

Vetenskap, fakta, och lite politik

Gott och blandat

Bloggarkiv

- ▶ 2015 (5)
- ▼ 2014 (9)
 - ▶ december (1)
 - ▼ oktober (3)
 - [The Pomp factor in Cold Fusion - a reply to the op...](#)
 - Mr. Rossi, I admire you!
 - [The Cat is dead](#)
 - ▶ maj (3)
 - ▶ april (2)
- ▶ 2013 (6)
- ▶ 2012 (13)
- ▶ 2011 (2)
- ▶ 2010 (3)
- ▶ 2008 (1)

Om mig



Stephan Pomp

Uppsala, Sweden

Jag är född 1968 och Dipl. Phys. från universitetet Erlangen-Nürnberg, Tyskland, fil dr i experimentell kärnfysik 1999. Professor i tillämpad kärnfysik vid Uppsala Universitet. Engagerad i Föreningen Vetenskap och Folkbildning. Jag är även inbiten ateist och medlem i Humanisterna.

[Visa hela min profil](#)

Intressanta sidor

- [Tillämpad kärnfysik](#)
- [Humanisterna](#)
- [Vetenskap och Folkbildning](#)

torsdag 16 oktober 2014

Mr. Rossi, I admire you!

Yes, I do! You have accomplished something quite remarkable. For many years now you have presented various versions of "the" E-Cat and argued along different and contradictory lines. But none of this bothers your followers. Somehow you have this rare ability to make people forgive you even if you outright admit that you have cheated the people that you worked together with. Here is a screenshot and the cut-and-paste quote from your recent statements published under the heading "[Rossi Responds to Swedish Professors Critical of E-Cat Report](#)" on [e-catworld.com](#) and in your own "[Journal of Nuclear Physics](#)" (sic!):

```
AS THESE SCIENTISTS CORRECTLY SAY, I SUPPLIED THOSE SAMPLES, IN 2011 (TO PROF. SVEN KULLANDER), AND I GAVE A SAMPLE FROM WHICH THE COMPONENTS, THAT AT THOSE TIMES WERE NOT DISCLOSABLE, HAD BEEN EXTRACTED BECAUSE NOT YET PATENTED. I CLEARLY WARNED PROF. KULLANDER OF THAT, SO WE ALL KNEW THAT THOSE ANALYSIS COULD NOT BE TAKEN AS COMPLETE, BUT JUST AS A FIRST APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM. THE COPPER FOUND WAS PROBABLY AN IMPURITY AND I MADE CLEAR THIS SUSPECT OF MINE. IN THAT CASE THE SAMPLE HAD NOT BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM A REACTOR BY A THIRD PARTY AND I HAVE NO DIFFICULTY TO SAY, AS I DID WHEN I DELIVERED IT, THAT I HAD TAKEN OFF FROM IT THE PARTS THAT I WANTED NOT TO DISCLOSE.
ANDREA ROSSI
```

"AS THESE SCIENTISTS CORRECTLY SAY, I SUPPLIED THOSE SAMPLES, IN 2011 (TO PROF. SVEN KULLANDER), AND I GAVE A SAMPLE FROM WHICH THE COMPONENTS, THAT AT THOSE TIMES WERE NOT DISCLOSABLE, HAD BEEN EXTRACTED, BECAUSE NOT YET PATENTED. I CLEARLY WARNED PROF. KULLANDER OF THAT, SO WE ALL KNEW THAT THOSE ANALYSIS COULD NOT BE TAKEN AS COMPLETE, BUT JUST AS A FIRST APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM. THE COPPER FOUND WAS PROBABLY AN IMPURITY AND I MADE CLEAR THIS SUSPECT OF MINE. IN THAT CASE THE SAMPLE HAD NOT BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM A REACTOR BY A THIRD PARTY AND I HAVE NO DIFFICULTY TO SAY, AS I DID WHEN I DELIVERED IT, THAT I HAD TAKEN OFF FROM IT THE PARTS THAT I WANTED NOT TO DISCLOSE.

ANDREA ROSSI"

The remarkable thing is that there is no outcry of indignation among the E-Cat believers. People forgive you and keep believing in you and "the" E-Cat. They even keep inventing more or less far-fetched excuses on your behalf. This must be due to the fact that the E-Cat has become a religion!^[1]

For let's be precise: you claim that [Sven Kullander](#)^[2] had been "warned" about the manipulated sample. If that were true, why would anyone do any kind of analysis on the "fuel/ash"? Where is any statement of Sven Kullander or Hanno Essén or Mats Lewan that they were aware of this? No scientist would accept these conditions (i.e., analyzing a manipulated sample) without clearly stating that the sample is not "the real thing"! I sure would like to hear from Hanno Essén, Bo Höistad, and/or Mats Lewan if they actually knew about the manipulation and for some reason kept this important piece of information for themselves or if your statement has taken them by surprise!

Mats Lewan writes in his book with the very true title "An impossible invention":

"During his Uppsala sojourn Rossi left two small bottles of the fuel powder used in the E-Cat—one with unused fuel and the other with powder that Rossi said had run in the device for months. Later Kullander had measurements made on the powder, indicating that Rossi's theory was wrong."

Follow by Email

Leta i den här bloggen

Min blogglista

Uppsalainitiativet
En klimatförvillande satirtecknars alster slår lite fel
4 dagar sedan

Vetenskap och Folkbildning
VoF på bokmässan
2 veckor sedan

Nuclear Power? Yes Please
Hjälp en exjobbare
4 månader sedan

Gadgeten innehöll ett fel

Prenumerera på

Mats Lewan. An Impossible Invention (Kindle Locations 1707-1709).

