How the Vacuum Could Give Us All the Energy We Need

A Concept Paper on the Energetics of a Near-Critical Medium

J. Konstapel · Leiden, 29 July 2026

Companion to The Constitutive Equation of the Vacuum Condensate, The Missing Weight and the Medium, The Vacuum as Weather *(3rd ed.), and* The Vacuum Replicator, *all available via the author's ResearchGate profile.*

Abstract

The constitutive programme for the vacuum has produced a number: the coefficient γ that governs the medium's state-dependent response is empirically pinned at $\gamma \approx cH_0/a_0 \approx 2\pi$, and a topological reading of the medium — a dynamic network of knots whose collective theory is the condensate — predicts that value exactly, as the phase of one closed winding. This paper draws out the energetic consequence, which is startling when stated plainly: $\gamma = 2\pi$ forces the quadratic self-interaction of the medium to be *negative*, cancelled to within ~16% by its stabilizing term. The vacuum is a loaded spring held near its critical point. We use that result to reframe the oldest question in technology — where does energy come from, and how do we get more of it — in constitutive terms. Three honest theses organize the paper: (1) the vacuum already supplies every joule humanity has ever used, since all stored energy is knot energy frozen into the medium at the tariff $E = mc^2$, and the history of energy technology is the history of progressively deeper topology editing; (2) there is no free lunch in the calibrated state — schemes that promise extraction from the local reference vacuum misread the floor as a reservoir, and the constitutive equation says precisely why; (3) the real levers are identifiable: editing knots by *conditioning* rather than pushing, tapping the medium through engineered boundaries where coupling is already experimentally demonstrated, and — on the civilizational horizon — the recognition that in this framework roughly ninety-five percent of the universe's energy budget *is* the medium itself. The paper fits nothing and promises nothing; it locates the taps, prices them, and states which are open, which are stiff, and why.

Genre note. This is a concept paper: a perspective disciplined by a framework, not a report of results. The technical basis — the derivation of the constitutive form, its empirical pins, and the status of γ — is given in the companion papers. Sections 4–6 are explicitly forward-looking and are labelled as such.

1. The spring: what the new number says

The constitutive equation of the vacuum condensate has the leading form $g_{eff} = \bar{g}(1 + \gamma\chi)$, with $\chi = a/(cH)$ the local dynamical state measured against the background of the largest cosmic mode. The crossover of galactic dynamics pins the coefficient empirically: $\gamma \approx cH_0/a_0 \approx 2\pi$. That the measured value lands on 2π has been sitting in the literature for forty years as an unexplained coincidence — Milgrom noted at the outset that the acceleration scale of galactic dynamics satisfies $a_0 \approx cH_0/2\pi$ (Milgrom, 1983) — and the knot-network reading of the medium turns the coincidence into a statement: the leading collective nonlinearity of a network whose basic constraint is *closure* carries the phase of one closed loop. The number is topological.

Now the energetic consequence. With $\gamma = 2g_3n_0/(g_2 + 2g_3n_0)$, any value of γ greater than one forces $g_2 < 0$: the medium's quadratic self-interaction is *attractive*, stabilized only by the higher-order term. Inserting $\gamma = 2\pi$ gives $g_2 \approx -0.84 \times (2g_3n_0)$ — a cancellation of eighty-four percent between attraction and stabilization. Two large quantities, opposed, almost balancing.

Readers of cosmology will recognize the silhouette. The most famous unsolved problem in physics — the cosmological constant problem — has exactly this shape: the vacuum's energy density, computed from its microphysics, is enormous, yet what survives observationally is a residue suppressed by many orders of magnitude (Weinberg, 1989). The standard framing treats the near-cancellation as an embarrassment to be explained away. The constitutive framing inverts it: near-cancellation is what a *poised medium* looks like. A system in which two large terms oppose each other to within a sliver sits close to its critical point — soft, responsive, capable of large collective rearrangements under small triggers. That is the formal version of what the third edition called the vacuum's *weather*: storms are what near-critical media do.

So the discovery reads, in one sentence: **the vacuum is a spring, loaded to within sixteen percent of letting go, held by topology.** The rest of this paper asks the only question an engineer can ask of such an object: where are the taps?

2. You already run on it

Begin with a fact hiding in plain sight: the vacuum already gives us all the energy we use, and always has.

