artifacts. A credible assessment must therefore distinguish between a device's proposed theoretical mechanism, the quality of its experimental evidence, and its possible engineering value if the reported effect is eventually validated.

Among the most prominent contested concepts are the Mach-Effect Gravity Assist Drive, commonly called the MEGA Drive or Mach-effect thruster, and the Electromagnetic Drive. Although both have been described as propellantless propulsion devices, they invoke substantially different mechanisms. The EM Drive proposes that electromagnetic radiation circulating within an asymmetric closed resonant cavity can generate net external thrust. The principal objection is that internal electromagnetic interactions within an isolated cavity should not produce a sustained change in the system's total momentum unless momentum is transferred to an identifiable external field, medium, or body. Controlled investigations have increasingly attributed reported EM Drive signals to thermal, electromagnetic, and experimental artifacts rather than to genuine propulsion (Tajmar & Fiedler, 2015; Tajmar et al., 2022).

The MEGA Drive is based on James F. Woodward's proposed interpretation of Mach's principle. In this framework, the inertia of a local object is associated with its gravitational relationship to matter distributed throughout the universe. Woodward proposed that an object undergoing simultaneous acceleration and variation in internal energy could experience small transient changes in effective mass. A piezoelectric stack driven by alternating electrical signals is intended to synchronize these proposed mass fluctuations with mechanical deformation, thereby producing a cumulative directional impulse (Woodward, 1990, 2013).

This proposed mechanism remains disputed. Critics question whether the predicted mass fluctuations follow from a valid relativistic derivation and whether the approximation used to obtain the effect adequately satisfies momentum and energy conservation. Proponents respond that the interaction should be interpreted globally, with momentum and energy exchanged through the hypothesized Machian gravitational relationship between the device and distant matter (Fearn & Woodward, 2019). This response has not secured general acceptance within mainstream gravitational physics. Accordingly, the MEGA Drive should not be described as theoretically validated or as having been demonstrated to comply with conservation laws. It is more accurately characterized as a contested propulsion hypothesis derived from a recognizable but non-mainstream interpretation of gravitational theory.

The experimental record is similarly unresolved. Research groups associated with the concept have reported small force signals from piezoelectric thruster assemblies, but independent experiments have identified vibration, electromechanical resonance, thermal effects, switching transients, and balance coupling as plausible explanations for the observed measurements. Investigations using increasingly sensitive torsion balances have not produced a consistently reproducible thrust effect that can be clearly separated from experimental artifacts (Monette et al., 2021). The principal scientific question is therefore not whether small signals have appeared on measurement systems, but whether any residual force remains after all conventional sources of disturbance have been identified, quantified, and controlled.

Despite this uncertainty, the MEGA Drive presents an analytically useful case for frontier science assessment. Unlike purely abstract propulsion proposals, it is associated with identifiable device architectures, measurable operating parameters, specific materials, and experimental configurations that can be subjected to falsification. Its functional core typically consists of piezoelectric materials, particularly lead zirconate titanate, or PZT, which converts applied electrical fields into mechanical deformation. PZT is a mature industrial ceramic used in medical imaging, sensing, actuation, sonar, precision positioning, and energy-conversion applications (Damjanovic, 2001; Rödel et al., 2009). Its industrial availability distinguishes the MEGA Drive from hypothetical technologies that depend on undiscovered particles, exotic matter, negative energy, or presently unavailable materials.

Material availability, however, does not establish propulsion feasibility. A complete assessment must consider not only the terrestrial abundance of lead, zirconium, and titanium, but also the functional performance of the resulting ceramic under propulsion-relevant conditions. Important considerations include electromechanical coupling, dielectric loss, fatigue resistance, fracture behavior, thermal stability, vacuum compatibility, radiation tolerance, manufacturability, and performance at very high operating frequencies. Lead content also introduces regulatory, manufacturing, disposal, and environmental concerns, although these risks depend heavily on encapsulation, handling, and the probability of material degradation. Research on lead-free piezoelectric systems, including potassium sodium niobate and related formulations, therefore has potential relevance to the long-term development of any propulsion system based on high-performance electroactive ceramics (Shrout & Zhang, 2007; Liu & Ren, 2009).

The issue of operating frequency is especially significant. The proposed Mach-effect model predicts that force generation increases strongly with the driving frequency. Existing devices operate primarily within kilohertz regimes, whereas ambitious mission concepts have assumed operation at much higher frequencies. This gap cannot be treated as a simple extension of current designs. Transitioning from kilohertz to megahertz or gigahertz regimes would likely require major changes in device dimensions, resonant architecture, electronic drive systems, impedance matching, heat dissipation, dielectric behavior, and material selection. Frequency scaling should therefore be regarded as an unresolved system-level redesign challenge rather than a straightforward performance multiplier.

These considerations also affect how the technology's possible futures should be evaluated. Frontier propulsion concepts are frequently discussed through binary judgments: either the device is assumed to revolutionize space travel or it is dismissed as physically impossible. Such framing overlooks the possibility that different levels of validated performance may support different classes of application. A very low but repeatable thrust-to-power ratio might be relevant only to precision station-keeping, drag compensation, or long-duration attitude control. Higher performance could potentially support primary propulsion for robotic science missions. More transformative applications, including rapid outer-solar-system transport or interstellar precursor missions, would require experimental validation together with substantial improvements in thrust, power efficiency, thermal management, structural durability, and frequency-dependent material performance.

A scenario-based assessment is therefore appropriate because the MEGA Drive's future significance depends on outcomes that have not yet been established. Such scenarios should not be interpreted as predictions. Rather, they identify the experimental and engineering thresholds at which the technology would become relevant to particular mission architectures. This approach allows the potential value of the concept to be examined without presuming that the underlying effect exists or that present laboratory devices can be scaled directly into operational propulsion systems.

The comparison with the EM Drive serves an important analytical purpose within this framework. It demonstrates that technologies commonly grouped under the label of propellantless propulsion may occupy different theoretical and experimental positions. Nevertheless, distinguishing the two devices does not validate the stronger candidate. The apparent failure of the EM Drive does not constitute evidence for the MEGA Drive. Each concept must be evaluated independently according to its proposed mechanism, experimental reproducibility, compatibility with established physics, material requirements, and engineering pathway.

The present study responds to three related gaps. First, discussions of contested propulsion technologies have often emphasized extraordinary performance claims without integrating theoretical criticism, experimental artifacts, and evidentiary uncertainty into a unified assessment. Second, the materials used in Mach-effect devices have received less attention than the proposed physics, despite the importance of piezoelectric properties, toxicity, frequency response, and long-duration reliability to any future engineering application. Third, futures discussions have frequently moved directly from laboratory-scale force claims to interstellar implications without identifying the intermediate performance thresholds required for operational relevance.

Accordingly, this study aimed to evaluate the MEGA Drive as a contested frontier-propulsion concept through an integrated theoretical, material, experimental, and futures-oriented assessment. Specifically, it sought to:

1. compare the proposed theoretical foundations of the MEGA Drive and the EM Drive, particularly in relation to momentum and energy conservation;

2. assess the experimental evidence associated with both devices, including the role of identified measurement artifacts and unresolved sources of force signals;

3. examine the composition, industrial availability, sustainability, and propulsion-relevant limitations of the principal materials used in MEGA Drive and EM Drive configurations;

4. identify the principal scalability and engineering challenges affecting the transition from laboratory devices to mission-relevant propulsion systems; and

5. develop conditional futures scenarios showing the performance thresholds at which validated Mach-effect propulsion could become relevant to specific space mission architectures.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Propulsion Constraints and the Search for Propellantless Systems

The design of deep-space missions remains strongly influenced by the relationship among spacecraft mass, available energy, propulsion efficiency, and required change in velocity. The Tsiolkovsky rocket equation establishes that the achievable velocity increment of a rocket depends logarithmically on the ratio of its initial mass to its final mass. As mission-energy requirements increase, a progressively larger proportion of the vehicle must therefore be allocated to propellant rather than scientific instruments, communications systems, shielding, power generation, or other payload functions (Tsiolkovsky, 1903; Sutton & Biblarz, 2016). This mass-ratio constraint becomes particularly severe for missions involving high velocities, repeated orbital maneuvers, or destinations in the outer solar system.

Chemical propulsion provides high thrust and remains essential for launch, rapid maneuvering, and operations requiring large forces over short periods. However, the comparatively limited specific impulse of chemical rockets restricts their efficiency in long-duration missions. Advanced nuclear concepts may offer improved performance, but nuclear thermal propulsion still requires reaction mass and introduces technical, regulatory, political, and safety considerations that complicate development and deployment (Borowski et al., 2012). These constraints have led aerospace researchers to investigate systems capable of generating sustained thrust more efficiently than conventional chemical propulsion.

Electric propulsion has already demonstrated the value of low-thrust, high-specific-impulse systems. Ion engines and related devices accelerate charged particles to high exhaust velocities, allowing spacecraft to accumulate substantial velocity changes while consuming less propellant than chemical systems. The Dawn and Hayabusa missions demonstrated how sustained electric propulsion could support complex trajectories and extended scientific operations (Rayman et al., 2006; Kawaguchi et al., 2008). Nevertheless, electric thrusters still expend stored reaction mass. Their operational lifetime and total available impulse remain dependent on the amount of propellant loaded before launch.