Nowhere can I find any mention that Sven was aware of the "incompleteness" of the sample. And of course we can no longer ask him to confirm or deny. What we have, though, is some emails from him and the previous report from Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet. The report makes no mention of any "warning" that the sample is incomplete. Sven wrote to Göran Ericsson on December 22, 2012:

Hej Göran

Bifogar rapporten från Naturhistoriska som gjordes under våren.

I den framgår klart att nickel inte är med i någon kärnreaktion.

Hsn Sven

[Translation: Hi Göran // Enclose the report from Naturhistoriska which was done this spring. // It clearly says that nickel is not involved in any nuclear reaction. // Grtns Sven]

If Kullander had known about your claimed "warning", he would have understood the importance of conveying this information to his collaborators. Certainly he would also have pointed this out in his email and it would have been mentioned in both the report and elsewhere on the internet where the results were discussed at length.

Also the people from **Ralon and KTH** that studied the manipulated sample - and clearly showed that the copper could not have been produced from nickel in a nuclear transmutation process in the E-Cat (of that time) - make no mention of any manipulation. Instead, they, e.g., **write**:

"Prover som erhöles från Sven Kullander i december har analyserats. Proverna bestod av två flaskor med ca 1 gram i varje flaska. Ena flaskan kallas "NY" och innehöll det nickel pulver som Rossi använde i reaktorn, taget innan någon aktivitet har skett. Den andra flaskan kallas "GAMMAL" och det innehöll pulver som använts i en av Rossis reaktorer i ca 6 månader. Denna flaska innehöll också ca 1 gram pulver."

[My translation: "Samples obtained from Sven Kullander in December have been analyzed. The samples consisted of two bottles containing about 1 gram each. One bottle is labeled "NEW" and contained the nickel powder that Rossi used in the reactor, obtained before usage. The other bottle is labeled "OLD" and it contained the powder that was used in one of Rossis reactors for about 6 months. This bottle also contained about 1 gram of powder."]

Curt Edström and Jan-Erik Nowacki, "Analys av två typer av nickelpulver", Ralon and KTH, 2013-01-17.

This is all. No mention is made that they, or Sven Kullander, knew that the analyzed and discussed sample has been manipulated.

Anyway: if what you state is true, i.e., that you removed (!) something from the sample but it actually was in the "reactor" I am even more baffled. It would mean that we had a different kind of nuclear reaction than we have now? No change in the isotopic composition then but a lot of change now? I mean, you cannot get back to natural isotopic composition by removing (!) something from the sample?

All this leaves only one conclusion: you were playing tricks then (trying to give the impression that copper was produced) and you are playing tricks now (trying to have people believe all nickel somehow converted into Ni-62).

Your statement about the 2011 sample simply is an after-the-fact construction desperately trying to save you from the mistake of going from one extreme (no isotopic change in Ni and Cu but claims of nuclear reaction) to another, contradictory extreme (**complete isotopic change in nickel to consist of only Ni-62** without any (!) other of the well-known nuclear reactions and without

inducing any radioactivity).^[3,4,5]

And the funny and very interesting thing is that this desperate try to justify and explain away all contradictions seems to work with your followers! They accept your claim that you need to do all this to protect your "patent". And you simply make good use of the fact that *people want to believe in miracles*. So you get away with it. **Again**. Well played! This is pure genius and I admire you!

Warm regards,

Stephan Pomp

P.S.: Some earlier posts on the subject concerning Swedish media and their treatment of the subject are found [here \(SVT\)](#) and [here \(P1\)](#) and a [comment related to the P1 reports](#) is given here (all in Swedish).

Appendix:

Regarding the copper in the 2011 sample, Lewan writes:

"What was particularly controversial was the scientific content—a theory that the device produced energy via the fusion of hydrogen and nickel nuclei. The result of such a nuclear reaction would be copper, of which Focardi and Rossi had found traces in the fuel powder after use."

Mats Lewan. *An Impossible Invention* (Kindle Locations 1303-1305).

and

"As in the Fleischmann and Pons experiment, in Rossi's device initial phenomena brought to mind fusion, including the discovery of copper in the nickel powder used as fuel. In this case, it could be the nucleus of nickel that had reacted with the nucleus of hydrogen, consisting of a single proton, which then formed a new nucleus, copper, because copper has one proton more than nickel—a fusion reaction that in itself would release energy if it occurred. But analysis of the used nickel shows that the copper was simply a contamination powder from another source."

Mats Lewan. *An Impossible Invention* (Kindle Locations 5113-5116).

Footnotes:

[1] Maybe this explains why the Cat has so many lives?


[2] As I mentioned in [this blog post](#) (in Swedish) - reporting from a talk Sven Kullander gave on November 9, 2011 - Sven seemed to have no doubt that the "fuel/ash" was the real thing. And I remember having been very critical about this blind trust and believe (as the blog post documents).

[3] It should be pointed out here that I have full confidence in the different analyses of the isotopic compositions etc of the "fuel" and the "ash" that have been performed by various labs. These analyses were *really* independent!

[4] I have a suggestion for further improvement of the reported results in the next round (yes, I am pretty sure there will be a next round with a new report calling for more tests and money from, e.g., [Elforsk](#) ...): change the isotopic composition a little less dramatic and make sure that there is some residual radioactivity in the "ash".^[4] Then it will be harder for us critics to claim that we know your game.

