

New Energy News

VOLUME 7, NUMBER 7 ISSN 1075-0045 DECEMBER, 2000

Editor: Patrick Bailey

Web Page: www.padrak.com/ine/

E-mail: halffox@slkc.uswest.net or ine@padrak.com

EDITOR'S NOTE:

Hereafter, New Energy News (NEN) will be sent by email in two forms: Regular ASCII (the most basic form for computer handling of alphabetic characters) and also as a *.pdf file. If you have Adobe Acrobat on your computer you can easily read any file with a *.pdf file extension. If you do not have Adobe Acrobat, you can download it from the internet for free. Alternatively, mail \$2 (for S&H) to NEN, 3084 E. 3300 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84109, together with YOUR MAILING ADDRESS and we will send you an Adobe Acrobat CD-ROM in the mail.

ITEMS FOR NEN

If you find new-energy items that you believe others would like to read, send them by email to Patrick Bailey, editor, nen@padrak.com

If you do not have access to email, please mail articles to NEN (see address above). We will give credit to the first person that sends in any particular item. Your help will make NEN a better source of new-energy information.

Copyright 2000 by Charles Platt (cp@panix.com).

Originally published in Washington Post Book World, June 25th, 2000.

Reprinted with permission.

VOODOO SCIENCE

The Road From Foolishness to Fraud

By Robert L. Park

Oxford Univ. 230 pp. \$25

For almost two decades, former physicist Robert Park has conducted a one-man search-and-destroy mission against inventors, scientists and pseudo-scientists who make claims that he describes as "totally, indisputably, extravagantly wrong." As a Washington lobbyist and PR flack for the American Physical Society, Park is widely quoted whenever journalists need a rebuttal source who will scoff pithily at concepts such as magnetic healing or antigravity. He helped to establish a prestigious study panel that debunked Ronald Reagan's Star Wars Strategic Defense Initiative, and campaigned to discredit New Yorker journalist Paul Brodeur, who warned of possible health hazards caused by electromagnetic radiation from power lines. These and other battles are retold in Park's new book, *Voodoo Science*, which denounces the culprits he has most loved to hate over the years.

This book could have served a useful purpose. If public funds or private-investment capital really are being squandered by researchers who are self-deluded or even fraudulent, we need a thorough investigation. Alas, thoroughness is not Park's strong suit.

His primary source of information, quoted repeatedly in many of his rants, is the nightly TV news. Nothing seems to enrage him more than the sight of some upstart inventor getting air time for results that don't make sense; and Park's anger permeates his rebuttals, which border on character assassination. He contemptuously dismisses scientist James Patterson, for example, as a "caricature of an inventor" purely because of his physical appearance. There's no mention of his claim to fame as co-developer of the fundamental laboratory technique of gas chromatography or his past consultancy work for Dow Chemical, Fairchild Semiconductor, Lockheed and the Atomic Energy Commission. Nor does Park allow Patterson any chance to explain or defend his work. In fact, none of the targets in *Voodoo Science* is allowed to speak for himself, apparently because Park chose not to talk to any of them. This armchair journalism leads to some blunders. For instance, he mocks credentialed NASA scientists for investigating a gravity-shielding effect that he feels would violate a basic law of thermodynamics. If he had spoken to the researchers, they might have told him (as they told other journalists) why their theories entail no conflict with thermodynamics at all. Also, Park might have learned that the Russian emigre who prompted this work is not an obscure physicist (as he states) but a materials scientist claiming authorship of 30 papers and 10 patents. Park's failure to gather first-hand data is unfortunate, but his selective omissions are far more serious.

In at least one case, he violates basic principles of journalism and science itself by apparently suppressing information that conflicts with his foregone conclusion. He dismisses the phenomenon of nuclear fusion at low temperatures as "no closer to being proven than it was the day it was

announced," despite hundreds of papers,, including many from scientists affiliated with respected universities, going far beyond the controversial claims that were made for "cold fusion" in 1989. Electrochemist Michael Mc Kubre, at SRI international, confirms that he has submitted his papers to Park, who also attended a conference last year including presentations on this topic. Park chooses to mention none of this.

Such tactics are reminiscent of the behavior of a zealous DA who is so convinced that a suspect is guilty that he feels entitled to withhold some information from the jury. Since Park also "convicts" his suspects almost entirely by paraphrasing them. In his own words, Voodoo Science is not the fair trial we might have hoped for.

This is unfortunate, because many of Park's targets have indeed made implausible claims, and may be guilty as charged. To be sure of this, however, we need a fairly argued refutation, not a perfunctory dismissal. The dividing line between valid data and artifacts is not always clear; the phenomenon of superconductivity, for instance, remained inexplicable for 42 years, as Park himself admits.

Despite Park's absolute faith in his own judgment, any rush to judgment entails a risk of convicting Innocent people, while search-and-destroy missions may tend to cause collateral damage. This is a serious matter, since even poorly documented vitriol can jeopardize a scientist's reputation and future funding if it is disseminated with the complicity of a respected organization such as the American Physical Society. Of course, so long as Park makes no mistakes, he may argue that his targets deserve their punishment. Still, his widely published attacks create a chilling effect that can discourage even legitimate scientists from discussing controversial work. This hardly seems consistent with the spirit of genuinely free inquiry that should energize science. Likewise, Park's reliance on second-hand data, his presentation of selective evidence and his refusal to quote his opponents are habits that seem unworthy of a scientist.

REPORT BY DR. HIDEO KOZIMA

<cf-lab.kozima@pdx.edu>

Visiting Professor of Physics at Portland State University

Professor Emeritus at Shizuoka University

1) H. Kozima, "TNCF MODEL A Possible Explanation of Cold Fusion Phenomenon", J. New Energy Vol. 5, p. 68 (2000).

ABSTRACT

The TNCF model with a single adjustable parameter for the cold fusion phenomenon (CFP), a complicated phenomenon composed of various events occurring in complex systems, is explained as an example of the phenomenological approach with several Premises based on experimental facts. Applied to many selected data sets, the model has given consistent explanations of CFP and therefore the Premises of the model may be taken as reflections of some phases of physics in the materials where occurred CFP. Selection of more than 60 data sets explained by the TNCF model has a statistical meaning even if each data set may include some faults or errors in it. Physical bases of the Premises are investigated upon physics of neutrons in solids.

In this issue of *J. New Energy*, there is another paper by Japanese researcher R. Notoya the title of which is as follows; R. Notoya, T. Ohnishi and Y. Noya, "Products of Nuclear Processes caused by Electrolysis on Nickel and Platinum Electrodes in Solutions of Alkali-metallic Ions" *J. New Energy*, vol. 5, p 88 (2000)

2) About "Coulomb lattice" of neutron and proton clusters in neutron star matter and in solids. In the study of neutrons in solids, I have studied two papers written about 30 years ago which suggest important properties of neutrons at sub-nuclear densities.

[1] G. Baym, H.A. Bethe and C.J. Pethick, "Neutron Star Matter" *Nuclear Physics A*, vol 175, 225 -271 (1971).

[2] J.W. Negele and D. Vautherin, "Neutron Star Matter at Sub-nuclear Densities" *Nuclear Physics A*, vol 207, 298 - 320 (1973).

i) Neutron Star Matter

In these papers, formation of clusters including neutrons and protons in neutron matter (how it resembles to the formation of neutron drops proposed by me in the paper appeared in *Fusion Technology*, vol. 37, p. 253, 2000) is proved by variational calculation. First of all, following sentence shocked me ([1]p.249);

"----- This modification of A (nucleon number in a cluster of neutron and proton) due to lattice interactions strikingly illustrates the subtle interplay between nuclear and solid-state physics that takes place in neutron stars."

These papers appeared when the neutron star had been recognized as reality for the first time tried to determine the stationary state of neutron matters by variational principle. Spatial distribution of neutrons, formation of clusters with N neutrons and Z protons (and Z electrons) with definite ratio of Z/N, stability of neutrons against beta decay are discussed. Main interactions between particles are the nuclear interaction between

nucleons and the electromagnetic interaction between charged particles.