The term propellantless propulsion encompasses several conceptually different technologies. Solar sails exchange momentum with solar radiation, while electrodynamic tethers interact with planetary magnetic fields. These systems do not violate conservation of momentum because momentum is exchanged with an identifiable external environment. More controversial devices claim to generate thrust through internal electromagnetic, inertial, or gravitational processes without clearly observable momentum exchange. Such claims require a higher level of experimental control because the reported forces are frequently close to the sensitivity limits of laboratory instruments.

The appeal of a genuinely propellant-independent system is substantial. Even a small continuous force could accumulate over long mission durations and reduce the need for stored reaction mass. However, its practical value would depend on thrust-to-power ratio, power-system mass, operational stability, thermal requirements, controllability, and reproducibility. Propellantlessness alone does not establish mission superiority. A device that eliminates propellant but requires an excessively massive power system, produces unstable thrust, or cannot survive the space environment may offer no net advantage over established propulsion technologies.

Frisbee (2003) emphasized the large performance gap between existing propulsion systems and the velocities required for interstellar or advanced precursor missions. This gap provides the strategic motivation for frontier-propulsion research, but it does not lower the evidentiary standards required for validation. Instead, the large potential consequences of a positive result increase the importance of rigorous theoretical scrutiny, independent replication, and experiments designed to identify conventional sources of apparent force.

2.2 Theoretical Foundations and Conservation-Law Questions

The Mach-Effect Gravity Assist Drive derives from James F. Woodward's interpretation of Mach's principle. Broadly stated, Mach's principle proposes that the inertial properties of a local body are related to its interaction with the distribution of matter in the universe. The concept influenced the historical development of relativistic gravitational theory, although no single formulation of Mach's principle is universally accepted within modern physics (Mach, 1883; Barbour & Pfister, 1995; Bondi & Samuel, 1997).

Woodward proposed that a body experiencing simultaneous acceleration and changes in internal energy could undergo small transient variations in effective mass. His derivation employed a Maxwellian approximation to gravitational interaction in the weak-field regime and predicted oscillatory mass fluctuations associated with the time-dependent energy density of the accelerating object (Woodward, 1990, 2013). In a practical thruster configuration, piezoelectric elements are driven electrically so that their mechanical deformation is synchronized with the proposed mass fluctuation. Proponents argue that the phase relationship between the fluctuating mass and applied mechanical force could generate a non-zero average impulse.

The derivation remains controversial. Critics question whether the predicted second-order effect survives a fully relativistic and covariant treatment. A central concern is that approximation terms may produce an apparent mass fluctuation of the same order as the mathematical errors introduced by the approximation. Under this criticism, the predicted effect may arise from the derivation method rather than from a physically realizable gravitational process (Rodal, 2019).

Momentum conservation presents a related issue. MEGA Drive proponents argue that the device should not be treated as a completely isolated local system because its inertial behavior is hypothesized to involve interaction with the mass-energy distribution of the universe. Under this interpretation, a local spacecraft could experience an apparent impulse while total momentum remains conserved globally through Machian gravitational coupling (Fearn & Woodward, 2019). This is a proposed theoretical resolution rather than an experimentally established mechanism. The existence, magnitude, and direction of any corresponding momentum exchange have not been independently demonstrated.

Energy conservation also requires clarification. If useful mechanical work is produced, the complete energy budget must include electrical input, mechanical deformation, thermal losses, electromagnetic effects, and any claimed gravitational interaction. Critics contend that the proposed derivation has not demonstrated energy closure within a fully covariant framework. Proponents maintain that energy is conserved when the global gravitational interaction is considered. The dispute therefore concerns not merely whether a force signal can be measured but whether the claimed mechanism is consistent with a complete and physically coherent accounting of momentum and energy.

The EM Drive differs in its proposed operation. It uses electromagnetic radiation within a closed, asymmetric resonant cavity and claims that differing radiation-pressure conditions at the cavity's ends produce a net external force. In an isolated cavity, however, internal photon-wall interactions should not change the total momentum of the complete system. Differences in cavity geometry, resonance, or group velocity do not by themselves provide an external momentum reservoir (Shawyer, 2006; Tajmar & Fiedler, 2015).

Various explanations involving the quantum vacuum or modified electromagnetic interpretations have been proposed for the EM Drive, but none has achieved broad theoretical acceptance. The comparison between the two devices should therefore be framed carefully. The MEGA Drive is connected to a disputed Machian gravitational model, whereas the EM Drive's original mechanism lacks a generally accepted means of external momentum exchange. This distinction may justify evaluating them separately, but it does not establish the validity of the Mach-effect hypothesis.

2.3 Experimental Evidence, Replication, and Measurement Artifacts

The experimental evaluation of claimed propellantless propulsion is difficult because the reported forces commonly fall within nano- or micronewton ranges. At these levels, apparent thrust can be produced by thermal expansion, vibration, electromagnetic interaction, cable stiffness, residual gas movement, electrostatic forces, changes in the center of mass, or coupling between the test article and the measurement apparatus. Reliable testing therefore requires more than detecting a deflection. The measured response must also reverse appropriately with device orientation, scale predictably with controlled operating parameters, persist under shielding and null configurations, and remain distinguishable from experimentally induced artifacts.

Woodward and collaborators reported force signals from successive generations of piezoelectric thrusters over several decades. These experiments commonly used torsion balances or related low-force measurement systems and produced thrust estimates that varied substantially across devices and experimental arrangements (Woodward, 2013; Fearn & Woodward, 2019). Such reports provided the basis for continued interest in the Mach-effect hypothesis, including support through the NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts program (NASA, 2018).

Independent testing has produced less favorable interpretations. Experiments conducted under the SpaceDrive research program used sensitive torsion balances to examine both EM Drive and Mach-effect configurations. The investigators identified significant contributions from vibration, resonance, switching transients, electromagnetic coupling, and other systematic effects. In the Mach-effect experiments, observed force traces were associated with vibrational coupling between the piezoelectric actuator and the torsion balance, and increased measurement sensitivity did not produce a stable thrust response consistent with the claimed mechanism (Monette et al., 2021).

These findings challenge characterizations of independent results as merely smaller but still unexplained signals. The relevant independent investigation concluded that the observed response could be explained by coupled vibration. This does not logically prove that no Mach-related effect could exist under any configuration, but it means that the cited experiment does not constitute affirmative independent replication.

The EM Drive's experimental record follows a similar but more conclusive trajectory. Early reports described small apparent forces from closed radio-frequency cavities, including a widely discussed vacuum experiment by White et al. (2017). Subsequent tests demonstrated that similar signals could be generated through electromagnetic interaction with cables, thermal deformation, magnetic effects, and other test-system asymmetries. When these factors were more rigorously controlled, no repeatable propulsion effect remained above the measurement noise (Tajmar et al., 2022).

The history of both devices illustrates the importance of artifact-oriented experimental design. In controversial low-force research, the objective should not be to maximize the apparent thrust signal but to maximize the capacity of the experiment to falsify the proposed mechanism. Useful procedures include blind operating sequences, powered null devices, reversed-device configurations, dummy loads producing comparable heat, independent monitoring of vibration and temperature, magnetic shielding, battery-powered or optically isolated electronics, and preregistered data-analysis criteria.

An experiment capable of producing a credible positive result must also be capable of producing a definitive negative result. For the MEGA Drive, a persuasive demonstration would require a repeatable force that survives thermal, vibrational, electromagnetic, and mechanical controls; changes direction with device orientation; follows a theoretically specified phase and frequency relationship; and can be reproduced by independent teams using sufficiently documented apparatus. Until such results are obtained, the experimental status should be described as unvalidated rather than confirmed, partly confirmed, or independently observed.

2.4 Piezoelectric Materials, Sustainability, and Scalability

The practical MEGA Drive architecture relies primarily on electroactive materials capable of converting electrical input into rapid mechanical deformation. Lead zirconate titanate is the dominant piezoelectric ceramic used in many experimental devices because of its relatively high piezoelectric coefficients, established manufacturing methods, and availability in formulations optimized for different operating conditions (Jaffe et al., 1971; Damjanovic, 2001).

PZT has a perovskite crystal structure and a general composition represented by $Pb(Zr_xTi_{1-x})O_3$. Adjusting the zirconium-to-titanium ratio and introducing dopants can modify dielectric properties, mechanical quality factor, sensitivity, electromechanical coupling, and power-handling capability. Soft PZT formulations generally provide high electromechanical response, while hard formulations offer improved stability and reduced losses under demanding operating conditions. These characteristics have supported applications in medical ultrasound, sonar, actuators, accelerometers, precision positioning systems, and energy harvesting (Rödel et al., 2009).

The constituent elements of conventional PZT do not appear to present immediate scarcity constraints at laboratory or prototype scale. Lead, zirconium, and titanium are produced through established mining and industrial systems, while the quantities required for experimental thrusters are small relative to global production (U.S.

Geological Survey, 2024). Copper, used in EM Drive resonant cavities, is similarly supported by mature extraction, refining, fabrication, and recycling infrastructures. From a narrow elemental-availability perspective, neither device is dependent on extremely rare or presently unobtainable materials.