[5] Both you and many others have pointed out that it was the team of researchers that have taken out the ash. Maybe so and maybe all researchers are really doing their best to find out about the mystery of "the" E-Cat. But who put the sample in? Was there only one sample inside? Or was the sample that was removed by the researchers only one that the researchers *believed* was the same that first showed natural isotopic composition in Li and Ni?

Upplagd av [Stephan Pomp](#) kl. 21:13

 +3 Rekommendera detta på Google

55 kommentarer:



tyy 16 oktober 2014 22:33

, it is fascinating how Rossi manages to go on, year after year. He should have gone down under a long time ago.

But no! He keeps coming back again, and again.

Maybe e-cat really is a religion now?

I do not know how this saga will end, but I am sure it will someday make a fascinating story.

A movie, perhaps?

Svara

▼ Svar



Stephan Pomp 16 oktober 2014 22:46

Indeed a fascinating story! No doubt!
Pseudoscience (or parallell science if you like) is a lot like religion. Belief in a superior power that brings hope. Rossi in this case.
And yeah: why not Hollywood?



Øystein Lande 17 oktober 2014 16:32

Dear Stephan,

Theoretical disputes in LENR are more religious than scientific and only experiments can and have to(!) decide

My comments were related to ELFORSK wanting to do LENR research. They do not mention E-cat as a focus for further research in their press release "Nu går vi vidare med forskning om LENR". They can easily free themselves from Rossi and continue with some of the many other scientists, like Mitchell Swartz and professor Peter Hagelstein I mentioned. We need more basic LENR research, and I am sure Hagelstein have many proposals of research that can be done. Or Lewis Larsen, a Chicago physicist and one of the co-promoters of Widom-Larsen theory on LENR.

Rossi is an inventor and engineer, not a physicist. We need more physicists onboard.

. In the real world imagination is more powerful than reality and the disputes are more intense than it can be justified with data coming from planned and organized experimental investigations.

Having seen so many reports on transmutation, transmutations is at least part of the LENR picture. The Japanese have done their own research, both Toyota and Mitsubishi. One Paper example (from American Nuclear Society, Vol 107):
<http://newenergytimes.com/v2/conferences/2012/ANS2012W/2012Iwamura-ANS-LENR-Paper.pdf>

"Today, LENR is a 'laboratory curiosity,' as was the fission of atoms in the 1930s, which now delivers 7 percent of the world's energy. That is why this 'laboratory curiosity' deserves our attention"

- Dr. H. Bottollier-Curtet, Atomic Energy Commission, France, CEA-Cadarache

If Rossi have something more than a "laboratory curiosity", then the Industrial Heat Company will prove it in due time with commercial plants.

Svara



Alain Coetmeur 16 oktober 2014 23:12

so what? Rossi hide data to scientist to protect his IP... Like the inventor of HTSC who tweaked the formula until the last moment...

what about the heat... especially the moment where 800W->900W induce 1250C-1400C instead of 1295C...

No news...

where could you read that text?

"Unfortunately, physicists did not generally claim expertise in

calorimetry, the measurement of calories of heat energy. Nor did they countenance clever chemists declaring hypotheses about nuclear physics. Their outspoken commentary largely ignored the heat measurements along with the offer of an hypothesis about unknown nuclear processes. They did not acquaint themselves with the laboratory procedures that produced anomalous heat data. These attitudes held firm throughout the first decade, causing a sustained controversy.

The upshot of this conflict was that the scientific community failed to give anomalous heat the evaluation that was its due. Scientists of orthodox views, in the first six years of this episode, produced only four critical reviews of the two chemists' calorimetry work. The first report came in 1989 (N. S. Lewis). It dismissed the Utah claim for anomalous power on grounds of faulty laboratory technique. A second review was produced in 1991 (W. N. Hansen) that strongly supported the claim. It was based on an independent analysis of cell data that was provided by the two chemists. An extensive review completed in 1992 (R. H. Wilson) was highly critical though not conclusive. But it did recognize the existence of anomalous power, which carried the implication that the Lewis dismissal was mistaken. A fourth review was produced in 1994 (D. R. O. Morrison) which was itself unsatisfactory. It was rebutted strongly to the point of dismissal and correctly in my view. No defense was offered against the rebuttal. During those first six years, the community of orthodox scientists produced no report of a flaw in the heat measurements that was subsequently sustained by other reports.

The community of scientists at large never saw or knew about this minimalist critique of the claim. It was buried in the avalanche of skepticism that issued forth in the first three months. This skepticism was buttressed by the failure of the two chemists' nuclear measurements, the lack of a theoretical understanding of how their claim could work, a mistaken concern with the number of failed experiments, a wholly unrealistic expectation of the time and resource the evaluation would need, and the substantial ad hominem attacks on them. However, their original claim of measurement of the anomalous power remained unscathed during all of this furor. A decade later, it was not generally realized that this claim remained essentially unevaluated by the scientific community. Confusion necessarily arose when the skeptics refused without argument to recognize the heat measurement and its corresponding hypothesis of a nuclear source. As a consequence, the story of the excess heat phenomenon has never been told."