In the constitutive picture, matter is frozen pattern — knots the medium tied and stiffened into permanence. The tariff at which energy was frozen into those knots is the most famous equation in the world: $E = mc^2$ is not a statement *about* matter so much as the exchange rate of the medium's battery. Every joule ever spent by humanity was withdrawn from that battery. What we call energy sources are, without exception, methods of *editing frozen topology* at some depth:

- **Fire and chemistry** edit the shallowest layer — the binding arrangements between knots — releasing parts in ten million of the stored total.
- **Fission** edits the edge of the knots themselves — reconfiguring the heaviest, least tightly wound structures — releasing parts in a thousand.
- **Fusion** edits the knots proper — rewinding the lightest structures into tighter ones — approaching parts in a hundred.
- **Annihilation**, the closing of knot against anti-knot, returns the full deposit: the complete unfreezing of the pattern.

Seen this way, the history of energy technology is one single programme that never knew its own name: humanity working its way down the medium's layers, from rearranging the furniture between knots toward editing the knots themselves. The question "can we get energy from the vacuum?" is answered by every power station on Earth. The real questions are how deep the editing can go, and what governs the difficulty — and those are constitutive questions.

3. Why there is no free lunch in the calibrated state

Before opening any taps, the framework closes one — loudly, because this is where a century of perpetual-motion schemes has gone to die.

The zero-point dream proposes to extract energy from the local vacuum itself: to drain the reference state. The constitutive equation says precisely why this fails. The laboratory vacuum is the medium at its stiff asymptote — saturated, work-hardened, the state in which its parameters have passed for constants of nature (that is Pin 1 of the companion paper: optical clocks bound the local state's variation to parts in 10^{17}). A reference state is a *floor*, not a reservoir: it is the configuration everything else decays toward, and there is nowhere below it to decay to. Devices that promise net extraction from the calibrated vacuum are attempting to fall off the floor.

Stating this is not pessimism; it is the credential that makes the rest of the paper worth reading. A framework that can say exactly *why* the naive tap is closed has earned the right to say where the real ones are. There are three, in ascending horizon.

4. Route one: conditioning instead of pushing (the fusion reframe)

The deepest editing operation within civilizational reach is fusion — and the way we currently attempt it is the purest expression of what an earlier essay in this series called the steam-engine reflex: when the response is insufficient, push harder. A hundred and fifty million degrees is *pushing*: brute kinetic energy thrown against the barrier between knot configurations, in machines the size of cathedrals, for decades, at the edge of net gain.

The constitutive equation suggests the alternative in one line. If the medium's interaction strength is a state function, $g = g(\alpha(\chi))$, then *barriers are state functions too*. The energy landscape between two knot configurations is not carved in granite; it is carved in the medium, and the medium has a stiffness that depends on its state. The constitutive approach to fusion is therefore not to push harder against the barrier but to ask under what conditions the barrier is lower — to *condition* the region where the editing happens rather than brute-force the edit. Soften, write, harden: the same forge cycle that the Vacuum Replicator paper develops for assembly applies, in principle, to the deepest energy technology we possess.

Honesty prices the lever immediately. On Earth we sit at the saturated asymptote, and the same clock bounds that closed Section 3's tap bound this one: the terrestrial state is pinned to parts in 10^{17}, so terrestrial context-conditioning has almost no throw. The framework does not promise desktop fusion; it does something more useful — it says *where the lever frees up* (as χ approaches the crossover, i.e., in dynamically quiet environments far from mass concentrations) and *what instrument reads the lever's length* (the clock networks are, in this reading, already measuring it). Whether the lever can ever be brought to bear on practical energy production is an open engineering question of the far kind. What the reframe delivers today is direction: fusion research has spent seventy years on one axis — push harder — and the constitutive picture says there is a second axis on the map.

5. Route two: the boundary tap (already demonstrated)

The second route is not futuristic at all; it has been on the laboratory bench for decades, waiting to be read constitutively.

The Casimir effect is the demonstrated fact that *boundaries change the state of the medium*: two conducting plates reconfigure the vacuum between them, and the medium pushes — a real force, measured to precision (Casimir, 1948; Lamoreaux, 1997). And its dynamical sibling is the demonstrated fact that *moving boundaries make the medium pay out*: a boundary condition oscillated at sufficient speed converts vacuum fluctuation into real, detectable photons — the dynamical Casimir effect, observed in a superconducting circuit (Wilson et al., 2011). No exotic claim is involved; this is textbook physics with an experimental record. What the constitutive framing adds is the correct name for what these experiments are: **stiffness engineering**. Boundaries are the one handle on the medium's state that the stiff asymptote leaves open, because a boundary does not need to soften the medium — it *reshapes which configurations count as its floor*.