At first, stability of neutrons against beta decay is proved. Then, it is shown the "Coulomb lattice" of neutron and proton with a definite ratio of Z/N ($\ll 1$) is more stable than a uniform distribution of the neutron star matter at sub-nuclear density. This "lattice" is similar to crystal lattices composed of atoms and the sentence cited above was written by the authors of the first paper [1].

In the Coulomb lattice (crystal lattice), clusters (atoms) are in a lattice with a lattice constant which depends on the density of the neutron matter (radius of atoms). In a cluster, Z/N is smaller than 1 and reaches less than 0.1. Distribution of neutrons in the cluster is wider than that of protons more pronounced but similarly to that in exotic nuclei. In the limit of large density, the lattice constant a becomes zero and the Z/N also approaches zero forming a neutron star.

Applicability of this calculation for lower density seems to about 10^{30} cm^{-3} or less. This is interesting for the investigation of CFP from our point of view.

ii) TNCF Model

Now, we turn to our TNCF model. In the TNCF model, it was assumed existence of trapped thermal neutrons in solids and its nominal density has been determined using experimental data sets as 10^8 - 10^{13} cm^{-3} . Several questions raised to this model were as follows;

- a) Stability of trapped neutrons against beta decay,
- b) Appropriateness of the determined value of the density given above,
- c) Source of these trapped neutrons,
- d) Possible explanation of gammaless de-excitation in CFP by TNCF model, etc. etc. etc.

It is clear that some of these questions have been resolved already by the calculations in the papers [1][2] in relation with stable composition of neutron star matter at sub-nuclear densities if we notice a possible existence of high-density neutrons realized by the local coherence at boundary region pointed out in one of our papers appeared in Fusion Technology (vol. 36, p. 337, 1999)

Here, we point out possible explanation for only one problem of gammaless de-excitation. In the ordinary nuclear physics, the nuclei are isolated fundamentally and its interaction with another particle if any occurs in short limited time. Or, if a many body problem is taken up, a nucleus is a part of the system and has no identity as we can see in the papers [1][2] cited above. Therefore, the situation occurring in CFP is so different from

those treated in nuclear physics where nuclei keeps their identity while interacting with others.

In CFP, there are several decay channels in the excited nuclei existing in the material used there and gammaless de-excitation is not special but usual modes of de-excitation. Similar explanation of events in CFP is possible from our point of view while ordinary nuclear physics could not give explanation for such events as the decay-time shortening and fission barrier lowering assumed to explain nuclear products in CFP.

The successful perspective given above is a merit of exchanging relationship between different branches to explore a new branch of science.

3) George Miley*s "Comments" *Fusion Technology*, vol. 38, p. iii (2000)
"It is with deep sadness that I retire in June 2001 as editor of *Fusion Technology (FT)*. Despite the extensive time involvement, I have immensely enjoyed serving as editor.

If you do not have access to email, please mail articles to *NEN* (see address above). We will give credit to the first person that sends in any particular item. Your help will make *NEN* a better source of new-energy information.

Copyright 2000 by Charles Platt (cp@panix.com).
Originally published in *Washington Post Book World*, June 25th, 2000.
Reprinted with permission.

VOODOO SCIENCE

The Road From Foolishness to Fraud

By Robert L. Park

Oxford Univ. 230 pp. \$25

For almost two decades, former physicist Robert Park has conducted a one-man search-and-destroy mission against inventors, scientists and pseudo-scientists who make claims that he describes as "totally, indisputably, extravagantly wrong." As a Washington lobbyist and PR flack for the American Physical Society, Park is widely quoted whenever journalists need a rebuttal source who will scoff pithily at concepts such as magnetic healing or antigravity. He helped to establish a prestigious study panel that debunked Ronald Reagan's Star Wars Strategic Defense Initiative, and campaigned to discredit New Yorker journalist Paul Brodeur, who warned of possible health hazards caused by electromagnetic radiation from power lines. These and other battles are

retold in Park's new book, *Voodoo Science*, which denounces the culprits he has most loved to hate over the years.

This book could have served a useful purpose. If public funds or private-investment capital really are being squandered by researchers who are self-deluded or even fraudulent, we need a thorough investigation. Alas, thoroughness is not Park's strong suit.

His primary source of information, quoted repeatedly in many of his rants, is the nightly TV news. Nothing seems to enrage him more than the sight of some upstart inventor getting air time for results that don't make sense; and Park's anger permeates his rebuttals, which border on character assassination. He contemptuously dismisses scientist James Patterson, for example, as a "caricature of an inventor" purely because of his physical appearance. There's no mention of his claim to fame as co developer of the fundamental laboratory technique of gas chromatography or his past consultancy work for Dow Chemical, Fairchild Semiconductor, Lockheed and the Atomic Energy Commission. Nor does Park allow Patterson any chance to explain or defend his work. In fact, none of the targets in *Voodoo Science* is allowed to speak for himself, apparently because Park chose not to talk to any of them. This armchair journalism leads to some blunders. For instance, he mocks credentialed NASA scientists for investigating a gravity-shielding effect that he feels would violate a basic law of thermodynamics. If he had spoken to the researchers, they might have told him (as they told other journalists) why their theories entail no conflict with thermodynamics at all. Also, Park might have learned that the Russian emigre who prompted this work is not an obscure physicist (as he states) but a materials scientist claiming authorship of 30 papers and 10 patents. Park's failure to gather first-hand data is unfortunate, but his selective omissions are far more serious. In at least one case, he violates basic principles of journalism and science itself by apparently suppressing information that conflicts with his foregone conclusion. He dismisses the phenomenon of nuclear fusion at low temperatures as "no closer to being proven than it was the day it was announced," despite hundreds of papers, including many from scientists affiliated with respected universities, going far beyond the controversial claims that were made for "cold fusion" in 1989. Electrochemist Michael McKubre, at SRI international, confirms that he has submitted his papers to Park, who also attended a conference last year including presentations on this topic. Park chooses to mention none of this.

Such tactics are reminiscent of the behavior of a zealous DA who is so convinced that a suspect is guilty that he feels entitled to withhold some information from the jury. Since Park also "convicts" his suspects almost entirely by paraphrasing them. In his own words, *Voodoo Science* is not the fair trial we might have hoped for.

This is unfortunate, because many of Park's targets have indeed made implausible claims, and may be guilty as charged. To be sure of this, however, we need a fairly argued refutation, not a perfunctory dismissal. The dividing line between valid data and artifacts is not always clear; the phenomenon of superconductivity, for instance, remained inexplicable for 42 years, as Park himself admits.

Despite Park's absolute faith in his own judgment, any rush to judgment entails a risk of convicting innocent people, while search-and-destroy missions may tend to cause collateral damage. This is a serious matter, since even poorly documented vitriol can jeopardize a scientist's reputation and future funding if it is disseminated with the complicity of a respected organization such as the American Physical Society. Of course, so long as Park makes no mistakes, he may argue that his targets deserve their punishment. Still, his widely published attacks create a chilling effect that can discourage even legitimate scientists from discussing controversial work. This hardly seems consistent with the spirit of genuinely free inquiry that should energize science. Likewise, Park's reliance on second-hand data, his presentation of selective evidence and his refusal to quote his opponents are habits that seem unworthy of a scientist.

REPORT BY DR. HIDEO KOZIMA

<cf-lab.kozima@pdx.edu>

Visiting Professor of Physics at Portland State University

Professor Emeritus at Shizuoka University

1) H. Kozima, "TNCF MODEL A Possible Explanation of Cold Fusion Phenomenon", *J. New Energy*, vol. 5, p. 68 (2000).

ABSTRACT

The TNCF model with a single adjustable parameter for the cold fusion phenomenon (CFP), a complicated phenomenon composed of various events occurring in complex systems, is explained as an example of the phenomenological approach with several Premises based on experimental facts. Applied to many selected data sets, the model has given consistent explanations of CFP and therefore the Premises of the model may be taken as reflections of some phases of physics in the materials where occurred CFP. Selection of more than 60 data sets explained by the TNCF model has a statistical meaning even if each data set may include some faults or errors in it. Physical bases of the Premises are investigated upon physics of neutrons in solids.