<http://iccf9.global.tsinghua.edu.cn/lenr%20home%20page/acrobat/BeaudetteCexcessheat.pdf#page=35>

if you don't trust Beaudette, just consult his library yourself
<http://www.infinite-energy.com/iemagazine/issue75/beaudette.html>

and don't say that you critic e-cat and not cold fusion, this is not honest. E-cat is cold fusion, and you have to deny cold fusion to claim E-cat is extraordinary. E-cat is an entrepreneur claim that looked weird at the beginning, and get more serious with first third party test, and now it looks solid.

this entrepreneur have manipulated scientists to hide his IP... won't you be paranoid if you have such a technology, not ready for market yet? that is business... I don't trust Rossi, I trust physics... and logic. and scientific method.

Svara

▼ Svar



ty 16 oktober 2014 23:53

Physics? Did you say you trust physics?

There must be a mistake.



Stephan Pomp 17 oktober 2014 08:30

Alain: of course for you its "so what"! That is the whole point of my text. So thanks for the confirmation.

And the point was made by, e.g. Sylvie Coyaud since a very

long time.

Listen to e.g. <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/avsnitt/375904?programid=412> minute 2:00 (there are also a bunch of other sections in English in this program)

Somewhere else she made the very fitting statement that Rossi was Jesus and Mats Lewan his prophet. It really very much seems so :-)

P.S. For Italians there is a good blog here:
<http://ocasapiens-dweb.blogautore.repubblica.it/2014/10/16/mr-rossi-i-admire-you/>
:-)



Stephan Pomp 17 oktober 2014 09:16

P.S. Well Alain, if I take your word for granted that you put an equal sign between E-Cat and cold fusion than I am sorry to say that cold fusion is as bogus as the E-Cat. Why I did not say so before? Because I look at the E-Cat and not all the other claims that are around. So in a careful manner I attack the E-Cat and not everything else around. But well, if you say it is the same than I guess it is ...



Alain Coetmeur 17 oktober 2014 15:22

Ok, it is clear now that you are not respecting scientific method...
replications are done and published.
no challenging artifact is found.
improvement of the process with time, and various experimental setup confirm the process...

of course there is visible human battle, opposition, but this did not prevent peer review to finally let some article get out because they have no huge flaw.

It is easier for LENr denier since they have no article that is reviewed and not refutes...

note that logically, theory and negative result cannot challenge positive result.

add to that the usual fear of the lab that Huizenga, & all have expressed... it is clearly a wishful anti-science that oppose experimental science of LENR.

absence of explanation have never been an argument, or science would be theology.



Stephan Pomp 17 oktober 2014 15:53

The E-Cat replicates itself. It is the same group all over. Especially Levi. When will we have a true independent test? I.e. Rossi sending his device to a professional test-lab?

No challenging artifact? Well, the Ni-62 is a proof that tricks are being played. It is actually pretty simple to understand. If you try.

Svara



DickeFix 17 oktober 2014 13:33

Den här kommentaren har tagits bort av skribenten.

Svara



DickeFix 17 oktober 2014 16:57

Stephan,

Thank you for pointing out these inconsistencies in the E-Cat story. I am also a bit surprised that the E-Cat community has not reacted stronger to Rossi's confession that the fuel and ash samples he gave to Kullander were not complete. To complicate matters even more, Rossi has claimed repeatedly, both in his patent applications and on his blog that Ni62 is an important part of the _fuel_ and that it is transformed to Cu63. In Dec. 6 2011 Rossi wrote:

"As I have explained many times, we use Ni enriched of 62 and 64 Ni, which are the sole to react, and 63 and 65 Cu are stable. Our process has been developed upon a theory that became stronger in time, based on the results of the thousands of our tests we made with our apparatuses. At this point we have a solid theory which is leading our R&D, making progress by the day. The problem is that the theory leads directly to the industrial confidential IP and since we have not a granted patent we deem opportune not to disclose the theory."

Both now and last time no enriched Ni62 is found in the fuel. Last time small flakes of copper was found in the ash whereas now it seems to consist of virtually pure Ni-62 without any trace of Cu63!

I agree that there are so many problems with the isotope results that the only realistic conclusion, even if LENR is present, is that either the analyzed ash or the analyzed fuel or both were not representative samples. The reason for this can be deliberate fraud, a mistake or just coincidence when sampling.

However, as long as we have no proof, we should be very careful to judge in any direction. Maybe Rossi doesn't consider the Ni62 as an integral part of the fuel but a part of his "secret catalyst" that he prepares the reactor with before the fuel is entered. Maybe the small sample of the ash that was analyzed this time by coincidence was pure catalyst whereas the small sample that was analyzed last time by coincidence was unburned fuel. I admit that it is not the most likely explanation but it can't be completely ruled out. If Rossi manages to give such a good illusion of excess heat, it is strange that he two times fails to make a better illusion when it comes to the fuel.

I also think that one should refrain from criticism against the research group and the funding agencies, Kungliga Vetenskapsakademien and Elforsk. As long as there is no scientific explanation of the observed excess heat, the research should continue and the scientists involved should be respected regardless of the outcome, as long as they follow good scientific practice. They are brave to do this and I wish some competent and skeptical nuclear scientist like yourself would dare to join them. I am sure that also you are interested to know the solution to this enigma, regardless if it is a trick played by Rossi or nature itself.

It is true that extraordinary claims need extraordinary proofs. However, it is equally true that one should not give up research that potentially can have immense importance for mankind as long as there is a miniscule possibility of success.