Elemental abundance, however, is only one aspect of material feasibility. A viable propulsion component must retain its properties under repeated electrical cycling, high mechanical stress, vacuum exposure, temperature variation, radiation, and long mission durations. It must also be compatible with the device's drive electronics, structural assembly, thermal-management system, and power source. The availability of lead, zirconium, and titanium therefore does not demonstrate that a ceramic with the required frequency response, fatigue resistance, and coupling efficiency can be manufactured for a practical thruster.

Lead content introduces additional concerns. Lead is toxic and is regulated in many electronic and industrial applications. In a fully sintered and encapsulated ceramic, direct exposure risk may be limited during normal operation. More relevant concerns include occupational exposure during manufacturing, fracture or degradation of components, contamination during maintenance, disposal, recycling, and compliance with hazardous-substance regulations. The environmental and regulatory profile of PZT has consequently encouraged research into lead-free piezoelectric materials.

Potential alternatives include potassium sodium niobate, barium titanate, bismuth ferrite, and bismuth-layered ferroelectric ceramics. Some potassium sodium niobate formulations have achieved piezoelectric responses approaching those of conventional PZT through compositional engineering and phase-boundary control (Shrout & Zhang, 2007; Liu & Ren, 2009). Nevertheless, lead-free systems continue to face trade-offs involving temperature stability, aging, manufacturability, dielectric loss, reproducibility, and long-term mechanical reliability (Takenaka & Nagata, 2005; Rödel et al., 2009).

Higher-performance relaxor ferroelectric crystals, including PIN-PMN-PT-related compositions, have also been proposed because of their high electromechanical coupling and large piezoelectric coefficients (Zhang et al., 2015). Their relevance to MEGA Drive research remains conditional. A larger piezoelectric coefficient may improve mechanical response, but it does not automatically produce greater propulsive force unless the underlying Mach-effect mechanism exists and scales as predicted.

Frequency scaling represents the most difficult intersection between materials and propulsion claims. The proposed force relationship places substantial emphasis on operating frequency, creating an incentive to move from kilohertz devices toward megahertz or gigahertz regimes. At very high frequencies, however, a macroscopic piezoelectric stack cannot be assumed to behave as a simple faster version of its low-frequency counterpart. Device dimensions become linked to acoustic wavelengths, internal wave propagation becomes significant, dielectric and mechanical losses increase, and electrical impedance, heat generation, electrode design, and structural resonance require different engineering solutions.

The transition to gigahertz operation should therefore be interpreted as a possible change in device class rather than a routine scaling exercise. It may require thin films, microelectromechanical structures, nanoscale resonators, or alternative electroactive materials rather than conventional stacked ceramic discs. The relevant material question is not simply whether PZT or a lead-free substitute is available, but whether any material system can sustain the required electromechanical behavior with acceptable losses, stability, and durability at the necessary frequency and power density.

2.5 Synthesis and Research Gaps

The literature establishes a clear motivation for investigating advanced propulsion: conventional systems remain constrained by propellant mass, while established electric propulsion, although efficient, still depends on stored reaction mass (Sutton & Biblarz, 2016; Rayman et al., 2006). It also demonstrates that claimed propellantless devices must be assessed according to the external interaction or momentum reservoir they invoke. Technologies such as solar sails have identifiable momentum-exchange mechanisms, whereas the MEGA Drive and EM Drive depend on contested theoretical claims.

The literature does not support treating the MEGA Drive as experimentally validated. Woodward and collaborators reported small force signals, but independent torsion-balance testing attributed observed Mach-effect thruster responses to coupled vibration and other systematic effects (Fearn & Woodward, 2019; Monette et al., 2021).

The EM Drive has an even weaker evidentiary position because controlled investigations have not identified a repeatable thrust effect after electromagnetic and thermal artifacts were addressed (Tajmar et al., 2022).

The MEGA Drive nevertheless differs from the EM Drive in the structure of its proposed explanation. It invokes a disputed Machian gravitational interaction rather than an internal radiation-pressure imbalance within a closed cavity. This distinction justifies separate analytical treatment, but it should not be converted into an inference of validity. The decisive issue remains whether the hypothesized force can be derived consistently and demonstrated under artifact-controlled conditions.

The materials literature shows that piezoelectric ceramics are industrially mature and that their constituent elements are broadly available (Damjanovic, 2001; U.S. Geological Survey, 2024). It also reveals unresolved questions concerning lead regulation, fatigue, thermal behavior, radiation resistance, dielectric loss, and high-frequency operation (Rödel et al., 2009). These issues become increasingly important as proposed applications move from laboratory demonstrations to long-duration spacecraft systems.

Three research gaps therefore remain. First, theoretical, experimental, material, and mission-level assessments are often discussed separately, preventing an integrated judgment of the technology's developmental pathway. Second, material abundance is frequently treated as equivalent to material suitability, despite the importance of frequency response, durability, and system integration. Third, discussions of future applications often move directly from uncertain laboratory signals to transformative mission claims without identifying the intermediate performance and validation thresholds required for operational use.

The present study addresses these gaps by applying a comparative feasibility framework that separates theoretical coherence, experimental evidence, material suitability, and scalability. It then uses conditional scenarios to determine what classes of space mission, if any, could become technically relevant at different levels of independently validated performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative, multi-method analytical design integrating a structured literature review, comparative technology assessment, material-feasibility analysis, and scenario-based futures assessment. The design was selected because the Mach-Effect Gravity Assist Drive remains a theoretically disputed and experimentally unvalidated technology for which sufficiently consistent quantitative evidence is not available to support statistical synthesis or engineering performance modelling.

The study did not conduct a new laboratory experiment, meta-analysis, or quantitative test of propulsion performance. Instead, it examined the claims, evidence, materials, and possible developmental pathways associated with the MEGA Drive and compared them with those of the Electromagnetic Drive. The EM Drive was included as a comparative case because both technologies have been described as propellantless propulsion concepts despite their different proposed mechanisms and experimental histories.

The inquiry was organized around four analytical domains:

- theoretical coherence and compatibility with conservation principles;
- experimental evidence and susceptibility to measurement artifacts;
- material composition, availability, and propulsion-relevant suitability; and
- scalability and possible implications for future space missions.

The study is best characterized as a structured comparative analytical review rather than a systematic review. Although the source search was organized thematically, the available research record did not include a complete protocol containing search dates, database-specific search strings, duplicate counts, screening totals, or formal risk-of-bias assessments. The methodology therefore avoids making claims of systematic-review completeness.

3.2 Sources of Evidence

The analysis drew on literature from four intersecting bodies of knowledge:

- theoretical and experimental research on Mach-effect and electromagnetic propulsion;
- aerospace engineering literature concerning propulsion performance and deep-space mission requirements;
- materials-science research on piezoelectric ceramics, particularly lead zirconate titanate and lead-free alternatives; and
- futures and technology-assessment literature concerning scenario construction and technological readiness.

The principal scholarly sources included peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, conference papers, and institutional technical reports. Literature was identified through searches of Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science using combinations of terms related to Mach effect, MEGA Drive, Mach-effect thruster, Woodward effect, EM Drive, propellantless propulsion, piezoelectric ceramics, lead zirconate titanate, lead-free piezoelectrics, torsion balance, space propulsion, technology readiness, and futures assessment.

Peer-reviewed journal literature was treated as the primary evidentiary foundation. Conference proceedings and technical reports were included when they documented device configurations, experimental procedures, mission concepts, or program developments not otherwise available in journal articles. NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts reports and publications associated with the California State University Fullerton research group were treated as primary documentation of the MEGA Drive program rather than as independent confirmation of its theoretical or experimental claims.

Sources were included when they contributed directly to at least one of the study's analytical dimensions. Materials-science sources were selected when they addressed piezoelectric properties, constituent-element availability, toxicity, thermal stability, fatigue, dielectric behavior, high-frequency performance, or lead-free alternatives. Aerospace sources were included when they established propulsion requirements, mission constraints, or performance benchmarks relevant to the scenarios.

Sources were excluded from substantive evidentiary use when they consisted primarily of unsourced popular commentary, promotional claims, speculative media reporting, or technical assertions that could not be traced to a scholarly or institutional publication. Popular accounts were not used as evidence of theoretical validity or experimental confirmation.

3.3 Comparative Assessment Framework

A four-dimensional comparative framework was developed to evaluate the MEGA Drive and the EM Drive. The framework combined criteria drawn from technology-readiness assessment, experimental physics, materials engineering, and futures analysis.

Theoretical coherence

- whether the proposed mechanism identified a plausible source of momentum exchange;
- whether the mechanism was formulated within an established or recognizable physical framework;
- whether it was compatible with conservation of momentum and energy;
- whether the derivation had been independently examined; and
- whether major theoretical objections had been resolved, remained disputed, or were unsupported by accepted physical theory.

The analysis distinguished between a theoretically proposed resolution and an empirically established mechanism. For example, the Machian gravitational coupling invoked by MEGA Drive proponents was treated as a theoretical claim rather than as demonstrated evidence of global momentum exchange.

