

Why can friction both stop us and help us walk?

Juan Segurola · All Rights Reserved

QUE · Article 005 · Simple Questions, Deep Answers · Version 0.1 EN

A sliding box slows down because of friction. A person starting to walk relies on friction to move forward. These familiar observations seem inconsistent only if friction is defined as a force that always opposes an object's motion. The more useful question is what the surfaces at a contact would do relative to one another, and how the contact resists that motion.

The distinction matters because an object can move while a particular contact remains momentarily at rest. A planted shoe can grip the ground as the person's body advances. Friction can then act forward on the person without making the sole slide forward. To understand the apparently contradictory roles, we need to separate the motion of a body, the motion at its contacts, and the conversion of mechanical energy into other forms.

1. The force responds to the contact

In a simple sliding contact, kinetic friction acts against the relative sliding velocity. A box travelling to the right across a stationary floor experiences a leftward friction force. The floor experiences an equal and opposite force. The forces belong to different bodies, so they do not cancel in the equation of motion for the box alone.

Static friction describes a contact that is not sliding. Its magnitude adjusts to the forces and constraints of the particular situation, up to a limiting value. A small horizontal push on a stationary box can be balanced by a small static friction force. It is incorrect to insert the maximum possible friction force into every problem merely because a coefficient is known. The distinction between an actual force and its upper bound is explicit in the elementary empirical model [1].

For a contact with normal force N , that model writes $|f_s| \leq \mu_s N$ before sliding and $|f_k| \approx \mu_k N$ during sliding. The subscripts distinguish static and kinetic friction. The coefficients describe a pair of surfaces under specified conditions. They are not immutable properties of one substance, and the approximation does not cover every speed, lubricant, temperature or contact geometry.

2. Why the ground can push a walker forward

During a propulsive part of a step, muscular action tends to drive the planted foot backwards relative to the ground. If the contact grips, the ground exerts a forward tangential force on the foot. That force contributes to the forward acceleration of the person's centre of mass. The Earth receives the opposite momentum change, although its enormous mass makes its resulting velocity change negligible for this purpose.

A whole walking cycle is more complicated than that one phase. Foot placement can produce a braking phase as well as a propulsive phase. At steady average speed on level ground, the horizontal momentum gained and lost over a cycle balances. It would therefore be another mistake to say that friction must point forwards throughout every step. Its direction follows the instantaneous contact mechanics.

A simple numerical illustration shows the difference between a requirement and a limit. Suppose a contact carries $N = 600 \text{ N}$ and its static coefficient is provisionally $\mu_s = 0.5$. The

model permits a tangential force up to 300 N. If the motion requires only 100 N at that instant, the friction force is 100 N, not 300 N. These are hypothetical inputs, not measured values for a particular shoe or person.

3. If there is no slipping, where does the energy come from?

In an ideal contact fixed to a rigid, stationary ground, the point where the ground force acts has zero velocity. The instantaneous mechanical power delivered through that stationary contact is therefore zero. Yet the ground force can change the momentum of the person. Force and energy transfer answer different questions, and a force need not supply power at every instant that it supplies impulse.

The person's internal chemical energy supports muscular work and the rearrangement of body segments. A calculation using the force times the displacement of the centre of mass tracks a centre-of-mass kinetic-energy relation; it is not automatically the work transferred at the actual foot contact. Confusing those two displacements makes the ground seem to be an unexplained energy source.

Real walking adds deformation of the sole and ground, movement of contact patches, impacts and internal dissipation. The ideal zero-power statement must not be extended to every part of a real shoe-ground interaction. It identifies a controlled limit that explains how traction can assist motion without the ground supplying the metabolic energy.

4. Why sliding usually dissipates mechanical energy

For two surfaces sliding relative to one another under a friction force of magnitude f , the rate at which their combined macroscopic mechanical energy is dissipated is f times their relative sliding speed in the simple model. Some energy appears as internal energy; deformation, vibration and wear can also matter. Energy is not destroyed when visible motion diminishes.

Using illustrative values $f = 20$ N and a relative sliding distance of 3 m gives 60 J transferred out of the tracked macroscopic mechanical motion. That number alone does not determine the temperature rise of either body. Their heat capacities, the division of deposited energy and subsequent heat transport would also be needed. The distinction is the same one that prevents friction from being reduced to a universal heating-rate formula.

Nor does a zero sliding speed imply that a real contact has no internal losses. Materials can deform and relax, contact patches can form and disappear, and a nominally stationary region can contain small local motions. The macroscopic static/kinetic division is useful without exhausting the microscopic description.

5. Roughness is only part of the explanation

The visible contact area is not necessarily the area over which two solids actually touch. Microscopic asperities, adhesion, deformation and films on the surfaces can control the load-bearing contacts. A polished surface need not have vanishing friction, and increasing visible roughness does not supply a universal prediction of its coefficient [1].

Dieterich and Kilgore directly observed frictional contacts in laboratory experiments. Their reported observations connected changes in frictional resistance with changes in the contact population and its age [2]. That is a narrower claim than explaining every shoe, fault or machine with one mechanism. It is nevertheless important evidence against treating the coefficient as a timeless number independent of contact history.

A useful friction measurement must therefore specify more than the names of two materials. Load, surface preparation, sliding history and measurement conditions help define what was measured. To test a walking explanation, one would additionally need the timing and direction of ground reaction forces and information about slipping. The outline here is a measurement strategy, not a report of an experiment performed for this article.

6. The two roles are compatible

What is well established is that contact forces can transmit momentum and resist relative sliding, while sliding and deformation can dissipate mechanical energy. What needs empirical input is the behaviour of a particular contact under particular conditions. The simple coefficient model is a useful approximation, not a complete microscopic theory.

Friction can stop a box because the box slides relative to the floor. It can help a walker because the planted foot resists slipping backwards while the body moves forward. The error is to assign the force a direction from the body's overall travel alone. The contact, not the everyday label “moving object”, determines the relevant relative motion.

Related reading: IDE-001, on energy.

References

- [1] OpenStax. University Physics Volume 1, §6.2, Friction.
<https://openstax.org/books/university-physics-volume-1/pages/6-2-friction>
- [2] Dieterich, J. H.; Kilgore, B. D. Direct observation of frictional contacts: New insights for state-dependent properties. *Pure and Applied Geophysics* 143, 283–302 (1994).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00874332>