Svara

▼ Svar



DickeFix 18 oktober 2014 08:45

PS. One should not jump to conclusions but it seems to me that the explanation for the excess heat has finally been found by the contributors Andra.S and Giancarlo on Mats Lewans blog:

<http://matslew.wordpress.com/2014/10/09/interview-on-radio-show-free-energy-quest-tonight/#comment-3593>

http://www.cobraf.com/forum/immagini/R_123566844_1.pdf

This theory, if it proves correct, would solve the enigma and kill the E-Cat for good. Future will tell if someone in the research team did this to trick the others or if it was a genuine mistake. I still hope the participating researchers who are innocent are not ridiculed by the scientific community. Even if it indicates a lack of correct competence for three phase measurements (and maybe an overestimation of the

possibility of a natural miracle), it would be thanks to their measured and published data that this was discovered.

However, Rossi's reply to this politely forwarded concern from Andrea.S to the research team is really disgraceful for himself:

<http://www.journal-of-nuclear-physics.com/?p=861&cpage=4#comment-1009467>

Hence, I suggest you change title of your blog entry... :)



DickeFix 18 oktober 2014 12:29

A summary of the important inconsistency in the report that Giancarlo points out on Mats Lewans blog:

The power consumption of the entire reactor should be proportional to the Joule heating in the cables if the reactor coil has a temperature independent resistance. This is because it is the same total current through all elements, see figure 4 in the report.

In table 7 (p. 22) with the active reactor the power consumption (column 2) is indeed proportional to Joule heating (column 7). The proportionality factor was 21.68 at 1260 degrees and 21.86 at 1400 degrees. This proves that the temperature dependence of the coil resistance is negligible.

For the dummy run the total Joule dissipation was 6.7W (p.14, Eq. 11). From above we expect that the power consumption should be around $21.7 * 6.7W = 145.4W$. However the actual measured power was 486W (p. 20), i.e. 3.34 times more. If we assume that the measurements of the dummy is correct, it means that the measured power consumption of the active reactor is 3.34 times too low and hence the estimated COP is 3.34 times too high.

The explanation for this error could be Andrea.S theory of reversed clamps or something else.



CimPy 18 oktober 2014 16:01

another good way to tell about E Cat story :D



CimPy 18 oktober 2014 16:04

and you should read this one : nice stuff!



Gdmster 18 oktober 2014 16:13

I sent the Profs a mail with my doubts. After 10 days I've not received yet any reply. On the contrary Mr. Rossi addressed my concerns on his blog (Raman it's me)

<http://www.journal-of-nuclear-physics.com/?p=861&cpage=4#comment-1009467>

So, now, I'm convinced I'm right. By the way Mr. Rossi would have replied the other way: that the resistance is decreasing by a factor of three; not increasing.

Maybe "Electronics for dummies" is better suited to him and friends.

Giancarlo



CimPy 18 oktober 2014 16:19

And if needed, that was another proof about how much thrdy the party is...

DickeFix 18 oktober 2014 18:14



Giancarlo, an eloge to you for discovering this inconsistency in the report!

I am upset about the response you (not Andrea.S as I wrote, sorry for my mistake!) got from Rossi and the lack of response from the rest of the research team. They must now go back to the data to see if they can pinpoint when the change of the setup was made. I guess Andrea.S hypothesises about the clamp meters is the most probable explanation. If it was only on one meter it may be due to a honest mistake but hardly both...

I am a bit surprised that the research team only calculated the resistance of the cables but didn't calculate or measure the resistance of the heating coil to double check if the power readings they got from the clamp meter were consistent with the measured current. I am also a bit surprised that both the research team and the reviewers missed the inconsistency in the values that you discovered.



CimPy 18 oktober 2014 18:57

It's a bit strange, about clamp stuff, that they posted the image with OL and the negative waves that clearly showed the trick to any expert of pce-830.

I wonder if they have so a low opinion of others or should we have of them...



Stephan Pomp 18 oktober 2014 22:04

Nice work Giancarlo! And well, yes, maybe I should change the title of my post here. However, the basic fact remains. The followers keep being followers and defend the E-Cat. The TPR people do not (to the outside) admit that there are problems.

I have been in touch with two of the authors and all they say is a) "I trust Rossi", and

b) "Why do you care? We only wrote a report! What's the problem with it!"

And well, Elforsk says they continue with the dead Cat. What a shame ...



Stephan Pomp 18 oktober 2014 22:07

P.S. It is indeed very funny and telling that the only one publicly defending this so-called "independent" report is Rossi and not any of the authors.

Svara



Gdmster 18 oktober 2014 16:10

Den här kommentaren har tagits bort av skribenten.

Svara



MD 18 oktober 2014 21:33

Hej Stephan,

Jag undrar vad du anser om LENR-forskningen de senaste 25 åren. Är det också ett skämt?

Svara



Stephan Pomp 18 oktober 2014 21:49

Hej MD! Som du kan läsa ovan och i mina andra inlägg uttalar jag mig om E-Cat historien. Några anser att E-Cat = LENR. Om det är sant så är LENR en död Cat.

Svara



Øystein Lande 18 oktober 2014 22:26

Stephan,

Why not give a more precise answer to MD's simple question?

Like;

"I have no knowledge of LENR research the last 25 years, since it is not part of mainstream science. Where I to investigate LENR/cold fusion more detail, I would be ridiculed by my colleagues and my professional career would be at risk. And my professional career is more important than the truth of the matter."