Experimental evidence

- repeatability of reported force signals;
- magnitude and stability of measured forces;

- use of vacuum, thermal, electromagnetic, vibrational, and mechanical controls;
- use of powered null tests and reversed configurations;
- consistency between theoretical predictions and measured responses;
- independent replication; and
- the extent to which identified artifacts accounted for the observed signals.

A measured force signal was not treated automatically as evidence of propulsion. Greater evidentiary weight was given to experiments capable of distinguishing genuine thrust from thermal expansion, electromagnetic coupling, vibration, cable effects, residual gas movement, balance instability, and changes in the test article's center of mass.

Material suitability

- constituent-element availability;
- industrial maturity;
- manufacturing capability;
- electromechanical properties;
- toxicity and regulatory status;
- thermal stability;
- fatigue and fracture behavior;
- dielectric and mechanical losses;
- vacuum and radiation compatibility; and
- suitability for high-frequency and long-duration operation.

The framework distinguished elemental abundance from functional material suitability. The widespread availability of lead, zirconium, titanium, or copper was treated as an enabling condition, but not as proof that the required propulsion-grade component could be manufactured or operated reliably.

Scalability and mission relevance

- current operating frequency;
- claimed thrust-to-power ratio;
- power-system requirements;
- thermal-management demands;
- device architecture;
- reproducibility;
- structural durability;
- control precision; and
- the performance threshold required for a specific mission function.

The analysis did not assume that laboratory-scale devices could be scaled directly to spacecraft applications. In particular, the proposed transition from kilohertz to megahertz or gigahertz operation was treated as a possible change in device architecture rather than as a simple increase in operating frequency.

3.4 Material-Feasibility Analysis

The material analysis focused primarily on lead zirconate titanate, the principal electroactive ceramic used in conventional MEGA Drive test articles, and copper, the principal structural and conductive material used in EM Drive resonant cavities.

Information on the terrestrial availability and production of lead, zirconium, titanium, and copper was drawn primarily from the U.S. Geological Survey Mineral Commodity Summaries. These data were used to assess whether elemental scarcity constituted an immediate constraint at laboratory, prototype, or limited-deployment scale.

The analysis also examined the industrial maturity of piezoelectric ceramic manufacturing. PZT was assessed in relation to its established use in actuators, sensors, medical ultrasound, sonar, accelerometers, and precision-positioning devices. Relevant performance characteristics included the piezoelectric coefficient, electromechanical coupling, dielectric loss, mechanical quality factor, Curie temperature, and suitability for repeated high-field operation.

Lead-free materials were examined as possible long-term alternatives to PZT. These included potassium sodium niobate, barium titanate, bismuth ferrite, and bismuth-layered ferroelectric systems. Relaxor ferroelectric crystals with high piezoelectric coefficients were also considered where they had been proposed as higher-performance alternatives.

The analysis did not assume that a material with a high piezoelectric coefficient would necessarily increase propulsion performance. Such improvement would depend on the validity of the proposed Mach-effect mechanism, the device's electromechanical configuration, operating frequency, phase control, thermal stability, and power-transfer efficiency.

Material feasibility was evaluated at the level appropriate to the current maturity of the technology. The study concentrated on laboratory and prototype production rather than projecting mass-market demand or constructing a global supply-chain model for large-scale spacecraft manufacturing.

3.5 Experimental-Evidence Assessment

The experimental literature was examined through an artifact-oriented approach. Particular attention was given to whether reported force signals could be distinguished from conventional causes of apparent thrust.

For each major experimental report, the assessment considered:

- the measurement apparatus;
- operating environment;
- reported signal magnitude;
- device orientation;
- frequency and phase dependence;
- thermal conditions;
- vibration and resonance;
- electromagnetic shielding;
- cable and electrical-feed configuration;
- null tests;
- control devices; and
- the investigators' interpretation of residual signals.

Studies conducted by proponents were used to document the reported development of the technology and its claimed performance. Independent investigations were given particular weight when evaluating replication and artifact control. Where an independent study concluded that an observed response was attributable to coupled vibration or another conventional effect, the response was not classified as independent confirmation of propulsion.

The evidentiary status of each device was classified qualitatively as:

- unsupported, when no repeatable force remained after conventional artifacts were controlled;
- unvalidated, when proponents reported signals but independent confirmation was absent or artifacts remained unresolved;
- provisionally supported, which would require reproducible evidence across independent laboratories under artifact-controlled conditions; or
- validated, which would require consistent replication, theoretical coherence, and a demonstrable relationship between operating parameters and measured propulsion.

Under this framework, neither the presence of unexplained residual measurements nor the absence of a complete theoretical refutation was considered sufficient for validation.

3.6 Futures-Scenario Development

The futures assessment used scenario analysis rather than predictive forecasting. The scenarios were constructed to examine what different levels of independently validated performance could mean for space mission architecture.

Conservative scenario

The conservative scenario assumed that a small, repeatable force could be demonstrated under rigorous experimental controls, but that the thrust-to-power ratio would remain low. Under this condition, potential applications would be limited to functions requiring extremely small continuous forces, such as precision attitude control, disturbance compensation, or selected station-keeping operations. Any comparison with established technologies would still need to account for the total mass and efficiency of the power, control, thermal, and structural systems.

Intermediate scenario

The intermediate scenario assumed that repeatable propulsion could be demonstrated at a substantially improved thrust-to-power ratio, with stable operation and independently reproduced performance. At this level, the device could be assessed against electric propulsion for selected robotic missions. Competitiveness would depend not only on thrust but also on power-system mass, operating lifetime, control accuracy, reliability, and the absence of consumable reaction mass.

Transformative scenario

The transformative scenario assumed that the underlying effect was experimentally validated, device performance improved by several orders of magnitude, high-frequency operation became technically feasible, and suitable power and thermal-management systems were available. Under these conditions, more ambitious outer-solar-system and interstellar-precursor concepts could be evaluated. This scenario was treated as highly conditional and was not presented as a probable or forecast outcome.

Each scenario was assessed against five questions:

1. What level of experimental validation would be required?
2. What thrust-to-power performance would be necessary?
3. What material and device-development milestones would have to be achieved?
4. What mission classes could plausibly benefit?
5. What unresolved technical constraint would remain most significant?

The purpose of the scenarios was to identify decision thresholds rather than predict adoption dates or technological success.

3.7 Analytical Procedure

The analysis proceeded in six stages.

1. The literature was organized into theoretical, experimental, material, scalability, and futures-related categories.
2. The operating claims of the MEGA Drive and EM Drive were compared against the theoretical-coherence criteria.
3. Major experimental reports were examined for replication, measurement controls, and identified artifacts.
4. The principal device materials were assessed for elemental availability, industrial maturity, environmental and regulatory concerns, and propulsion-relevant performance limitations.
5. Major technological bottlenecks were identified, including experimental reproducibility, high-frequency operation, power efficiency, heat management, structural reliability, and system integration.
6. The futures scenarios were developed by linking different levels of validated performance to possible mission functions. Conclusions were then based on the convergence of evidence across the four analytical dimensions rather than on any single theoretical claim, experiment, or material property.

3.8 Trustworthiness and Limitations

Analytical trustworthiness was strengthened through source triangulation. Claims made by device proponents were compared, where possible, with independent theoretical criticism, replication studies, materials-science literature, and aerospace-engineering benchmarks. The study also distinguished clearly among reported observations, proponents' interpretations, independent experimental findings, and the present study's analytical inferences.

Several limitations remain.

1. The study depended on publicly available literature and did not have access to complete laboratory data, raw force traces, unpublished negative results, or proprietary device specifications.
2. The search process was structured but was not documented at the level required for a formal systematic review. The review cannot therefore claim exhaustive coverage of all relevant publications.
3. The literature includes conference reports and technical documents whose evidentiary status differs from that of peer-reviewed journal articles. These sources were used principally to document claims, apparatus development, or program history.
4. The study did not independently verify the mathematical derivation of the proposed Mach effect through a new relativistic analysis. Its assessment of theoretical coherence was based on published arguments from proponents and critics.
5. The material-feasibility analysis did not include laboratory testing of PZT or lead-free ceramics under propulsion-relevant conditions. It therefore identifies requirements and constraints rather than demonstrating that a suitable high-frequency material currently exists.
6. The futures scenarios are conditional analytical constructs. They should not be interpreted as forecasts, expected development timelines, or evidence that the underlying propulsion effect will be validated.
7. The study does not establish that continued research will produce a positive result. Its purpose is to determine whether the technology can be evaluated through a disciplined framework and what evidentiary and engineering thresholds would have to be met before mission-level claims could be considered credible.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Comparative Theoretical and Experimental Status

The comparative assessment indicates that the MEGA Drive and the EM Drive occupy different positions within the spectrum of contested propulsion technologies. This difference concerns the structure of their proposed mechanisms, the nature of the conservation-law objections directed against them, and the interpretation of their experimental records. It does not, however, establish that either device has produced validated propulsive thrust.

The MEGA Drive is based on Woodward's proposed interpretation of Mach's principle. Its theoretical model assumes that the effective inertia of an accelerating body may be influenced by changes in its internal energy and by its gravitational relationship with distant matter. Proponents argue that the resulting transient mass fluctuations can be synchronized with mechanical deformation in a piezoelectric stack to generate a non-zero average impulse (Woodward, 1990, 2013; Fearn & Woodward, 2019).