Read as an energy technology, the boundary tap is modest and real: conversion, not creation. Casimir machinery moves energy between forms using the medium as the working substance — nanoscale actuation, adhesion control, and, in the dynamical case, photon generation paid for by whatever drives the boundary. No net extraction from the floor occurs, in exact agreement with Section 3. But as a *proof of coupling* it is priceless: it establishes, with laboratory rigor, that the medium of space is a physical substance whose state responds to engineering — which is the entire premise of this programme, demonstrated at the only scale where our instruments currently reach it. Route two is where the constitutive energy programme touches ground today: a research line in engineered vacuum stiffness — geometry, materials, modulation — pursued not for watts but for *handles*.

6. Route three: the budget (the civilizational horizon)

The third route is stated as perspective, and labelled as such.

In the constitutive picture, the two dark components of the standard cosmic inventory are not substances but the medium itself: dark matter is the softened collective mode of the vacuum where local dynamics falls below the background strain (the companion papers' central claim), and dark energy is the energetics of the medium's own large-scale state — the spring of Section 1, seen at the wavelength of the universe. Take the standard budget at face value — roughly sixty-eight percent dark energy, twenty-seven percent dark matter (Planck Collaboration, 2020) — and translate: **about ninety-five percent of the energy content of the universe is the medium.** The knots we are made of, and everything we have ever burned, fissioned, or fused, are the five-percent residue.

A civilization that understands its medium constitutively is in the position of a sailor who has just understood that the ocean under the hull is not scenery but the main body of the world. Nothing in this paper proposes a mechanism for coupling to the large-scale state, and intellectual hygiene requires saying so plainly: no such mechanism is currently known, and Section 3's discipline applies with full force. What the framework contributes is the *reclassification*: the dominant energy reservoir of the cosmos is no longer a mystery component beyond physics but a material system with a constitutive equation — pinned at three regimes by existing data, photographed through its crossover by galaxy kinematics, and now carrying a topological coefficient of order 2π. Reservoirs with equations are, on the scale of centuries, reservoirs with engineering literatures. That is not a promise; it is a trajectory, and every prior medium we have understood — air, water, the electromagnetic field — has followed it.

7. The spring, the knots, and the tap

Assemble the picture.

The vacuum is a near-critical medium: a spring loaded to within sixteen percent, held by topology, its poise measured by a coefficient that equals the phase of one closed loop. Everything we call matter is its frozen pattern, and everything we call energy is the editing of that pattern — a programme humanity has pursued since fire without knowing the medium it was working in. The naive tap — draining the floor — is closed, and the constitutive equation is the first framework that says exactly why, rather than merely that. The real taps are three: *condition instead of push*, with fusion as the first candidate and the lever's length already being read by clock networks; *engineer the boundaries*, where coupling to the medium is demonstrated laboratory fact awaiting its constitutive reading; and, on the horizon, *the budget itself* — the ninety-five percent that has an equation now.

The steam-engine age asked: how hard can we push? The constitutive age asks: what state is the medium in, and what is the smallest intervention that moves it past its bend? Between those two questions lies, if this programme is right, the entire future of energy — and the answer to the question in the title is the honest one: the vacuum could give us all the energy we need because it already does. What changes now is that, for the first time, we know what we are drawing on — and where it keeps its spring.

References

Author's technical basis (ResearchGate, profile: Hans Konstapel): Konstapel, J. (2026a). *The Constitutive Equation of the Vacuum Condensate: Existence, Form, and Empirical Closure of g(χ).* Leiden. Konstapel, J. (2026b). *The Missing Weight and the Medium*. Leiden. Konstapel, J. (2026c). *The Vacuum as Weather*, 3rd ed. Leiden. Konstapel, J. (2026d). *The Vacuum Replicator: Matter as Address in a Constitutive Medium — A Concept Paper*. Leiden. Konstapel, J. (2026e). *Fractal Context Dynamics — A Context-Dependent Framework for the Emergence of Physical Law*. Leiden.

External: Casimir, H. B. G. (1948). On the attraction between two perfectly conducting plates. *Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet*. 51, 793. Lamoreaux, S. K. (1997). Demonstration of the Casimir force in the 0.6 to 6 μm range. *Phys. Rev. Lett*. 78, 5. McGaugh, S. S., Lelli, F. & Schombert, J. M. (2016). Radial acceleration relation in rotationally supported galaxies. *Phys. Rev. Lett*. 117, 201101. Milgrom, M. (1983). A modification of the Newtonian dynamics as a possible alternative to the hidden mass hypothesis. *ApJ* 270, 365. Pitaevskii, L. & Stringari, S. (2016). *Bose–Einstein Condensation and Superfluidity*, 2nd ed. Oxford UP. Planck Collaboration (2020). Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *A&A* 641, A6. Weinberg, S. (1989). The cosmological constant problem. *Rev. Mod. Phys*. 61, 1. Wilson, C. M. et al. (2011). Observation of the dynamical Casimir effect in a superconducting circuit. *Nature* 479, 376.