Svara

▼ Svar



Stephan Pomp 18 oktober 2014 22:36

Dear Øystein,
why do people keep asking me things that have ABSOLUTELY nothing to do with my critique of the current E-Cat report? Why don't you try to find answers to all the problems about the reported measurements that have been reported?
Of all the responses from Cat-fans I have received so far NONE is concerned about the problems but criticizes either me as a person, my motives, why I don't look into other stuff etc. The E-Cat fans do more or less like Rossi: they basically insult critics instead of re-checking the report and trying to think again.

Svara



Stephan Pomp 18 oktober 2014 22:46

Another comment on the E-Cat story worth reading is here:
<https://medium.com/starts-with-a-bang/the-e-cat-cold-fusion-or-scientific-fraud-624f15676f96>

Svara



Øystein Lande 19 oktober 2014 12:08

Stephan,

It's of course important to Ask questions when we face something strange and unexplained.

Questions have been raised on inverted clamps, on emissivity of alumina, of how samples were taken, on picture showing OL=overload, on sampling, on transmutations etc. Etc. Fine!-

And we may speculate, but Now it's time for the testers to answer what they can, not the critics, not the sceptics, not the believers, not the members of the "Rossi Church" and not the "agnostics".

However, all questions have been discussed back and forth on various forums, and you will find speculating answers that support both camps (or both "clamps" ;-)...)

Anyhow;

According to The "Industrial Heat" Company the first 1 MW plant have been installed at a Customer. If the customer saves money, compared to other competing heat sources, and Industrial Heat makes money selling them, all is well and there must be something to it. Of it's all a scam, they are using the most expensive energy source to make heat, i.e. Electricity, which the Customer will note fast...

Svara

▼ Svar



Stephan Pomp 19 oktober 2014 12:29

This comment seems, on the surface, to make much sense. Wait and see. Have more tests about the E-Cat, etc.

We have heard this for years. Also the rumors about the "1 MW" plant. Where is it? Where are the results?

Meanwhile solid evidence has been building up for a long time

that "the" E-Cat is a scam.

You say we should lean back and wait for the testers to answer. But they never do! If any answer is given it is by Rossi (!) and not in a really nice tone. Our last critique (Ericsson and Pomp) on arXiv remained unanswered; instead a new test with a different Cat was made, most reporting false results but asking for further test ...

Meanwhile Rossi is making money, and Levi et al. undermine the understanding of how a scientific (and independent test) is performed. And Swedish electricity consumers (via Elforsk) support this ...



CimPy 19 oktober 2014 13:19

To have oppositors "lean back and wait" is the dream of any scammer - "please, let us do our work" or "mind your own business" or "Time (a lot of) will tell who is telling the truth" are common sentences...

In any case, it is true that testers should not simply speak,; but - for those who take them seriously - show data they collected, starting with videos they made.

Matter is: they never showed even TPR1 ones...

Svara



Øystein Lande 19 oktober 2014 16:36

Stephan,

Wrt Industrial Heat, I only know what they said in their press release in January this year;

- they have acquired the technology from Rossi, so he no longer control any business part of e-cat technology

- they must have done some testing apart from the Swedish ones, ".....validation tests were conducted in the presence of IH personnel and certified by an independent expert." - as part of due diligence before the acquisition

- Industrial Heat have raised some 12 MUSD last year, probably most or all from the Cherokee Investments Private Equity Company.

- As far as I understand Rossi is still involved in the R&D at Industrial Heat, but not in any decisions wrt the business side.

- The 1 MW plant recently installed at customer, is said to be different design that was tested in Bologna some time back. The new is said to be constructed by Industrial Heat, so it should be natural that the design have changed and improved.

- and I have to agree with Cherokee Investment Partners CEO Tom Darden how said about E-cat, "don't care who gets there first, how it happens, I just want to see it happen".

- I think we will hear from Industrial Heat if this is successful or not. They are at least a professional Company.

- My advice to ELFORSK is therefore to continue LENR research, but now with others. I have mentioned a few suggestions. We need more basic research. Here is one candidate: <http://world.std.com/~mica/jetrefs.htm>

Anyhow, the planned MFMP e-cat replication will be interesting, if nothing else, the dummy test should resolve some questions.

Svara



Gdmster 20 oktober 2014 22:48

@Stephan

He did it again. So it's clear I found a fault..

<http://www.journal-of-nuclear-physics.com/?p=861&cpage=7#comment-1013805>

Svara

▼ Svar



DickeFix 21 oktober 2014 02:09

Den här kommentaren har tagits bort av skribenten.

Svara



Øystein Lande 20 oktober 2014 22:57

I have tried to make a comment on Ethan Siegels blog, but I don't get through, so I gather he does not like what I want to say.

And my comment is regarding the pictures he use on top of the e-cat blog "...cold fusion or Scientific fraud" - with some glow discharge pictures "credit to" to a French "HOAX" experimenter.

Talk about Scientific dishonesty and dogmatism.

The Six pictures at the top of his blog has nothing to do with E-cat. And not only is he misspelling Naudins name, but also somehow think it is connected to some sort of "HOAX" as he call the pictures.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Jean-Louis Naudin (a French experimenter) performed NO HOAX but replicated a Japanese scientists Cold Fusion experiment from 2000:

Mizuno, T., et al., Production of Heat During Plasma Electrolysis. Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. A, 2000. 39: p. 6055.

Mizuno, T., T. Akimoto, and T. Ohmori. Confirmation of anomalous hydrogen generation by plasma electrolysis. in 4th Meeting of Japan CF Research Society. 2003. Iwate, Japan: Iwate University.