This mechanism is connected to a recognizable tradition in gravitational theory, but it remains outside accepted mainstream physics. Critics question whether Woodward's mass-fluctuation expression follows from a valid relativistic derivation and whether the Maxwellian approximation used in the model preserves the relevant terms of the complete gravitational field equations. Momentum and energy conservation are not necessarily violated under the proponents' interpretation because the device is hypothesized to interact gravitationally with distant matter. Nevertheless, this global exchange mechanism has not been demonstrated experimentally or established through an accepted covariant formulation.

The EM Drive proposes a substantially different mechanism. It attributes net thrust to electromagnetic radiation circulating within an asymmetric closed resonant cavity. Under conventional electrodynamics, internal photon interactions with the walls of an isolated cavity cannot produce a sustained change in the total momentum of the device. Variations in cavity shape, electromagnetic mode structure, or group velocity do not independently provide an external momentum reservoir. The original EM Drive explanation therefore faces a more direct conservation-law objection than the Mach-effect model (Shawyer, 2006; Tajmar & Fiedler, 2015).

The experimental distinction is also important. Early EM Drive investigations reported small apparent forces, including measurements conducted in vacuum conditions (White et al., 2017). Subsequent experimental programs showed that similar signals could be produced by thermal deformation, electromagnetic interaction with cables, magnetic coupling, and other measurement-system effects. When these artifacts were controlled more rigorously, no repeatable net thrust remained above the noise level (Tajmar et al., 2022).

Mach-effect experiments have also produced small force signals, but their interpretation remains contested. Experiments associated with Woodward and collaborators reported thrust-like responses from electrically driven piezoelectric stacks. Independent torsion-balance testing, however, found that the observed force traces were consistent with vibrational coupling, electromechanical resonance, and interaction between the actuator and the balance apparatus. Monette et al. (2021) concluded that the response observed in their experimental configuration could be explained by coupled vibration rather than by a Mach-effect propulsion force.

The present assessment therefore classifies the EM Drive as unsupported by the available controlled experimental evidence and the MEGA Drive as unvalidated. The latter classification acknowledges that proponents have reported measurable signals while recognizing that independent experiments have not isolated a reproducible force that cannot be accounted for by conventional artifacts.

Table 1. *Comparative Assessment of the MEGA Drive and EM Drive*

Assessment dimension	MEGA Drive	EM Drive
Proposed mechanism	Transient mass fluctuations synchronized with mechanical deformation through a hypothesized Machian gravitational interaction	Internal electromagnetic radiation pressure within an asymmetric closed resonant cavity
External momentum exchange	Proposed global gravitational interaction with distant matter; not empirically demonstrated	No accepted external momentum reservoir identified in the original mechanism
Conservation-law status	Disputed; proponents claim global momentum and energy conservation, while critics question the derivation and energy closure	Original mechanism is inconsistent with conventional momentum conservation in a closed cavity
Experimental reports	Small force signals reported by proponents using piezoelectric thruster assemblies	Small apparent forces reported in early cavity experiments
Independent findings	Signals attributed in a major independent test to coupled vibration and related artifacts	Apparent forces attributed to thermal, electromagnetic, magnetic, and apparatus-related artifacts
Current evidentiary classification	Unvalidated	Unsupported

Assessment dimension	MEGA Drive	EM Drive
Principal requirement for reconsideration	Independent, reproducible force surviving comprehensive artifact controls and following predicted parameter relationships	A theoretically coherent external momentum mechanism and reproducible thrust beyond established artifacts

Table 1 shows that the relative theoretical defensibility of the MEGA Drive should not be confused with experimental confirmation. The comparison supports separate treatment of the two concepts, but it does not justify describing the MEGA Drive as a demonstrated or partially validated propulsion system.

4.2 Material Feasibility and Engineering Constraints

The material assessment indicates that elemental scarcity is not the principal constraint affecting either device at laboratory or prototype scale. The functional core of the MEGA Drive typically consists of lead zirconate titanate ceramic, while the EM Drive primarily requires a conductive resonant cavity commonly fabricated from copper.

Lead, zirconium, and titanium are supported by established mining, processing, and manufacturing industries. The small quantities required for experimental piezoelectric stacks are negligible relative to present global production. Copper is likewise widely available and supported by mature fabrication and recycling infrastructures (U.S. Geological Survey, 2024). Consequently, neither technology depends on an element that is intrinsically too rare for research or limited prototype production.

The principal materials question for the MEGA Drive is not whether PZT can be obtained, but whether it can perform reliably under the electrical, mechanical, thermal, and frequency conditions required by the proposed propulsion mechanism. PZT is an established electroactive ceramic with high piezoelectric response and extensive industrial use in sensing, actuation, medical imaging, sonar, and precision-positioning applications (Jaffe et al., 1971; Damjanovic, 2001). This manufacturing maturity is a genuine advantage because it allows researchers to obtain materials with documented electrical and mechanical properties.

Conventional PZT nonetheless presents several limitations. Repeated high-field cycling can produce heating, dielectric loss, fatigue, depolarization, fracture, and changes in electromechanical response. These concerns become more significant when the material is driven near resonance or at power levels intended to maximize mechanical deformation. A propulsion component would also have to maintain stable performance under vacuum, radiation exposure, thermal cycling, launch vibration, and prolonged operation.

Lead content creates additional environmental and regulatory concerns. Lead within a sintered and encapsulated ceramic does not necessarily create substantial exposure during normal spacecraft operation. The primary risks concern manufacturing, machining, component fracture, disposal, recycling, and regulatory restrictions. The presence of lead should therefore be treated as a life-cycle and compliance issue rather than automatically as a direct hazard to spacecraft occupants.

Lead-free piezoelectric systems may eventually reduce these concerns. Potassium sodium niobate, barium titanate, bismuth ferrite, and bismuth-layered ferroelectric systems have been investigated as possible alternatives to PZT (Takenaka & Nagata, 2005; Shrout & Zhang, 2007; Rödel et al., 2009). Some engineered potassium sodium niobate compositions have achieved piezoelectric responses approaching those of conventional PZT (Liu & Ren, 2009). However, performance trade-offs remain in temperature stability, aging, reproducibility, dielectric loss, and manufacturing consistency.

Relaxor ferroelectric crystals such as PIN-PMN-PT may offer substantially higher electromechanical coupling than standard PZT formulations (Zhang et al., 2015). These materials remain lead-based, however, and their greater piezoelectric response does not independently validate the propulsion mechanism. A stronger mechanical response would improve thrust only if the proposed Mach-effect relationship exists and if the device maintains the necessary phase, frequency, and structural behavior.

The EM Drive has fewer material-performance constraints because a copper microwave cavity is comparatively straightforward to manufacture. This apparent material advantage has little practical significance when the proposed propulsion mechanism itself is unsupported. Material maturity is an enabling condition only after physical viability has been established.

Table 2. *Material Feasibility and Principal Engineering Constraints*

Material or component	Relevant advantage	Availability	Principal limitation
Conventional PZT ceramic	High piezoelectric response; mature manufacturing; broad industrial use	Widely available at laboratory and prototype scale	Lead content, fatigue, heating, dielectric loss, fracture, and uncertain very-high-frequency performance
Lead-free piezoelectric ceramics	Improved environmental and regulatory profile	Constituent materials generally available	Performance and manufacturing maturity remain below or less consistent than established PZT systems
PIN-PMN-PT and related relaxor crystals	Very high electromechanical coupling and piezoelectric response	Commercially available but more specialized	Lead-based, costly, structurally demanding, and not demonstrated for propulsive operation
Copper resonant cavity	Mature fabrication, high electrical conductivity, established microwave applications	Widely available	Material suitability does not resolve the EM Drive's theoretical and experimental deficiencies
Drive electronics and electrodes	Permit phase control and high-frequency electrical input	Based on mature electronic technologies at conventional frequencies	Impedance matching, switching losses, heating, electromagnetic interference, and control complexity increase with frequency
Structural and thermal system	Maintains alignment, prestress, and heat rejection	Conventional materials are available	Added mass may eliminate the system-level advantage of small propellantless thrust

Table 2 demonstrates that the MEGA Drive does not face an immediate raw-material shortage. Its main material challenges involve functional performance, device integration, and long-duration reliability. The results therefore do not support a broad conclusion that the technology is materially feasible in an operational sense. They support the narrower conclusion that constituent-element availability is unlikely to prevent further laboratory development.

4.3 Scalability and Performance Thresholds

The most significant engineering challenge identified in the assessment is the proposed scaling of device performance with operating frequency. Existing Mach-effect thrusters have generally operated in the kilohertz range. More ambitious performance projections have assumed operation several orders of magnitude above these frequencies.

The theoretical model associates the magnitude of the proposed effect with time-dependent changes in internal energy and acceleration. This has led to the expectation that increasing frequency could substantially increase force output. Even if the mathematical relationship is accepted within the proposed model, however, it does not follow that a macroscopic piezoelectric stack can preserve the same operating behavior across several orders of magnitude in frequency.

At sufficiently high frequencies, the acoustic wavelength within the material becomes comparable to or smaller than relevant device dimensions. Internal wave propagation, local resonances, electrode geometry, dielectric dispersion, phase delay, and boundary conditions become increasingly important. The device may no longer behave as a uniformly deforming stack. Mechanical and electrical losses may increase, while the energy delivered by the drive electronics may be converted primarily into heat rather than useful deformation.