In this issue of *J. New Energy*, there is another paper by Japanese researcher R. Notoya the title of which is as follows; R. Notoya, T. Ohnishi and Y. Noya, "Products of Nuclear Processes caused by Electrolysis on Nickel and Platinum Electrodes in Solutions of Alkali-metallic Ions" *J. New Energy*, vol. 5, p 88 (2000)

2) About "Coulomb lattice" of neutron and proton clusters in neutron star matter and in solids. In the study of neutrons in solids, I have studied two papers written about 30 years ago which suggest important properties of neutrons at sub-nuclear densities.

[1] G. Baym, H.A. Bethe and C.J. Pethick, "Neutron Star Matter," *Nuclear Physics A*, 175, 225 -271 (1971).

[2] J.W. Negele and D. Vautherin, "Neutron Star Matter at Sub-nuclear Densities," *Nuclear Physics A*, 207, 298 - 320 (1973).

i) Neutron Star Matter

In these papers, formation of clusters including neutrons and protons in neutron matter (how it resembles to the formation of neutron drops proposed by me in the paper appeared in *Fusion Technology* Vol. 37, p. 253, 2000, last Spring) is proved by variational calculation. First of all, following sentence shocked me ([1]p.249);

"----- This modification of A (nucleon number in a cluster of neutron and proton) due to lattice interactions strikingly illustrates the subtle interplay between nuclear and solid-state physics that takes place in neutron stars."

These papers appeared when the neutron star had been recognized as reality for the first time tried to determine the stationary state of neutron matters by variational principle. Spatial distribution of neutrons, formation of clusters with N neutrons and Z protons (and Z electrons) with definite ratio of Z/N, stability of neutrons against beta decay are discussed. Main interactions between particles are the nuclear interaction between nucleons and the electromagnetic interaction between charged particles.

At first, stability of neutrons against beta decay is proved. Then, it is shown the "Coulomb lattice" of neutron and proton with a definite ratio of Z/N ($\ll 1$) is more stable than a uniform distribution of the neutron star matter at sub-nuclear density. This "lattice" is similar to crystal lattices composed of atoms and the sentence cited above was written by the authors of the first paper [1].

In the Coulomb lattice (crystal lattice), clusters (atoms) are in a lattice with a lattice constant a which depend on the density of the neutron matter (radius of atoms). In a cluster, Z/N is smaller than 1 and reaches less than

0.1. Distribution of neutrons in the cluster is wider than that of protons more pronounced but similarly to that in exotic nuclei. In the limit of large density, the lattice constant becomes zero and the Z/N also approaches zero forming a neutron star.

Applicability of this calculation for lower density seems to about 10^{30} cm^{-3} or less. This is interesting for the investigation of CFP from our point of view.

ii) TNCF Model

Now, we turn to our TNCF model. In the TNCF model, it was assumed existence of trapped thermal neutrons in solids and its nominal density has been determined using experimental data sets as $10^8 - 10^{13}$ cm^{-3} . Several questions raised to this model were as follows;

- a) Stability of trapped neutrons against beta decay,
- b) Appropriateness of the determined value of the density given above,
- c) Source of these trapped neutrons,
- d) Possible explanation of gamma-less de-excitation in CFP by TNCF model, etc. etc. etc.

It is clear that some of these questions have been resolved already by the calculations in the papers [1][2] in relation with stable composition of neutron star matter at sub-nuclear densities if we notice a possible existence of high-density neutrons realized by the local coherence at boundary region pointed out in one of our papers appeared in Fusion Technology (vol. 36, p. 337, 1999)

Here, we point out possible explanation for only one problem of gamma-less de-excitation. In the ordinary nuclear physics, the nuclei are isolated fundamentally and its interaction with another particle if any occurs in short limited time. Or, if a many body problem is taken up, a nucleus is a part of the system and has no identity as we can see in the papers [1][2] cited above. Therefore, the situation occurring in CFP is so different from those treated in nuclear physics where nuclei keeps their identity while interacting with others.

In CFP, there are several decay channels in the excited nuclei existing in the material used there and gamma-less de-excitation is not special but usual modes of de-excitation. Similar explanation of events in CFP is possible from our point of view while ordinary nuclear physics could not give explanation for such events as the decay-time shortening and fission barrier lowering assumed to explain nuclear products in CFP.

The successful perspective given above is a merit of exchanging relationship between different branches to explore a new branch of

science.

3) George Miley*s "Comments," *Fusion Technology*, vol. 38, p. iii (2000)
"It is with deep sadness that I retire in June 2001 as editor of *Fusion Technology (FT)*. Despite the extensive time involvement, I have immensely enjoyed serving as editor.

“Discussions with authors and reviewers were continuously stimulating, and I always enjoyed a feeling of satisfaction from providing this service to the fusion community and to the American Nuclear Society (ANS). There were, of course, a few down sides, largely concerned with occasional financial struggles, debates over rejected manuscripts, and continued attempts to control paper backlogs that slowly oscillated back and forth from being either too large or too small as circumstances in the fusion community changed.

“Inclusion of papers on "cold fusion" (or anomalous nuclear reactions in solids) in *FT* has been one of the more controversial decisions I made as editor of *FT*. Rather than rehash the issues involved, I would simply repeat my view expressed in an early preface that it is the "responsibility of a journal to publish scientific work related to its field of coverage that can pass through peer reviews."

“Indeed, all papers on this topic in *FT* have undergone a rigorous peer review. In the early years (1987- 1990) following Pons and Fleischman*s original announcement, reviewers ensured that the papers were technically sound but allowed speculations about mechanisms since the field was so new. However, starting in 1990, as the field matured, review standards reverted to the same guidelines as other papers in *FT*.

“Further, based on discussions in the *FT* Editorial Advisory Committee, an additional reviewer from outside the "cold fusion community" was typically added on these manuscripts. Readers who are interested in more detail about events during this period from my point of view as an editor are referred to an article titled "Some Personal Reflections on Scientific Ethics and the Cold Fusion 'Episode' " that I prepared for a fall issue of the *Journal on Accountability in Research Policies and Quality Assurance*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2000)."

“As was stated in the first paragraph in the above Comments, G. Miley is going retire from the Editor of *Fusion Technology* by June, 2001. His successor will be Dr. Nermin Uckan. It is not certain yet but we would like to hope that his policy for "cold fusion" will be kept by the new Editorial Board.

“It is true that ideas presented in the field of CFP is in full variety from

using ordinary physics to those of new ones ignoring principles of physics easily or thinking similarly to UFO and supernatural phenomenon. But, it is the undeniable fact that there occur events showing bio-nuclear transmutation in bodies of some plants and animals even if someone tries to explain bio-nuclear transmutation by assuming a micro-cyclotron in a living cell which contradicts principles of physics.”

STATE OF THE INE: STATUS AND PLANS

By Patrick Bailey, President, Institute for New Energy

Well: Here we are at the end of 2000, at the real dawn of a new millennium (Jan. 1, 2001), and the INE is still here, and the world is still in a real energy mess. - Which is about to get a whole lot worse!

The subject in the news is now about ENERGY: That is, the LACK of it.

I read today (Dec. 19) that President-elect George Bush is meeting with everyone he can in WDC about "America's Energy Crisis". Gee, I learned recently from TV and newspapers that the only problem we had in this country was not knowing how to read and punch holes in ballot forms...

For those of us that look closely at ALL of the news, especially news from overseas, we all can see that the next big areas to be funded here will be energy, food, and national defense. We shall see that the INE is well represented in any of the "new energy resources" areas.

The INE has had its ups and downs these past two years. Most recently, its "downs".

Hal Fox has performed an outstanding service in publishing *the New Energy News (NEN)* in his paper format for many, many years, and the promised funding to support the continuation of that, as well as other well-intended programs, has just not materialized. Even after many promises and statements made to him, like: "Get ready, the money is coming"; or "it should be ready next month!", etc. Therefore, after operating at a substantial loss for several years, the decision has been made to have the *New Energy News* sent out only to INE members, and only by email.