<http://jjap.ipap.jp/journal/pdf/JJAP-39-10R/6055.pdf>

Naudin never claimed anything, but reported objectively only what he found, positive or negative. He was pure and simply interested in doing experiments, not selling any claims.

So I will repeat,

The world needs dreamers and the world needs doers. But above all, the world needs dreamers who do.

Professors Martin Fleischmann and Pons said it started with an idea, a dream.

And we noted then and now the theoretical physicists that likes to talk.

Unfortunately, talkers are usually more articulate than doers, since talk is their specialty.

But talkers have never been good doers. It's the doers that change this world.

Svara

▼ Svar



CimPy 20 oktober 2014 23:17

Welcome, you *Talker*



CimPy 20 oktober 2014 23:22

By the way, seems as if you read the wrong books and still believe Santa Claus will bring you something this year again. Let me tell you it will not happen without the help of some family member.

Sorry if I broke your beliefs..



ty 21 oktober 2014 16:03

It is somewhat amazing, that most adult people are able to comprehend Santa Claus is not real, but at the end are somehow unable to generalize the idea.

Svara



Øystein Lande 21 oktober 2014 19:15

Dear CimPy & Tyy

Sorry to disapoint you, but I really wish I was a better talker. It seems they, the talkers, are the ones getting the crowd...just look at Rossi ;-)

Anyhow, I'm not member of the "Rossi Church". But I have met highly creative inventors in my job, that have been insanely strange and wary about their secret invention. So, have Rossi lied? Probably - to protect his invention. Have Rossi got it? Well, I'm not ruling that one out just yet.

To explain why we must turn the clock back 25 years.

I was at the time a young student at the University, and witnessed the amazing announcement in March 1989, made by Professors Martin Fleischmann and Pons. And the first question Physicists asked was; why is not F&P dead? Surely the radiation should have killed them a few times over if they where right.

And some 38 days later cold fusion was deleared dead and buried by the American Physical Society. From May 1989 cold fusion was no longer part of science.

I did not think of CF any more after 1989, until I "re"-discovered cold fusion in around 2003. I noticed then CF was alive and well, and that good replications had been performed just too many times by too many good scientists in too many good places. And still it was not part of mainstream science. Why? Because experimental results would not comply to our precious theory of physics.

So theory rules over experiment? In the 1930's it was the other way around.

The whole issue is pure insanity. And in 2014 LENR is more "alive" than ever, with or without mr.Rossi.

I'm convinced F&P discovered a new branch of nuclear reactions happening in deuterated condensed matter. Many theories have been suggested that would embrace both new and "old" physics.

Rossi claims he has build upon the work on various scientists CF experiments.

Fine. Therefore I will not rule him out yet.

Regards

Lande

Svara

▼ Svar



tyy 23 oktober 2014 10:15

Lande,

Sorry about ranting, I don't mean to offend anyone.

I have also met a lot of intelligent and creative people. Also a lot of people who think out of the box.

At the time Fleischmann and Pons published they paper, I was working for a government radiation security organization. In Europe it was the time after Chernobyl and there was a lot to do.

But I actually read F&P original paper, as a lot of colleagues did. I don't remember what I thought of it, but probably not much, because it contradicted with I though I knew.

Maybe there is something in LENR&stuff, but I am pretty sure there is nothing that can be used to produce useable amounts of energy.

I wouldn't mind being wrong.

Best regards,
-- Timo

Svara



TinselKoala 21 oktober 2014 19:31

Stephan, in your Footnote 5 you say that it was the researchers who extracted the ash for testing. But on Page 7 of the Lugano report, it clearly states the following:

"Rossi later intervened to switch off the dummy, and in the following subsequent operations on the E-Cat: charge insertion, reactor startup, reactor shutdown and powder charge extraction."

This one sentence destroys any claim of "independence" that anyone can make concerning the Lugano test and report. Rossi had hands-on involvement in every critical phase of the demonstration.

Svara

▼ Svar



Stephan Pomp 21 oktober 2014 21:36

You are very right with that. It is not an independent report. That is something we criticized already in the last report. See especially the appendix here: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6364>

Svara



Øystein Lande 22 oktober 2014 17:25

And on page 28 it says:

"The sample was taken by us at random from the fuel and Ash, observing utmost care to avoid any contamination"

Which means they where "hands on"

Which means Rossi must be a close-up magician if you are concluding foul play.

Svara

▼ Svar



Stephan Pomp 22 oktober 2014 21:28

And why not? There are many ways to trick. Ask James Randi! And you don't need to be world class to trick believers.

How does the container look like? Two sides? Double bottom? Have you ever looked in a children's magician toy set? And how was the "fuel" inserted? By whom and when? Who can say it was not the manipulated fuel from the start?

So let's be honest: there are many ways to play tricks as long as the "independent" tests don't keep Rossi a few miles away ...



CimPy 22 oktober 2014 21:57

Not to speak the trick could take place in any moment - before, at end and even after - till the bottle reached the lab...What is more likely to have happened, a miracle or a trick? And with such a Saint in charge, as a plus...(!)



Stephan Pomp 22 oktober 2014 22:29

The funniest defense in favor of Rossi I have read so far is the suggestion that someone changed the sample (to the very Ni-62 enriched one) in order to discredit Rossi ... :-)

tyy 23 oktober 2014 09:57



That's IS really funny :-D



tyy 23 oktober 2014 10:01

I have no idea what actually happened, but it would be logical to assume, that Rossi "salted" his reactor already at the beginning of the test.