The transition from kilohertz operation to megahertz or gigahertz regimes should therefore be treated as a possible change in device architecture. Practical high-frequency systems may require thin-film piezoelectrics, microelectromechanical resonators, nanoscale structures, distributed drive elements, or alternative electroactive materials. This transition cannot be described credibly as merely operating the existing stack at a faster rate.

Thrust magnitude alone is also an incomplete measure of scalability. An operational spacecraft system must be evaluated through system-level performance. Relevant variables include:

- net thrust after structural and control losses;
- electrical input power;
- power-generation mass;

• thermal-management mass;

• control electronics;

• structural reinforcement;

• operating lifetime;

• force stability;

• thrust directionality;

• electromagnetic compatibility; and

• reliability under spaceflight conditions.

A device producing a measurable force may still be inferior to an ion engine if the associated power and thermal systems are excessively massive. Conversely, a low-thrust device could have operational value if it functions continuously for long periods without consuming reaction mass and without imposing excessive system mass.

Three technical milestones follow from this analysis.

First, researchers must establish that a repeatable force exists under artifact-controlled conditions. Frequency scaling has little engineering meaning until the underlying effect is independently validated.

Second, the relationship between force and operating variables must be demonstrated. A genuine propulsion effect should show reproducible dependence on parameters predicted by the theoretical model, including phase, acceleration, energy input, device orientation, and frequency. Increasing the drive frequency should produce the predicted response rather than merely increasing vibration or heating.

Third, propulsion performance must be evaluated at the complete-system level. This requires comparing the total mass and energy requirements of the thruster, power source, thermal system, electronics, and support structure with established propulsion alternatives.

The original claim that gigahertz operation represents a single critical pathway to practical propulsion should therefore be moderated. High-frequency operation may be relevant, but it is one component of a broader validation and systems-engineering problem.

4.4 Conditional Futures Assessment

The futures assessment produced three scenarios based on different levels of experimental validation and engineering development. These scenarios are conditional analytical constructs rather than predictions. They identify the requirements that would have to be satisfied before particular mission applications could be considered credible.

Table 3. *Conditional Futures Scenarios for Mach-Effect Propulsion*

Scenario	Validation and performance assumption	Possible applications	Essential requirements	Principal uncertainty
Conservative	A small continuous force is independently reproduced and remains after thermal, vibrational, electromagnetic, and mechanical controls	Precision attitude control, disturbance compensation, limited station-keeping, or drag compensation	Stable directional force, low system mass, long operating life, and a net advantage over conventional actuators	Whether a genuine residual force exists at all
Intermediate	Force output and thrust-to-power performance improve substantially and are reproduced across laboratories	Selected robotic deep-space propulsion, long-duration trajectory correction, or missions where propellant storage is a dominant limitation	Competitive system-level efficiency, reliable control, scalable manufacturing, thermal management, and long-duration durability	Whether laboratory performance can scale without disproportionate power and mass requirements

Scenario	Validation and performance assumption	Possible applications	Essential requirements	Principal uncertainty
Transformative	The underlying effect is validated, performance improves by several orders of magnitude, and high-frequency architectures become feasible	Rapid outer-solar-system missions, solar-gravitational-lens missions, and interstellar precursor concepts	High-output power source, major advances in materials and resonator design, high-frequency operation, exceptional reliability, and complete mission integration	Whether the theoretical scaling relationship remains valid across radically different device architectures

Conservative scenario

In the conservative scenario, the principal scientific achievement would be the demonstration of a small but genuine non-conventional force. Such a result would not immediately displace established spacecraft propulsion. Low-force spacecraft functions are already performed through reaction wheels, magnetic torquers, cold-gas systems, electric microthrusters, solar-pressure management, and other technologies.

A Mach-effect device would become relevant only if it provided a measurable life-cycle advantage. The absence of stored propellant could be beneficial for long-duration missions, but that advantage would have to exceed the mass, power, heat-rejection, and reliability costs of the complete system. The conservative scenario is therefore mission-enabling only in specialized applications where continuous operation and the elimination of consumable reaction mass outweigh low thrust and power demands.

Intermediate scenario

The intermediate scenario assumes that the propulsion effect is not only validated but substantially improved. At this level, the device could be compared with electric propulsion for robotic science missions. The principal advantage would be the absence of propellant depletion, potentially allowing thrust to continue as long as electrical power remained available.

The relevant comparison would not be based solely on thrust-to-power ratio. Electric propulsion systems have established lifetimes, controllability, and mission heritage. A competing Mach-effect system would need to demonstrate equivalent or superior reliability, force stability, pointing accuracy, and total spacecraft-level performance. It would also need to operate for mission-relevant durations rather than during short laboratory test sequences.

If these conditions were satisfied, long-duration exploration of the outer solar system could become more flexible. Missions might allocate less mass to propellant and more to scientific instruments or shielding. However, travel times would still depend on actual acceleration, available power, spacecraft mass, and trajectory design. The absence of propellant would not eliminate all mission constraints.

Transformative scenario

The transformative scenario assumes several major breakthroughs occurring together: validation of the proposed physical effect, large improvements in force generation, successful high-frequency device architectures, durable electroactive materials, and compact high-output power systems. Only under this combination of conditions would rapid outer-solar-system or interstellar-precursor missions become technically discussable.

This scenario carries the greatest potential value and the greatest uncertainty. It cannot be derived directly from existing kilohertz-scale experiments. The device architecture required for such performance may differ fundamentally from current piezoelectric stacks. Power generation and waste-heat rejection could become as limiting as thrust production. Interstellar or near-interstellar mission claims should therefore be framed as distant conditional implications rather than as an extrapolation of present performance.

The scenarios show that the value of the technology depends on the level at which it is validated. A weak but reproducible effect could have narrow applications. A stronger effect could have broader mission value. Transformative applications would require multiple advances beyond the confirmation of thrust alone.

4.5 Discussion

The findings support three principal interpretations.

First, the comparative assessment demonstrates the importance of discriminating among contested technologies without converting relative plausibility into validation. The MEGA Drive and EM Drive should not be treated as theoretically identical. The former invokes a disputed Machian gravitational relationship, while the latter originally attributes thrust to internal electromagnetic processes within a closed cavity. This distinction may justify allocating different levels of analytical attention to the two concepts.

Nevertheless, the failure of the EM Drive does not provide affirmative evidence for the MEGA Drive. The proper comparison is not between a discredited concept and a validated alternative, but between an unsupported device and an unvalidated hypothesis. This distinction is essential to a balanced interpretation of the evidence.

Supporters of continued MEGA Drive research may reasonably emphasize that the proposed mechanism can be formulated mathematically, that the device can be constructed from accessible materials, and that the existence of even a weak effect would have substantial technological implications. From this perspective, limited and carefully staged funding may be justified because a decisive experiment could generate either highly valuable confirmation or scientifically useful falsification.

Skeptics may respond that the theory has not been accepted within mainstream gravitational physics, that independent testing has attributed observed signals to conventional artifacts, and that extraordinary mission implications have frequently been extrapolated from uncertain laboratory measurements. From this perspective, research resources should be directed toward established propulsion technologies unless proponents can first produce a replicable effect through transparent and independently verifiable experiments.

Both positions identify legitimate considerations. High potential value may justify continued investigation, but it does not justify reduced evidentiary standards. Conversely, the existence of substantial theoretical criticism does not prevent a claim from being tested experimentally when a decisive and reasonably bounded experiment is possible. The appropriate research posture is therefore neither advocacy nor automatic dismissal, but staged falsification-oriented investigation.

Second, the material analysis demonstrates the limited explanatory value of elemental abundance. The availability of lead, zirconium, titanium, copper, and associated manufacturing infrastructure means that raw-material scarcity does not prevent laboratory research. It does not establish that a propulsion-grade material or scalable thruster can be produced.

The binding material questions concern electromechanical behavior, thermal stability, fatigue, fracture, dielectric loss, radiation response, and operation at radically higher frequencies. These factors interact with the entire device system. A material with excellent laboratory piezoelectric properties may be unsuitable when subjected to prolonged high-power cycling or when integrated into a high-frequency resonator.

The paper's original framing of PZT as Earth-abundant and therefore materially feasible should consequently be narrowed. PZT is materially accessible and industrially mature, but operational suitability for Mach-effect propulsion remains unestablished. Lead-free materials may improve the environmental profile, but they do not resolve the principal theoretical or experimental questions.

Third, the scenario analysis demonstrates the value of performance-threshold futures assessment. Frontier technologies are often discussed through extreme alternatives: complete failure or civilizational transformation. The present framework offers a more disciplined approach by examining what different validated performance levels would permit.

The conservative scenario is particularly important because it prevents the analysis from depending entirely on interstellar claims. A small, genuine, stable force could have scientific value even if it never became a primary propulsion system. It would constitute evidence of a presently unconfirmed physical interaction and could motivate new theoretical and experimental work.

The intermediate and transformative scenarios require increasingly demanding assumptions. They are useful not because they predict technological success but because they expose the milestones that speculative narratives frequently omit. These include independent replication, system-level mass advantage, sustained operation, thermal management, material endurance, high-frequency architecture, power generation, and mission integration.