Your input is wanted and needed in future *NEN* articles! If you find a good story in the new energy field and want to share it with others, please email it to me at nen@padrak.com, and I will see that it is included ASAP in a future *NEN* issue!

The INE still retains and shall continue to retain its "IRS Non-profit" status. The INE corporation papers have been recently reviewed and updated as required.

The August 2000 INE/EEMF New Energy Symposium was well attended, and the proceedings of the papers presented will be coming out soon in the Journals of New Energy (JNE). A summary of the meeting and announcements of the new *JNEs* will be soon added to the INE website at <http://www.padrak.com/ine/>.

I think I am going to run the INE like Tina Turner likes to sing: "First we're gonna start out nice and easy, and then we're gonna get real rough!"

It's time to start to get "real rough".

The INE has had a great 8 (eight) year history. The first NEN was published in May 1993. I have them all. You can get them all from Hal on a CD! We have had a yearly conference almost every year, with published papers in the *JNEs*.

We have read lots of papers. We have memorized lots of theories. Everybody knows at least one Whitaker theorem! We have seen intriguing results from promising experiments. We have seen researchers that really thought that they have something disappear into private research funding deals, and we hope to hear of their results soon. We have read books of "new energy" that promise great things from various experimenters and devices. The INE now has a fantastic website and massive references, and even listings of what devices look good and which ones look ready to be commercialized, ranked by careful criteria. So: What are we lacking?

I have at least two "sugar daddies" (funders) who just want to see a videotape of a new and promising device that works on a kitchen table - and if they like what they see, they will fly out and talk 6-to-7 figure deals for follow-on prototype R&D. No videotapes have been received.

I have read lots of promising things written in books over the past 5 years about research in the new energy areas. Not one promise or "statement of fact" in those books has been found to be true! - the only exception being in the "cold fusion" or "low energy nuclear reactions" areas - especially when one uses "Palladium Type-A".

Where's the Beef?

I think we need additional non-government funds to support INE research. I think we need to submit very complete business proposals to the

individuals and corporations that want "new energy" to be developed - and not just by good ol' Dennis Lee! I think many serious investors are scared of the US "Government". I think that many movie stars are serious about new energy investing! I think that many companies in the Silicon Valley area are serious about new energy investing! I think that Zapada Oil and the US oil importers will try to hinder our progress. However; I think that the oil producing nations are very concerned about the continuing drain on their limited oil reserves, and they would be VERY interested in seeing our research proposals, and funding our INE research projects. Ahem!: They also have all these USD's (\$ FRNs) that they need to get rid of... Therefore, I have taken the proper accredited courses, and I am now writing those proposals for those people, companies, corporations, banks, and Royal Families that ARE interested.

It's time to get "real rough". On a trip recently, I bought a book that summarizes the "Feringi Rules for Acquisition", from the Star Trek & Deep Space Nine Series. Great Book! One Rule says: "If it's worth doing, it's worth doing for profit". Another says: "The bigger the smile, the sharper the teeth". Of course there is the old stand-by "Profit - Morality = Happiness" (for the Feringi, and Hollywood, I guess). I like the one that I made up: "Persistence + Facts = Profit." Let's do it.

With your help and assistance, the INE will have an incredible year in CY 2001, and I daresay that we could re-write some of these recently published books with real facts and real experiments that do work. That's the plan.

Make it so!

GLOBAL WARMING COULD MAKE WATER A SCARCE RESOURCE

By Cat Lazaroff, Environment News Service

Submitted by Patrick Bailey.

<http://ens-news.com/ens/dec2000/2000L-12-15-06.html>

OAKLAND, California, December 15, 2000 (ENS) - Global warming could have serious impacts on water resources in the United States, and some of those effects are already being felt, a new report released today concludes. To counter those effects, government and water management officials must act now - a prescription that may be a hard sell under the new George W. Bush administration.

Those are the major conclusions of a two-year study of the potential

impacts of climate change on the nation's fresh and salt water systems.

"Water: The Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change," concludes that climate changes in this century may have serious implications for U.S. water resources. In fact, scientists are already observing changes in snow and rainfall, freeze and thaw dates and runoff patterns, attributable to global warming.

"Humans are changing the climate - the evidence is ... increasingly compelling," said Peter Gleick, president of the Pacific Institute and the lead author of the study. The study was jointly released today by the nonprofit Pacific Institute and the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The report offers the first opportunity for water managers to access information that can help them make long term policy decisions, said David Hayes, deputy secretary of the Interior Department.

"The report gives us both a positive and negative message," Hayes said. On the negative side, "yes, climate change is having important impacts" on "critically important" water and coastal resources.

"But it is not a 'sky is falling' report that merely paints a bleak picture," Hayes continued. "It gives us an opportunity to plan ahead."

The assessment caps more than two years of work by representatives of the government, corporate and non-governmental groups to evaluate the implications of both existing climate variability and future climate change on national water resources.

Scientists have determined that the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere over the past century, primarily from fossil fuel combustion, has contributed to a temperature increase of about two-thirds of a degree Celsius in the United States, with 1998 the warmest year on record.

The report concludes that this has already resulted in substantial thawing of the permafrost in the Alaska Arctic and unprecedented melting of mountain glaciers, an increase in sea level of between 10 to 20 centimeters, and an alteration of water runoff patterns as a consequence of decreased snow and ice cover and earlier melting.

Climate models predict that temperatures could increase another three to six degrees Celsius by the end of this century. Warming of this magnitude could seriously affect U.S. water resources, the new report concludes.

Among the impacts outlined by the study are:

EUR Snowfall and snow melt will be significantly affected in the Sierra Nevada, Rocky Mountains, and the Pacific Northwest, leading to changes in the timing and magnitude of runoff. These changes could reduce the amount of water available to drinking water reservoirs and for freshwater species.

EUR Rising sea levels will threaten coastal aquifers and water supplies. Vulnerable regions include Cape Cod, Long Island, the coastal aquifers of the Carolinas and the central coast of California.

EUR The risk of increased flooding may be as serious and widely distributed as the expected impacts of droughts.

EUR Changes associated with climate change, such as increases in lake and stream temperatures, permafrost melting, and a reduction of water clarity, could seriously threaten fish and water species and critical habitats such as wetlands.

The study produced more than 40 new peer reviewed papers, and almost 1,000 more were evaluated and summarized. The report went through extensive external reviews, including reviews by the different assessment teams, a diverse advisory group, two separate formal external scientific review periods, and a 60 day public comment period.

Despite all the resources used to produce the report, the authors found they could not predict specific effects for particular regions with any degree of certainty. Although there are now a number of highly sophisticated models for predicting climate change effects, they often disagree about predictions on the regional level.

"Even if the models said the same thing we should be somewhat skeptical, because these models are not perfect," said Gleick. "We're very confident that the temperature is going to go up, and will continue to go up until we get a handle on our greenhouse gas emissions."

"This assessment was designed to be the first step," Gleick noted. "Our hope is that our ability to look at regional impacts will improve in the coming decades."

"We think there will always be uncertainty," said Gleick. But "not everything is uncertain," he noted. "We know enough now to take some actions."

Gleick emphasized the importance of water conservation and efficiency programs, and the need to look beyond traditional options for water supply options, such as dams and reservoirs to potential alternative sources of

supply, including wastewater reclamation and reuse and desalination.

"Sole reliance on traditional management responses is a mistake," Gleick argued. "Water managers need to integrate possible climate change impacts into their planning processes and to build flexibility into the system to maximize our ability to respond to changing conditions."

Gleick emphasized the need to focus on measures to reduce the risks of climate change and to develop effective ways to adapt to the inevitable changes. "Water managers should begin now assessing how their resources could be affected by climate change," said Gleick. "We're worried that if they don't start taking actions now, we're going to see the adverse effects of climate change hitting us."

