

Nature

March 22, 2010 newsblog

- Out of comments the most recent were:
 - abcxyz on [ACS: Cold fusion calorimeter confusion](#)
 - **Heinrich Hora** on [ACS: Cold fusion calorimeter confusion](#)
 - [Fusion Power](#) on [ACS: Cold fusion calorimeter confusion](#)

[ACS: Cold fusion calorimeter confusion](#)

Since its triumphal [return](#) to the ACS three years ago, cold fusion seems to have gathered momentum.

Cold fusion is the nuclear fusion of atoms at room temperature, creating excess heat. When Stanley Pons and Martin Fleischman announced, at a press conference in 1989, that they'd discovered cold fusion a great swathe of publicity followed, and in hot pursuit was one of the greatest scandals of modern science when the results turned out to be impossible to reproduce. Cold fusion was at this point dismissed as a nonsense by many.

Back in 2007, the session took place on the last day of the meeting when most people had already gone home, and was tucked away in a room that was a ten-minute walk from the main sessions, and only a handful of people attended - all who knew one another already.

How times change. This year the "low energy nuclear reactions" (LENR) sessions took place over the first two days of the conference, in rooms that are not at all hard to find, and also with many more attendees. The ACS press office even publicised the event and gave a press conference to the speakers.

So why the change? It's not clear. Jan Marwan, from his own private research institute in Berlin, said in the press conference that the field of low energy nuclear reactions has made great progress, and urged people to take a closer look. "There is very strong experimental evidence in terms of excess heat, helium, tritium emission, in terms of nuclear transmutation. Strong experimental evidence."

Continue reading "[ACS: Cold fusion calorimeter confusion](#)" »

Posted by **Katharine Sanderson** (Nature) on March 22, 2010

Categories: [American Chemical Society](#) | [Permalink](#) | [Comments \(16\)](#) | [TrackBacks \(0\)](#)

.....



Nothing in that video contradicts anything in my post. It spends a lot of time on heat and helium, but none at all on the correlation of heat with all the other effects, like tritium, transmutations, alphas etc.

Posted by: abcxyz | [March 27, 2010 12:45 AM](#)

After Miles' talk claiming heat production I ask for his comments to the following fact: After the Hokkaido conference I visited Dr. Okamoto at his highly supported Japanese research lab for cold fusion and he told to my colleague and me that they had paid a huge sum for getting a number of experimental sets from the Riviera laboratory to show heat generation. After no heat was detected they had Stan Pons in Sapporo for about 10 weeks to get the instruments running: not any heat was produced. -- I should mention that the only fact I am taking serious as I explained in my talk shared with George Miley is with his very carefully and reproducibly seen heavy element generation. At the atomic number 153 appears a local maximum in his measured generation distribution similar to the uranium fission at 119, the Maruhn-Greiner effect. Miley could not know this then and all the consequences are in our article in Volume 2 of the LENR book at Oxford University Press edited by Jan Marwan and Steve Krivit. This is the point where I see that there is substance in the field. (see also: H. Hora and G.H. Miley, Maruhn-Greiner maximum from uranium fission for confirmation of low energy nuclear reactions LENR via a compound nucleus with double layer magic numbers *Journal of Fusion Energy* **26**, 349-354 & 347 (2007))

Posted by: **Heinrich Hora** | [March 27, 2010 07:46 AM](#)

More predictable, I think aneutronic [nuclear fusion](#) can be an alternative path to supply our future needs.

Posted by: [Fusion Power](#) | [March 28, 2010 02:26 AM](#)