The results have direct implications for research governance. Future experiments should be designed collaboratively with critics and independent measurement specialists. Test protocols should include powered null devices, blind operating sequences, thermal replicas, vibration monitoring, magnetic shielding, orientation reversal, independent calibration, preregistered analysis, and public release of raw data where feasible.

Funding should be staged according to evidentiary milestones. Initial support should prioritize definitive low-force measurement rather than spacecraft design or speculative mission modelling. Higher levels of investment would become appropriate only after independent replication and demonstration of predictable scaling relationships.

Science communication should likewise distinguish among theoretical proposal, measured signal, artifact-controlled result, independent replication, engineering scalability, and mission feasibility. Failure to maintain these distinctions can convert legitimate frontier inquiry into exaggerated technological advocacy.

The principal contribution of this study is therefore not a conclusion that Mach-effect propulsion is viable. It is the development of an integrated framework showing how such a claim should be evaluated. The framework indicates that the MEGA Drive remains experimentally unvalidated, that its materials are accessible but not demonstrated to be propulsion-suitable, and that its possible mission implications are conditional on a sequence of theoretical, experimental, material, and systems-engineering achievements that have not yet been realized.

5. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

This study evaluated the Mach-Effect Gravity Assist Drive through an integrated assessment of theoretical coherence, experimental evidence, material suitability, scalability, and possible future mission applications. It also compared the MEGA Drive with the Electromagnetic Drive to clarify differences between two technologies frequently grouped under the broad category of propellantless propulsion.

The analysis concludes that the MEGA Drive and the EM Drive should not be treated as scientifically equivalent. The EM Drive's original mechanism does not identify a credible external momentum reservoir and is inconsistent with the conventional treatment of momentum conservation in a closed electromagnetic cavity. Controlled investigations have further attributed previously reported EM Drive forces to thermal, electromagnetic, magnetic, and apparatus-related effects. On the basis of the available evidence, the EM Drive is therefore classified as unsupported.

The MEGA Drive occupies a different but still unresolved position. Its proposed mechanism is derived from a disputed interpretation of Mach's principle and gravitational interaction. Proponents argue that momentum and energy may be conserved globally through coupling between the device and distant matter, but this mechanism has not been established through an accepted relativistic derivation or demonstrated experimentally. The theoretical framework is consequently recognizable as a scientific hypothesis, but it remains outside mainstream acceptance.

The experimental evidence does not establish the existence of Mach-effect propulsion. Although proponents have reported small force signals from piezoelectric thruster systems, independent torsion-balance testing has attributed observed responses to coupled vibration, resonance, and other conventional artifacts. The MEGA Drive should therefore be classified as experimentally unvalidated rather than provisionally confirmed. A credible positive conclusion would require repeatable force measurements that survive thermal, vibrational, electromagnetic, mechanical, and analytical controls and that are independently reproduced across laboratories.

The material assessment shows that raw-material scarcity is unlikely to constrain continued laboratory research. Lead zirconate titanate is industrially mature, widely manufactured, and composed of elements available in quantities far exceeding prototype requirements. Copper, used in EM Drive cavities, is similarly abundant and supported by mature manufacturing systems.

This availability does not establish operational material feasibility. PZT-based propulsion devices would still need to demonstrate stable electromechanical performance, low dielectric and mechanical loss, thermal tolerance, fatigue resistance, radiation compatibility, structural reliability, and long-duration operation. Lead content also creates manufacturing, regulatory, environmental, and end-of-life concerns. Lead-free piezoelectric materials may eventually reduce these concerns, but their performance trade-offs remain relevant, particularly under high-frequency and high-power operating conditions.

The analysis further concludes that frequency scaling represents a system-level engineering problem rather than a straightforward extension of current devices. Transitioning from kilohertz operation to megahertz or gigahertz regimes would likely require changes in resonator dimensions, material architecture, electrode design, drive electronics, thermal management, and control systems. It cannot be assumed that the proposed force relationship will remain valid across radically different device configurations.

The futures assessment indicates that possible mission relevance depends on the level of independently validated performance. A very small but repeatable force could support narrow scientific or spacecraft-control applications if the complete system offered an advantage over established technologies. Stronger and more efficient performance could justify comparison with electric propulsion for selected long-duration missions. Transformative applications involving rapid outer-solar-system travel or interstellar precursor missions would require several major advances beyond experimental confirmation, including substantial improvements in thrust, power density, system mass, durability, high-frequency operation, thermal management, and mission integration.

The central conclusion of the study is not that Mach-effect propulsion is viable, but that it can be evaluated through a disciplined sequence of theoretical, experimental, material, and engineering tests. Continued research may be scientifically defensible only when it is explicitly designed to distinguish genuine propulsion from conventional artifacts and when mission claims remain proportional to the level of evidence achieved.

5.2 Recommendations

For experimental researchers

Future MEGA Drive investigations should prioritize falsification-oriented experimental designs. The central objective should be to determine whether any residual force remains after all plausible conventional causes have been isolated and controlled. Experiments should include:

- powered null devices that reproduce heating and electrical activity without the proposed propulsion configuration;
- reversal of device orientation to test whether the measured force changes direction consistently;
- blind and randomized operating sequences;
- independent measurement of vibration, temperature, magnetic fields, and structural deformation;
- thermal replicas or dummy loads;
- magnetic and electrostatic shielding;
- minimized or optically isolated electrical connections;
- independent calibration of force-measurement systems;
- preregistered data-processing and exclusion criteria; and
- release of raw data and apparatus specifications where intellectual-property restrictions do not prevent disclosure.

Researchers should avoid treating unexplained residual signals as evidence of new physics. A residual measurement should instead be treated as an unresolved experimental observation until it is reproduced independently and shown to follow a theoretically predicted relationship.

For independent replication teams

Independent laboratories should reproduce the complete experiment rather than only the nominal device design. Replication should include the operating waveform, prestress, phase relationship, mounting conditions, electronics, frequency regime, vacuum environment, calibration procedure, and data-analysis method.

Replication efforts should involve specialists in low-force metrology, vibration analysis, thermal engineering, electromagnetic compatibility, and piezoelectric materials. The complexity of the measurement problem makes multidisciplinary participation necessary.

For theoretical physicists

The proposed Mach-effect mechanism requires further examination through a fully covariant treatment of the relevant energy-momentum relations. Theoretical work should clarify:

- whether the predicted transient mass fluctuation survives beyond the Maxwellian approximation;
- how local and global momentum are exchanged;
- how the complete energy budget closes;
- whether the proposed interaction permits a measurable laboratory force;
- which operating variables should produce distinct and falsifiable experimental signatures; and
- what magnitude of force should be expected under realistically specified device conditions.

A useful theoretical model must generate testable predictions that distinguish a genuine Mach-related effect from vibration, heating, resonance, electromagnetic coupling, or conventional piezoelectric behavior.

For materials scientists

Materials research should focus on the requirements of prolonged high-field, high-frequency, and vacuum-compatible electroactive operation rather than only on maximizing piezoelectric coefficients. Relevant performance indicators include:

- dielectric loss;
- mechanical quality factor;
- fatigue resistance;
- fracture toughness;
- depolarization behavior;
- thermal stability;
- radiation resistance;
- frequency-dependent electromechanical coupling;
- long-term dimensional stability; and
- reproducibility of material properties across manufactured components.

Lead-free piezoelectric systems should be evaluated as possible long-term alternatives, but comparisons should consider the full set of operational properties rather than piezoelectric response alone.

For aerospace engineers

Mission studies should not assume that a laboratory force signal can be directly converted into spacecraft performance. Any proposed application should include the total mass and energy requirements of:

- the thruster;
- power generation;
- drive electronics;
- thermal rejection;
- structural support;
- shielding;

• control systems; and

• redundancy provisions.

Mach-effect systems should be compared with existing alternatives on the basis of net spacecraft-level performance, reliability, lifetime, controllability, and mission risk.

For research funders and policymakers

Funding should be staged according to explicit evidentiary milestones.

Early-stage support should concentrate on decisive measurement, independent replication, and theoretical clarification. Larger engineering investments should be considered only after a reproducible force has been demonstrated under comprehensive artifact controls.

Funding programs should require:

• transparent experimental protocols;

• independent review of measurement design;

• predefined success and failure criteria;

• reporting of negative and null results;

• data-sharing provisions where feasible; and

• clear separation between experimental evidence and speculative mission projections.

Continued investment in the EM Drive is difficult to justify without a fundamentally new theoretical mechanism and reproducible evidence beyond known artifacts. MEGA Drive research may warrant limited investigation because its hypothesis remains testable, but such support should not be interpreted as institutional endorsement of the claimed effect.

For science communicators

Public and scholarly communication should distinguish among:

• a proposed theoretical mechanism;

• a detected instrument response;

• an unexplained residual;

• an artifact-controlled force measurement;

• independent replication;

• engineering scalability; and

• mission-level viability.

Terms such as validated propulsion, reactionless drive, interstellar engine, or breakthrough technology should not be used unless the corresponding evidentiary threshold has been met. Communication should present both the potential significance of a positive result and the substantial probability that present signals arise from conventional causes.