"One of the conclusions I take from this report is that some of our assumptions about water availability for the future may be misguided," said deputy secretary Hayes. "Our country is now looking for water resources to be shared among competing needs, including environmental needs."

"We are on the threshold of some very major investments in water infrastructure throughout the country," Hayes said, citing the recently signed Everglades restoration bill, which promises to spend \$8 billion dollars to reroute water within the nation's largest wetlands.

But that effort could be derailed before it is begun. "Rising sea level is going to be a challenge to the Everglades," said Gleick, a consideration which may not have been given enough weight in drafting the 30 year restoration plan. "It's a very important issue to the Everglades," because the largely freshwater wetlands are "very sensitive" to sea level rise.

The massive San Francisco Bay Delta restoration project, another pet project of the Clinton administration, could face similar difficulties, Gleick said. "They've not adequately looked at" sea level rise from global warming, he said.

Most climate change models project between half a meter to a meter of sea level rise over 100 years, an amount which may not appear to be very large at face value. But "the sea level rise we're talking about is faster than any sea level rise we've had to deal with in our civilization," Gleick warned.

"All of these efforts, as they proceed down a long path, need to now take a hard look at potential climate change impacts," said Hayes. "Climate change is the new kid on the block in terms of a new factor that ought to be taken into consideration."

However, the administration set to enter the White House in January may not give much weight to potential climate change effects. President Elect George W. Bush is on record as opposing the Kyoto Protocol, an international treaty aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Bush has also said he believes that more data must be gathered before any action is taken to counter climate change.

"We're about to have a new administration in town that I'm afraid may not show the same sensitivity to this problem that the current administration has done," said Hayes.

Yet "part of this is independent of the next administration," noted Gleick. "I think no matter what, we're in for climate change. There is some unavoidable climate change coming. In that sense, it doesn't matter who the president is, or who the Interior secretary is."

"We do need to begin to look at these things now, and if we don't the risk of surprise is greater," Gleick continued. "The risk of being blind sided is greater. It's really time to begin integrating these issues into our long term planning."

The full report is available at: <http://www.pacinst.org/naw.html>

CHERNOBYL SHUT DOWN FOR GOOD

BBC, Friday, 15 December, 2000

Submitted by Patrick Bailey.

The ill-fated Chernobyl nuclear plant has been permanently shut down in Ukraine -- more than 14 years after a reactor exploded in the world's worst civil nuclear catastrophe.

Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma gave a nationwide television address before ordering the Chernobyl control room to turn a knob shutting down the last working reactor.

"To fulfil a state decision and Ukraine's international obligations, I hereby order the premature stoppage of the operation of reactor No 3 at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant," Mr Kuchma said.

His words were relayed to Chernobyl via a live television link.

In the control room, shift chief Aleksandr Yelchishchev turned a black switch -- marked BAZ, short for "rapid emergency defense" -- sending containment rods sliding into the reactor core to stop the atomic chain reaction.

Workers' tears

Within seconds, a dial showed the reactor's output dropping to zero.

"Mr President of Ukraine, the third reactor is being stopped for good. I have nothing more to add," reported the station's director, Vitaly Tovstonohov, wearing white protective clothing.

About 100 workers at the plant followed events in the control room on a large television screen. Many had tears in their eyes as they stood to watch.

Representatives from more than 10 countries including the United States attended the closing ceremony. The ceremony followed a church service in Kiev to remember those who died in the nuclear disaster. Thirty-one people, mostly firemen, were killed immediately after the explosion, and several thousand more -- those involved in the clean-up and children -- have since died from radiation-related illnesses. Ukraine says the health of millions of its people have been affected by the disaster.

International pressure

The country agreed to close down the plant under intense international pressure. The schedule was finally agreed during a visit by US President Bill Clinton to Kiev earlier this year.

Even so the Ukrainian parliament made a last-minute attempt on Thursday to keep the plant open for the rest of the winter, voting to postpone closure until April 2001. Angry Chernobyl workers staged protests as President Kuchma took foreign dignitaries including the premiers of Russia, Belarus and Georgia on a tour of the plant, which supplies roughly 5% of the country's electricity needs. Ukraine has pledged not to use Chernobyl for electricity generation again, though it will take until 2008 before the last fuel rods are removed from the plant.

The disaster occurred nearly 15 years ago on 26 April 1986, when an experiment went wrong, causing the fourth reactor to explode and melt down.

The European Union has agreed to provide a total of nearly \$1 billion to

help two replacement nuclear reactors in the former Soviet republic.

But environmentalists Greenpeace International condemned the EU plans terming them as "utterly cynical." The pressure group's nuclear expert, Tobias Munchmeyer, said Ukraine should instead meet its energy capacity needs through renewable sources and improving efficiency. Greenpeace International also said the closure of the Ukrainian plant should be followed by shutdowns at similar plants in Russia and Lithuania. "We cannot afford to wait another 14 years before the remainder are shutdown," said Mr. Munchmeyer.

International funds have been made available to make safe the concrete sarcophagus hastily thrown up around the ruins of the stricken fourth reactor, in the months following the 1986 explosion. However a permanent solution, including the possible construction of a second shelter, remains a long way in the future.

CLIMATE SHIFT: BRUSSELS REPORT WARNS OF DESERTS IN SOUTH AND STORMS IN NORTH: EUROPE TOLD THERE IS NO CHOICE BUT TO ADAPT

Paul Brown, environment correspondent, *The Guardian & Observer*, Nov. 2, 2000

Submitted by Patrick Bailey

[http://www.guardianunlimited.co.uk/Distribution/Redirect_Artifact/
/0,4678,0-391415,00.html](http://www.guardianunlimited.co.uk/Distribution/Redirect_Artifact/0,4678,0-391415,00.html)

Europe must adapt to extremes of climate which will cause new deserts in the south and floods and wind storms in the north, according to a new report before the European commission.

The report, compiled by climate scientists, warns that traditional holiday destinations on the Mediterranean will lose their beaches as sea levels rise, temperatures will become too hot for comfort and many older people will die due to excessive heat. The Alps will lose most of their glaciers and uncertain snow patterns will lead to serious problems for the ski industry.

Agriculture in the south will suffer as underground water is exhausted and already sparse summer rain disappears. There will not be enough water to grow the fruit and vegetables that fill northern supermarkets. Hot summers will double in frequency by 2020 and be five times as likely in Spain. Forest fires will increase across the whole region.

Species of wading birds which live on the Mediterranean wetlands will become extinct as sea levels rise, and environmental refugees will invade from Africa as local people move north in search of a gentler climate.

The north-west of Europe will suffer least and has the technology to adapt to climate change. There will be some gains, including faster growing forests, less snow and lower heating bills. Cold winters will be half as frequent by 2020 and disappear altogether except in the extreme north.

Dangers include more droughts, floods, storms, tidal surges and insects bringing new diseases.

The 350-page report to the commission is edited by Martin Parry of the Jackson Environment Institute at the University of East Anglia, and was released yesterday – two weeks before EU governments meet in the Hague to discuss reducing carbon dioxide emissions to try to slow global warming.

Prof Parry said climate change was already measurable and the extra greenhouse gases in the atmosphere would usher in a warmer, stormier world. "It is imperative that we take the first steps to adapting to climate change now by factoring the coming effects into environmental and regional policies," he said.

Although sea walls could be built higher, buildings adapted, water conserved and agriculture changed to meet new conditions, the report makes clear that many species will disappear. Prof Parry said nature reserves would suffer as the climate changed. Mountain-top species such as alpine plants would disappear as vegetation changed. Cold-water species such as salmon, arctic char and sturgeon would die out in southern rivers.

Dr Jorgen Olesen, a co-author of the report from Denmark, said: "Agricultural crops will move an average of 50km [30 miles] north per decade so there can be advantages in places too cold to grow crops now. But unless we make changes to make new habitats as water temperatures rise and salt marshes in the Mediterranean and Baltic disappear, because of sea level rise, we will see extinctions of fisheries and loss of wading birds."