Many magic tricks are done that way.

Svara



Øystein Lande 24 oktober 2014 22:21

I think this is going in circle now.

Of course Rossi could be a scam artist, but then he is also scamming Industrial Heat and the related investors.

But how far can he take it? And what is his real goal?

Industrial Heat has bought the technology, so Rossi should have taken the money and fled by now...

As I stated above I'm sure we will hear more from Industrial Heat regarding results from their first commercial plant.

Having experience with Technology Qualification Activities through my job, I'm not surprised it took three years from the first prototype 1MW plant to a first commercial plant this year (as stated by Industrial Heat)

I hope ELFORSK will continue LENR research, but as I said: It does not need to be the E-cat. They can contact other researchers or other companies, like JET energy.

regards
Lande

Svara

▼ **Svar**



CimPy 24 oktober 2014 23:43

I'm not surprised it took three years from the first prototype 1MW plant to a first commercial plant this year (as stated by Industrial Heat)

So, this year we will have "the first commercial plant"?
And if not what? Will you state that it is normal due to matter x or y, and that within next six month it will be solved? Then, if not, will you state that it is only a minor detail but they will need another year?

Guess what? Rossi already said he will work on that "first commercial plant" for NEXT six /twelve months - that is: you're already late in upgrading excuses...Better try again: did you mean "3 more years after the release of NEXT 1 mw plant that should be ready between 6 and 12 months from now"?

Don't you feel a bit tricked? A tiny bit, I mean...

Svara



Øystein Lande 26 oktober 2014 21:18

Cimpy,

Not sure what you are trying to say here.

But I'm saying that going from a prototype 1 MW plant in 2011 to the first Commercial plant installed recently is not a long time.

And yes, I do expect issues to arise that will need attention, since it is a first commercial plant. It is just normal that you would have problems in a first delivery, it could be equipment failures, process control issues,

delivery spec issues, reliability questions etc.....

Svara



Øystein Lande 27 oktober 2014 10:52

According to Appendix 4 in the report, The ICP-MS & ICP-AES analyzed a sample of ASH of mass 2,13 mg.

This analysis is analyzing bulk elements. The other types of analysis was surface measurements of ash grains.

Assuming the total ash content is around 1000 mg, then this analysis is based on 0,21 % of total ash weight.

How anyone can base any types of conclusions on 0,2 weight% of material beats me. (And I mean conclusions like a "definite hoax", or a "clear proof of transmutations").

Most likely this 0,2% sample is not representative of the total.

Svara



Unknown 28 oktober 2014 11:49

I'm with Stephan on this, why, oh why, has no reputable organisation been able to get repeatable results. It stinks. Rossi put up or shut up.

Svara

▼ Svar



Alain Coetmeur 28 oktober 2014 18:26

what result ?

if you talk on LENr experiments there are hundreds of replication of various phenomenons, by reputable scientists, in reputable organization.

of course one have to be blind not to notice that there is a harsh opposition by people who are afraid to break their career, preventing things to does farther than the experimenters.

Anyway, Iwamura transmutation in Mitsubishi was replicated by takahashi in Toyota.

Fralick at Nasa GRC have bee replicated by University of Tsinghua, by Biberian, then in 2008 by colleagues at NASA GRC...

Tritium evidences by ed Storms were replicated by Bockris, bu BARC, and dozens of other labs, not only with electrolysis but with glow discharges...

Miles/Bush He4/heat corelation was replicated by McKubre, by DeNinno, and a handful of others...
F&P were replicaed with different calorimetry (seebeck, flow) hundreds of times, and exactly by Longchamp of CEA...

there is mass of replication, even if those replication are very difficult like were the first replications of transistors (even industrially), or of planes.

if we applied your criteria to reject LENR science, like difficulties to replicate, replication by people who have succeeded in replicating (yes, scientist who have replicated LENR are considered non trustable), to most science today, there would be no science.

if you judge that 20% or 100% heat anomaly does not deserve interest, and even deserve to be forbidden, better close all lab on earth and create cathedrals.

If all plane that crashed meant that human could not fly, we should not even be able to use horses, as people have probably taken decades to tame horses.

I advise you to read review on the subject like:
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2F800114-010-0711-x>
<http://lenr-canr.org/acrobat/StormsEstatusofcoa.pdf>

or this book
<http://www.amazon.com/Science-Energy-Nuclear-Reaction-Comprehensive/dp/9812706208>

Svara



jetmech 10 november 2014 15:11

Please Alain go back to the eskimo vortex!
You are embarrassing yourself here.
Alain you need to avoid critical thinkers!
Of course you can go to Kmart and get some underwear!
I know you can count all those toothpicks!
Your a good driver!
Watch jeopardy!
(Raymond or Rainman?)

Svara



Hawks Henry 31 december 2014 08:18

The reason why the ultrasonic crusher has many different applications is that they are equipped with many different features. From here: www.toption-china.com/products/ultrasonic-cell-crusher-ordinary-type .As a matter of fact, it is sometimes called as the ultrasonic cell grinder that is a use of strong ultrasonic cavitation generated in the liquid.

Svara

Kommentera som: Google-konto ▾
Publicera Förhandsgranska

[Senaste inlägg](#)

[Startsida](#)

[Äldre inlägg](#)

Prenumerera på: [Kommentarer till inlägget \(Atom\)](#)