For future researchers

Future studies should develop more formalized technology-assessment frameworks that combine theoretical plausibility, experimental quality, material suitability, system-level engineering, and futures scenarios. Additional research may also compare the MEGA Drive with physically established non-propellant-consuming systems such as solar sails, magnetic sails, electrodynamic tethers, and beamed-energy propulsion. Such comparisons would provide more operationally meaningful benchmarks than comparison with the EM Drive alone.

5.3 Implications of the Study

Theoretical implications

The study demonstrates that relative theoretical plausibility must not be confused with empirical validity. A technology may be more theoretically structured than another contested concept while still lacking an accepted mechanism or reproducible evidence. The MEGA Drive's connection to Machian gravitational ideas warrants analytical consideration, but it does not exempt the theory from conservation-law analysis or experimental falsification.

The study also emphasizes the importance of identifying the momentum reservoir in propulsion claims. Any system that produces sustained spacecraft acceleration must exchange momentum with an external body, field, radiation source, or other physical degree of freedom. A proposed global interaction must be described mathematically and tested empirically rather than invoked only as a conceptual explanation.

Methodological implications

The assessment illustrates the value of artifact-oriented methodology in frontier science. In low-force measurement, the existence of a signal is less informative than the experimental process used to eliminate conventional explanations. The credibility of a propulsion claim depends on the quality of controls, replication, calibration, data transparency, and theoretical prediction.

The study's comparative framework also provides a method for evaluating contested technologies without relying on binary judgments. A technology can be classified as unsupported, unvalidated, provisionally supported, or validated according to explicitly stated criteria. This allows uncertainty to be represented more accurately than labels such as promising or discredited.

Materials-science implications

The findings show that material availability and material suitability are distinct analytical questions. A device may use abundant elements and established manufacturing processes while remaining infeasible because of fatigue, losses, thermal instability, frequency response, or integration requirements.

This distinction has relevance beyond Mach-effect propulsion. Frontier technologies involving batteries, superconductors, quantum devices, high-temperature systems, fusion components, and advanced semiconductors also depend on functional material performance rather than elemental abundance alone.

Engineering implications

The study highlights the need to evaluate propulsion technologies at the complete-system level. Eliminating stored propellant does not automatically reduce spacecraft mass or improve mission performance. Power systems, heat rejection, electronics, shielding, control mechanisms, and structural components may offset or exceed the mass saved by removing reaction mass.

The findings also caution against assuming continuity across large scaling ranges. Moving from kilohertz laboratory devices to gigahertz propulsion architectures may require fundamentally different materials and designs. Engineering extrapolation should therefore be constrained by demonstrated behavior rather than by theoretical scaling relationships alone.

Futures-studies implications

The scenario framework demonstrates how speculative technological futures can be examined without treating them as predictions. By linking each scenario to explicit validation and performance thresholds, futures analysis can reveal which claims are plausible under limited success, which require substantial engineering progress, and which depend on multiple unverified breakthroughs.

This threshold-based approach is particularly useful for frontier technologies whose potential impact is large but whose present evidence is weak. It preserves the value of imaginative exploration while maintaining analytical discipline.

Policy and institutional implications

The study supports a staged approach to high-risk, high-impact research. Scientific institutions need not choose between unrestricted funding and complete rejection. Limited research can be justified when the hypothesis is testable, the experiment is affordable relative to the potential value of the result, and the research design can produce a decisive negative outcome.

Institutional credibility depends on maintaining a clear distinction between funding an investigation and endorsing its claims. Programs supporting frontier propulsion should communicate that their purpose is to resolve uncertainty, not to confirm a preferred technological future.

Implications for frontier science

The broader implication is that frontier science is best protected through methodological rigor rather than through either enthusiasm or ridicule. Claims at the boundary of accepted knowledge should be examined according to their theoretical structure, testability, evidentiary quality, and capacity for independent replication.

The MEGA Drive provides an instructive case because it combines a disputed theoretical framework, measurable laboratory devices, accessible materials, and extraordinary projected implications. Its scientific value now depends less on repeating additional thrust claims than on conducting experiments capable of determining conclusively whether the observed signals represent new physics or conventional artifacts.

6. REFERENCES

Barbour, J. B., & Pfister, H. (Eds.). (1995). Mach's principle: From Newton's bucket to quantum gravity. Birkhäuser. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-3936-3

Bondi, H., & Samuel, J. (1997). The Lense-Thirring effect and Mach's principle. Physics Letters A, 228(3), 121–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(97)00117-5

Borowski, S. K., McCurdy, D. R., & Packard, T. W. (2012). Nuclear thermal rocket propulsion: A proven game-changing technology for future human exploration missions (NASA Technical Report E-18199). National Aeronautics and Space Administration. https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20120009207

Damjanovic, D. (2001). Piezoelectric properties of perovskite ferroelectrics: Unsolved problems and future research. Annales de Chimie: Science des Matériaux, 26(1), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0151-9107(01)90020-0

Fearn, H., & Woodward, J. F. (2019). Advances in Mach Effect Gravitational Assist (MEGA) Drive experimentation. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 72(11), 376–381.

Frisbee, R. H. (2003). Advanced space propulsion for the 21st century. Journal of Propulsion and Power, 19(6), 1129–1154. https://doi.org/10.2514/2.6948

Jaffe, B., Cook, W. R., Jr., & Jaffe, H. (1971). Piezoelectric ceramics. Academic Press.

Kawaguchi, J., Fujiwara, A., & Uesugi, T. (2008). Hayabusa—Its technology and science accomplishment summary and Hayabusa-2. Acta Astronautica, 62(10–11), 639–647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2008.01.028

Liu, W., & Ren, X. (2009). Large piezoelectric effect in Pb-free ceramics. Physical Review Letters, 103(25), Article 257602. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.257602

Mach, E. (1960). The science of mechanics: A critical and historical account of its development (T. J. McCormack, Trans.). Open Court. (Original work published 1883)

Monette, M., Kößling, M., & Tajmar, M. (2021). Experimental investigation of Mach-effect thrusters on torsion balances. Acta Astronautica, 182, 531–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2021.02.037

National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (2018, March 30). Mach effect for in space propulsion: Interstellar mission. https://www.nasa.gov/general/mach-effect-for-in-space-propulsion-interstellar-mission/

Rayman, M. D., Fraschetti, T. C., Raymond, C. A., & Russell, C. T. (2006). Dawn: A mission in development for exploration of main belt asteroids Vesta and Ceres. Acta Astronautica, 58(11), 605–616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2006.01.014

Rodal, J. J. A. (2019). A Machian wave effect in conformal, scalar–tensor gravitational theory. General Relativity and Gravitation, 51, Article 64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-019-2547-9

Rödel, J., Jo, W., Seifert, K. T. P., Anton, E.-M., Granzow, T., & Damjanovic, D. (2009). Perspective on the development of lead-free piezoceramics. Journal of the American Ceramic Society, 92(6), 1153–1177. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2009.03061.x

Shawyer, R. J. (2006). Technical report on the development of a microwave engine for satellite propulsion [Technical report]. Satellite Propulsion Research Ltd.

Shrout, T. R., & Zhang, S. J. (2007). Lead-free piezoelectric ceramics: Alternatives for PZT? Journal of Electroceramics, 19(1), 113–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10832-007-9047-0

Sutton, G. P., & Biblarz, O. (2016). Rocket propulsion elements (9th ed.). Wiley.

Tajmar, M., & Fiedler, G. (2015). Direct thrust measurements of an EM Drive and evaluation of possible side-effects. In Proceedings of the 51st AIAA/SAE/ASEE Joint Propulsion Conference (AIAA Paper 2015-4083). American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2015-4083

Tajmar, M., Neunzig, O., & Weikert, M. (2022). High-accuracy thrust measurements of the EMDrive and elimination of false-positive effects. CEAS Space Journal, 14, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12567-021-00385-1

Takenaka, T., & Nagata, H. (2005). Current status and prospects of lead-free piezoelectric ceramics. Journal of the European Ceramic Society, 25(12), 2693–2700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2005.03.125

Tsiolkovsky, K. E. (1903). Exploration of the universe with reaction machines. Nauchnoye Obozreniye, 5.

U.S. Geological Survey. (2024). Mineral commodity summaries 2024. U.S. Department of the Interior. https://doi.org/10.3133/mcs2024

White, H., March, P., Lawrence, J., Vera, J., Sylvester, A., Brady, D., & Bailey, P. (2017). Measurement of impulsive thrust from a closed radio-frequency cavity in vacuum. Journal of Propulsion and Power, 33(4), 830–841. https://doi.org/10.2514/1.B36120

Woodward, J. F. (1990). A new experimental approach to Mach's principle and relativistic gravitation. Foundations of Physics Letters, 3(5), 497–506. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00665932

Woodward, J. F. (2013). Making starships and stargates: The science of interstellar transport and absurdly benign wormholes. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5623-0

Zhang, S., Li, F., Jiang, X., Kim, J., Luo, J., & Geng, X. (2015). Advantages and challenges of relaxor-$PbTiO_3$ ferroelectric crystals for electroacoustic transducers—A review. Progress in Materials Science, 68, 1–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmatsci.2014.10.002