Tony Juniper, campaigns director of Friends of the Earth, said: "The report is about adapting to climate change, but arctic char, salmon and wading birds cannot evolve fast enough to cope with the dramatic changes being caused by people polluting the atmosphere. The catastrophic consequences of rapid climate change are being made clear in ways that should focus

governments' attention at this month's climate change negotiations on the urgent measures that are now absolutely necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

"The longer governments delay what must be the inevitable transition to a new energy economy, the worse the consequences will be. "Global warming is destroying coral reefs, scientists have confirmed. New Scientist reports that US researchers have discovered the first direct evidence that mass deaths of coral are caused by rising temperatures. The alarm was raised after reports of "bleaching", which occurs when warmer waters force corals to expel algae. During the 1997-98 El Nino weather system, reefs bleached throughout the world and there were mass deaths of coral in the Caribbean. Cores drilled from Caribbean reefs off Belize show nothing like this has happened for at least 3,000 years.

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM ROBERT BASS, Dec. 12, 2000

Letter to Mr. Park:

Submitted by Patrick Bailey

Dear Dr. Park,

With regard to your disinformation-attempt [below] regarding a Cold Fusion "terrorist bomb", let's recall the situation regarding the ablative-compression pellets supposed to be compressed to about 10,000 times normal solid-state density in Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) as pursued by Hot Fusioners at LLNL. If memory serves, one of these pellets contains deuterium gas and if it were compressed to solid state would be about 1 micron in diameter. They have at LLNL supposedly achieved compression to 100 times solid density, but need to improve that by a factor of about 87 to get ignition, in which case the micro pellet will go off like a little H-bomb releasing the energy of "about 10 pounds of dynamite." But in the ICF case, the "bomber" needs an Ignition Laser bigger than a football field and costing Billion\$ and must drop the pellets at the rate of once every 10 seconds – not very cost-effective! In my "Deuterium Crystals" proposal [2nd and 3rd clicks below] I want to make a crystal of Meta Stable Deuterium (MSD) [similar to the JPL proposals re solid MetaStable Helium (MSH)] and about 4 mm on a side. If one cm³ of MSD would give the energy of 150 lbs of TNT then a 4 mm-sized cube of MSD would give the energy of 10 lbs of TNT, provided that it could be triggered via the "chain fusion" concept of [Nobel Laureate] Julian Schwinger to go off all at once.

Here is my calculation. I have a Cold Fusion colleague who doubts the Pons-melt down story. I just sent him the following: "Your arguments and experiments against the possibility of the Pons-melt down do seem cogent, well-taken and persuasive."

HOWEVER:

I just re-read in Beaudette's book the account of the Pons-alleged Meltdown with one cm^3 of Pd. He quotes an independent eye-witness grad student who wandered in by accident and saw a hole in a hard lab-bench-top about a "foot in diameter" with a "4-inch" hole in the concrete floor beneath. They say that the Pd cube was "[melt-]fused & partially vaporized." That took a LOT of energy if their account is accurate. Do you concur with the following calculation which indicates that if ALL the deuterons in a cm^3 of perfectly loaded Pd nuclearly - fused before the metallic cube could melt & lose its lattice configuration then the energy release would be about the same as 150 pounds of High Explosive? (So if one percent was nuclearly-fused then it would have been like 1.5 pounds of TNT.) Li says that a 100% loaded cube of Pd of size 1 cm^3 contains 6.8×10^{22} deuterons or 3.4×10^{22} D-D pairs. If fusion of $d+d \rightarrow \text{He}_4$ gives 2.4 MeV or 3.8×10^{-13} J [J =Watt-sec] then fusion of one cm^3 of loaded Pd can release in lattice-energy 1.3×10^6 kW-sec, or enough energy to raise 1,650 pounds of water from 14 deg C to 99 deg, i.e. to nearly boil a ton of water (or to run a 100 kW-engine electric-powered car at high speed for nearly 4 hours). Garwin says that 100 Mega Joules of energy is equivalent to 25 kg of High Explosive (HE). Hence 1.3×10^9 J is equivalent to 325 kg (or 148 lbs) of HE. Certainly only a fraction of the energy in 150 pounds of dynamite would do the damage observed by the graduate student who surprised F&P surveying the unexpected wreckage of their lab but "smirking like a cat who had just eaten a canary" (with simultaneous damage-chagrin & discovery-elation). And where would the chemical energy come from if they have accurately described what happened? Scaramuzzi's essay in the AIR Special Issue stresses the role of "chance" in his own work. If he had not had extraordinarily good "beginner's luck" in his own two departures from prior work, he would have long ago got out of the field of CF and believed it to be all a delusion. Maybe the same "beginner's luck" came to F&P and encouraged them to keep going rather than give up prematurely.

CONCLUSION:

My proposal to make MSD crystals is NOT far-fetched if you have read the May 2000 Cover Story in *Scientific American* about the success at LLNL in demonstrating Deuterium in the state of a Liquid Metal (though for nanoseconds only). But it would take the resources of a large corporation or a small nation to develop my proposed VERY high-tech process to BULK-MANUFACTURE MSD. It obviously (see my

postings below) CANNOT be done by backyard militants or garage-terrorists. And any organization large enough to _develop_ MSD would be sufficiently _visible_ to be vulnerable to conventional military retaliation. Furthermore, despite the successful attempt by the Federation of American Scientists to shame Pres. Clinton into renouncing work at LANL on the He-driven, magnetically-pumped "pure fusion bomb," the question of WMD- Proliferation versus Benefit to Humanity is supposed to be decided in a democracy by the will of the majority as reflected in the Legislature, not by some bureaucrat at the State Department acting on the basis of propaganda from lobbyists with covert agendas (such as to protect existing sources of energy like fossil fuels and nuclear fission from more cost-effective competition). As you know very well, for 3 cents one may extract the deuterium in a gallon of water, and thereby get the fusion-"fuel" with energy equivalent of over 300 gallons of gasoline! The _taxpayers_ should decide whether or not they should have Energy Utopia [to complement the internet's Information Utopia!!] even if the concomitant new technology could also [as can EVERY new technology] be put to a possibly destructive as well as constructive use. The present "in-group" at the APS stands to lose prestige and influence with society when the taxpayers learn how they have been betrayed merely for the personal convenience of a group of over-privileged elites who are more concerned about loss of PERSONAL funding than over-all benefit to society as a whole. Instead of behind- the-scenes lobbying/sabotage as in the recent past, the whole matter should be debated _openly_ in Congress where all points of view can be presented and the most persuasive OBJECTIVE arguments can be weighed. You have spoken about "nutty" papers at CF sessions. Please take the 22papers presented at the recent ANS Special Session on Low Energy Nuclear Reactions and critique them one-by-one! _Many_ of these papers were of the very HIGHEST quality! Your attempt to discredit them is going ultimately to discredit you and the AIP and the APS. You had better start reconsidering the AIP/APS stance before it is too late!

Sincerely,

Bob Bass

**THE WORLD'S MOST POWERFUL
SEARCH ENGINE IN EXISTENCE.**

Email received from Robert Bass, Dec. 12, 2000.

Submitted by Patrick Bailey

Click on <http://www.express.go.com> and then click on "Download Express Search" and follow easy instructions. It works with Windows 95/98 or NT.

When you first use Express Search, it gives you up to ELEVEN search engines that will be used _simultaneously_. (_Restore_ Info Seek's competitors Lycos and HotBot which they have carefully left unchecked!! Lycos is often VERY good.) When you scan results, you first select all the possible hits that you might be interested in, and it starts quietly downloading them in the background, invisibly, so you don't have to wait for each one. Then when you ask to see Selected items it gives you them one at a time; you have to go to the next one from an arrow near upper right which says that you are e.g. on number 3 out of 5 selected and want to go on to "next" (which will be the 4th). If you want to Save one among your Favorites, you have to use an obscure small command near the upper RH corner of Express Search rather than your own browser's "Favorites, Add" commands. Yesterday as a test I tried to find the site wherein people rebut Marilyn vos Savant's claim that Pascal's Wager is no good. I couldn't find it using the MSN search engine that comes with MS Outlook Express. Today I remembered how to go and get my old Express Search application (lost when my computer was upgraded) and after downloading it, I found what I was looking for in a few seconds, using a Comma to separate Key Words: Pascal's Wager, vos Savant [The posted arguments are ALL naive & uninformed; none of them quote Pascal's Wager as he actually formulated it; they quote over-simplified versions of it. The true version doesn't say that believing in and obeying the commands of a Non-existent god doesn't cause you to lose _anything_, it says (e.g. by giving up hedonism) that your loss is FINITE whereas if your belief is actually Warranted, then your gain is INFINITE. It is rational to wager a finite loss against an infinite gain! Many atheistic expert Logicians admit that the logic of Pascal's Wager is flawless but they disregard it anyway because it doesn't move them emotionally. (For that one needs personal experience in the present.)]

Regarding InfoSeek's "Express Search:" The makers give it away FREE, I don't know why it is so difficult to locate and download except that now some web sites want you to use it on THEIR websites (with their ads) rather than let you have your own copy!
Successful Searching!

Bob Bass

**Suspicious Confirmed: EVIDENCE of Organized
opposition to CF/LENR, etc.**

Email Received Nov. 29, 2000 from Robert Bass

Submitted by Patrick Bailey

The ex-spook who sent me the following has held VERY high-level governmental & defense-industry positions involving MAJOR responsibilities for multi-billion \$\$ weapon systems.

-----Original Message-----

Subject: Re: EVIDENCE of Organized opposition to CF/LENR, etc.

Bob, as usual you are quite thorough. Your points are well-taken. There indeed are those "out there" with whom our well-being is of little import. The walls not only are "full of ears," but also are full of termites. There are so many vested interests it is challenging to determine where and on whose hit-list one might be! But you have done a good job of highlighting some of them.

You may not know that I was a Special Agent in Washington, DC and Baltimore back in the late 40's and early 50's, and in the process of associating with my CIA and FBI counterparts (as well as with about a dozen other government investigative agencies -- there are WAY too many!) I learned that there REALLY ARE many "secret combinations" in these happy though often innocent U.S.-of-A that pursue their own hidden agendas. There are so many "bad guy groups" that often they themselves tromp on each other's turf in their urge to be one-up on everyone else! And these days they seem to be replicating like rabbits! Will the really bad guys please stand up in the mire and identify themselves?!

Anyhow, old friend, keep an alert eye via your rear-vision mirror, because the closer you/we/anyone gets to success in certain of the "new energy" areas, be it CF, the vacuum energy methods, or whatever, the more attention is paid to us by the bad guys. Their first line of offense is defamation of character, which unfortunately is much too similar (and often mistaken for) the panning we all get via peer reviews of papers we write and attempt to publish. Next they get REALLY nasty if they sense anyone outside their domain getting into the public-dollar feeding trough. You have very nicely pointed out both of these.

They think they OWN the public monies. This has been especially true with the Hot Fusion folks at Germantown and Princeton. They have been utterly stupid to have swallowed the old KGB-initiated TOKAMAK math model and hypothesis, hook, line and sinker. This was one of the reasons that the Soviets doubted at first our nuclear weapon capability to such a degree that our perceived "weakness" nearly lead to a shooting war.

They figured if we're stupid enough to bite on TOKOMAK that we might

just be stupid on other nuclear technology. I was one of those participating (in a very small capacity) in General Pete Cassada's nuclear task force in the late 40's and early 50's when many of the early Pacific atom bomb tests were conducted. Even our own Navy had to be convinced that one bomb could destroy an entire fleet, not just one ship!

But in the process of swallowing TOKAMAK, the New Jersey and Pennsylvania Congressmen and lobbyists found a way to install a permanent tap on the public treasury to continue what a three-year-old kid knows will never, ever be successful. As I remember it, that is one of the weaknesses that eventually destroyed the thousand- year-old Roman empire.....their subject states (not the vested citizens in Rome itself) finally got fed up enough by excessive Roman taxation, and capable enough, to throw off the hated conqueror, and there went the Empire.

Email received from Integrity Institute, Nov. 14, 2000

Submitted by Patrick Bailey.

Dear APS President and Director of Public Affairs:

In his excellent letter to the Washington Post Science writer, Dr. Scott Chubb refers to your latest What's New column that is circulated by email to thousands of physicists and posted eternally on the American Physical Society website at www.aps.org. The WN paragraph referring to Integrity Research Institute is reprinted below and then Scott's commentary follows.

IRI has been targeted by Park's "What's New" on Nov. 10, Oct. 20, and Aug. 18 of this year, besides a half dozen times last year. On Aug. 18, Park leaped to the unscientific conclusion that religion and cold fusion are the same. In a further lapse of mental stability on Oct. 20, Park was begging to know "what am I doing wrong?" As to the Nov. 10 WN reprinted below, since when are peer-reviewed physics papers at the American Nuclear Society "an embarrassment"? Does the APS also admit the same embarrassment for their cold fusion sessions of their past two conferences? Or are there two different measuring sticks being used here by Mr. Stalled and Parked???

Integrity Research Institute's Board of Directors agrees with Dr. Chubb's assessment that this has become an ethics issue that reflects upon the APS, because it appears that the physics society CONDONES Park's malicious and defamatory statements. Park obviously reviewed the announcement for the upcoming LENREW conference, since he accurately spelled two of the speakers names, but chose to discredit the conference itself with an

erroneous title. More and more physicists who are members of APS, as well as the scientific community at large, regard such deliberate actions by the APS Public Affairs Office as unethical and an embarrassment.

We demand an immediate broadcast email correction to What's New, stating that the "free-energy" conference was mistakenly described and is actually a Low Energy Nuclear Reactions Educational Workshop (LENREW) being held at the Holiday Inn, College Park, Maryland on Nov. 17, 2000.

If the American Physical Society is unable to comply with this reasonable request, we will be forced to consider legal action.

Sincerely,
Thomas Valone, MA, PE
President
Integrity Research Institute
1220 L St. NW #100-232
Washington, DC 20005
202-452-7674, 800-295-7674
FAX: 301-513-5728
<http://www.integrity-research.org>

WHAT'S NEW Robert L. Park Friday, 10 Nov 00 Washington, DC

1. COLD FUSION: CONFERENCES HELD, PATENT REJECTED.

The American Nuclear Society is holding an embarrassing session on cold-fusion at its meeting next week in Washington. Capitalizing on the presence of so many fanciful minds, the new-age Integrity Research Institute (WN 5 Mar 99) holds its free-energy conference two days later. A likely topic of discussion is last Wednesday's ruling by a Circuit Court of Appeals to reject the appeal of Michael Swartz for a cold-fusion patent on the grounds of "lack of operability." The Court ruled that the patent didn't convince sensible people that the idea could work. But, not everybody falls into that category. Testifying for Swartz were two invited speakers at the IRI conference - Eugene Mallove and Scott Chubb.

----- Original Message -----

From: <CHUBBSCOTT@aol.com>
To: <park@aps.org>; <brodsky@aip.org>; <langer@physics.ucsb.edu>;

<ght@lbl.gov>; <wfb@lucent.com>; <jjf@mit.edu>

Cc: <editor@infinite-energy.com>;

<steinr@washingtonpost.com>

Sent: Monday, November 13, 2000 10:43 PM

Subject: Letter to the Editor, submitted to APS NEWS

To the Editor:

Just a little too often "WHAT'S NEW" in the "APS" has errors. Just a little too often when this happens, I fail to remember that the "APS" in "WHAT'S NEW" really doesn't stand for the American Physical Society. Just a little too often, I forget about the small letters at the bottom of the page that say, the "Opinions are the author's and are not necessarily shared by the APS, but they should be."

But when I do come to my senses, it dawns on me. I'm wrong. Instead of "WHAT'S NEW IN THE APS" having something to do with the American Physical Society, I realize a basic truth: "WHAT'S NEW IN THE APS" really, very often, should refer to something else, such as, "WHAT'S NEW IN THE ABSENTED-MINDED PHYSICS SOCIETY", or "WHAT'S NEW" FOR ABSENT-MINED POT SHOTS." The reason I say this is that all too often, in "WHAT'S NEW," the goal is in taking "cute" pot-shots, at humorous targets, as opposed to seeking the truth.

On Sept. 30, a serious event occurred. A Gordon and Breach Ethics in Science journal, Accountability in Research (vol. 8, issues 1 and 2, 2000), independently called into question events associated not only with practices carried out by the American Physical Society in the manner it has conducted meetings and the associated ramifications involving suitable adjudication of the relevant science but indirectly in venues, explicitly involving the Internet and "extemporaneously-constructed" comments in columns, such as WHAT'S NEW. The explicit topic, which has now become a case for historians of science, involves events that took place on 1 May 1989, where two chemists, Martin Fleischman, and Stanley Pons were "tried" in absentia, by the American Physical Society in a poorly defined meeting, with negligible documentation at an APS meeting, in Baltimore.

Four days later, in "WHAT'S NEW IN THE APS", irrelevant, unscientific language began that continues to this day (WHAT'S NEW, 10 Nov. 2000). Since science has continued, despite this fact, it is now time to question why the ludicrous "WHAT'S NEW" language about this topic continues. In the end, how the APS will judge these events will involve how we as members of the APS and the American Institute of Physics respond. As one who has been involved, I will swear on any number of bibles that "WHAT'S NEW" has "merely" taken pot-shots at this subject.

And I have done so, in a court of Law (as noted in What's new, 10 Nov. 2000).

As a scientist, I seek the truth. When mistakes occur, I admit them. A mistake occurred in 1989. It is time to move on and to admit that the "cute" and "witty" language ("sances," "true believers," etc) that is rampant in "WHAT'S NEW" with regard to the poorly-defined term "Cold Fusion" that is so frequently used in this venue does not belong, at least if "WHAT'S NEW" is to anything to do with seeking and disseminating "the truth" about the physics of this subject, which is, by necessity, a fundamental goal of the American Physical Society.

Respectfully submitted,

SCOTT CHUBB

home: Dr. Scott R. Chubb

9822 Pebble Weigh Ct.

Burke, VA 22015-3378

DAYTIME PHONE: 202-767-5270, HOME PHONE: 703-644-1206

work:

Dr. Scott R. Chubb

Code 7252

Naval Research Laboratory

Washington, D.C. 20375-5351

EMAIL: scott.chubb@nrl.navy.mil

<Attachments Included. Available from Scott.>

POLLUTED CHINA

Courtesy of Gordon B. Moody

Gordon B. Moody, Publisher/Editor, Global Energy Outlook, vol 5 no 11.

Serious Problems Plaguing Asia in the Slowing Global Economy.

Quoting from the Economist, "China has a new obsession. It needs not only to be concerned about enough grain to feed its many billion-plus mouths, but it now must worry about sufficient energy to drive its power stations and cars. Energy security is now at the top of its agenda, including volatile international oil prices, the rapid rise in demand for energy, and the nightmarish air pollution that is killing thousand of its people. ...China has the world's most polluted cities.

The World Bank estimates that 100,000 of its population in big cities die prematurely each year of diseases resulting from air pollution. "Global Warming Doesn't Sound so Bad Until You Learn that it may Bring on an Ice Age. "Sharon Begley, reporting in the December 4th issue of Newsweek says for most people, global warming means little more than a rise in the earth's temperature. She says it might not be quite so simple. The greatest worry is that it might shift the Atlantic Ocean currents that warm northern Europe. If that happens, says Begley, the temperature of northern Europe could plunge 20 degrees in 10 years.

PLANT OIL

Purdue News, Agricultural Communication Services, "Plant oils will replace petroleum in coming years, scientist says. "Bernie Tao predicts that over the next several decades, plant oil will become just as essential to every day life as fossil fuels are today. Prof. Tao may be right. However, with the growing demand for more acreage to grow food for an increasing world population, there may not be enough land to also produce oil from plants. As with most "locked-into-oil" thinking, there are very few academicians who are considering new-energy devices. So sure that it is impossible to tap the energy of space and so sure that low-energy nuclear reactions are impossible, most academicians stress conventional means.

A VIDEO REVIEW

THE FREE ENERGY SECRETS OF COLD ELECTRICITY

A video presentation by Dr. Peter Lindemann, 12 Sept. 2000

Available from:

Clear Tech, Inc.

PO Box 37

Meta line Falls, WA 99153

Phone 509-446-2353 Fax 509-446-2354

website: www.free-energy.cc

The Video presents the story of a search and an amazing discovery. Dr. Peter Lindemann presents information about the late Edwin Gray, Sr and his marvelous motor that apparently runs on "cold electricity." Gray had discovered a special effect that could be obtained with the use of high voltage capacitors to produce bursts of energy. Gray was able to develop this discovery into a working "conversion switching tube" which he used in special circuits to provide energy for lights, motors, and recharging his batteries. Peter Lindemann describes his long search for meaningful

energy sources and the culmination of trying to discover how Gray's motor was powered. Lindemann makes an excellent discovery that is told to the viewer in lecture form as Lindemann reads from writings about Tesla and shows diagrams of both the work of Gray and similar work of Tesla. If you are interested in sources of energy that can change the world, this is a fascinating story.

Those familiar with Tesla's work will remember that he was the inventor of polyphase electrical power production. Most of us enjoy today, the fruits of Tesla's work. Our alternating current system, often three phase at the power plant output, but more often single phase at our home electrical outlets, is the result of earlier work by Tesla. Not so well known was that Tesla discovered "cold electricity" that appeared to travel on the outer surface of conductors, that could be broadcast from a central location, and picked up anywhere. Tesla did some of his work in Colorado and later began to build a tower on Long Island from which he was to broadcast energy that could then be picked up anywhere.

Until I viewed this film, I wondered why the funding for Tesla's work was stopped and why Tesla was never to complete what he thought was one of his greatest inventions. Apparently, the reason for stopping the funding of Tesla's work was that it would have had a serious economic impact on the then growing generation and distribution of electrical power. An event somewhat similar to the academic attacks on the discovery of cold fusion, except that cold fusion was deemed to be a threat to the funding of hot fusion. Lindemann describes at length the experiments and patents of Tesla that are related to cold electricity.

At the conclusion of the review of Tesla's work, Lindemann then shows the similarities between Gray's work and Tesla's work. In addition, Lindemann describes how some of the previously unexplained devices in Gray's circuits can operate. It is likely that one skilled in the art and with sufficient funds for some of the equipment (such as high-voltage capacitors) can replicate both the cold electricity that Tesla discovered and rebuild Gray's circuits so that power can be obtained similar to Gray's invention. After watching this video, the viewer may wonder, "What would our power systems in the world be like if Tesla had been allowed to complete his work?" This viewer judgement is that with the current energy crisis, this video could (and should) lead to a serious investigation of "cold electricity." This is probably another way to tap the energy so abundant in space around us (aka ZPE, zero-point energy, space energy, vacuum energy, etc.).

Is the real answer to our getting off the grid by use of "cold electricity?" This video may be the answer. This reviewer highly recommends this presentation to those who have an interest in solving the current energy

problems.

Hal Fox, editor, Journal of New Energy

HYDROGEN EXPLAINS DARK MATTER

Paul Marmet, "Discovery of H-2 in Space Explains Dark Matter and Redshift," *21st Century Science and Technology*, Spring 2000, pp 5-7, 8 refs, illus.

This article explains that recent discoveries show that there is a lot of molecular hydrogen in space, as predicted by Paul Marmet some years ago. Marmet explains that this molecular hydrogen can account for both dark matter and for the Red shift. For an excellent article on the nature of the red shift and also the microwave background radiation see Petar Anastasovski, et al., "A New Approach to the Cosmic Red-Shift and to the Cosmic Microwave Sources," *J. New Energy*, vol 1, no 2, Summer 1996, pp 79-87, 4 refs, 5 figs.

Happy New Year 2001!