

=====

Subj: CMNS: Re: Rossi 6 Oct Experiment Data - Preliminary Data Analysis

Date: 10/8/2011

From: [Brian Josephson]

To: cmns@googlegroups.com

And here we have the Last Word, from the Dark Knight himself:

<http://blog.newenergytimes.com/2011/10/08/e-cat-test-demonstrates-energy-loss/>

> E-Cat Test Demonstrates Energy Loss

> Posted on October 8, 2011 by Steven B. Krivit

> Promoter Andrea Rossi's most recent test of his "energy catalyzer" failed to demonstrate the production of excess heat.

So I guess we can all go home now. But methinks the honourable DK doesn't get it!

Brian

=====

Subj:RE: CMNS: Rossi test

Date:10/9/2011

From: [Brian Ahern]

To:cmns@googlegroups.com

This test was an intentional deception as usual. He mounted the thermocouple such that it responded directly to the heater and not the actual temperature of the hot water. This was not an oversight. He used this trick in February with Levi.

This is why the power appeared to go up when shutting off the power. The liquid heat transfer exceeded the vapor and the thermocouple temperature rose as it did not reflect the fluid characteristics as nmch as the location of the external thermocouple.

Mounting thermocouples externally is also absurd. A t-type fitting to place it in the actual flow costs less than \$20.

There is a psychological torment associated with Rossi within CMNS. I think I am witnessing the behavior of seven year-old children who cannot bring themselves to give up on Santa Claus.

Rossi is not Santa Claus. He has been tried, convicted and sentenced in Italy multiple times.

=====

Subj:Re: CMNS: Rossi test

Date:10/9/2011

From: [James "Jim" Corey]

To:cmns@googlegroups.com

That's harsh, Brian. It may be a fraud, but it's an interesting and entertaining fraud.

=====

Subj:Re: CMNS: Rossi test

Date:10/9/2011

From:[Larry Forsley]

To:cmns@googlegroups.com

I agree with Brian's points, and whether or not Rossi's incompetent, fraudulent or both, his behaviour has tied up a lot of air time, and some experimental time. It has been divisive within the community. It casts doubt on the legitimate work that the rest of us do, and sets back our community in the wider world. I have observed both first hand.

To some, who were around 22 years ago, this may smack of the incredulity of the physics community towards "cold fusion". However, that doesn't support the suspension of disbelief, nor, conjuring up excuses for Rossi's data or his behaviour.

Whether or not Brian's ascerbic observations are entirely accurate, there have been enough false starts with Rossi in this debacle. For my money, all he wants is THE money, whatever and however he can extract it from whatever foolish mark he can get his hands on. It appears that he's had non-disclosures signed precluding those privy to his machinations from saying so, if they feel they've been duped.

Regrettably, there is no happy ending to this.

Larry

=====

Subj:Re: CMNS: Rossi test

Date:10/9/2011

From:[Ed Storms]

To: cmns@googlegroups.com

Larry and Brian,

From my point of view, the only question of any importance is whether Rossi has successfully created significant nuclear energy from Ni and H₂ or not. His personality, methods, and history are completely unimportant. He has demonstrated his device several times in the presence of credible witnesses and has published data that can only be interpreted as indicating the generation of significant energy when none is expected based on a chemical source. Fraud is no longer a plausible explanation.

We know from a huge collection of observation that nuclear reactions can be initiated under similar conditions using D₂. We know from the many papers by Piantelli et al. that abnormal energy results from Ni and H₂. Therefore, the Rossi claim is only one of increased magnitude. The fact that such a large magnitude is possible should encourage renewed interest in the phenomenon, not dismissal. In fact, in view of the desperate need for this kind of clean energy, I'm at a loss to understand why rational people would not explore this source no matter how great their doubts. Such efforts have nothing to lose and perhaps a great deal to gain. While Rossi is not able to satisfy all of our requirements, he is attempting to develop an energy source of great value in the face of skepticism and with no patent protection. Personally, I would rather give him the benefit of doubt, no matter how great the doubt, rather than make his efforts more difficult.

Ed

=====

Subj: Re: CMNS: Rossi test

Date: 10/13/2011

From: [Brian Josephson]

To: cmns@googlegroups.com

On Oct 12, 9:16 pm, Horace Heffner <hheff...@mtaonline.net> wrote:

> Brian,

> Yes, of course.

> Everything is in my review though, I think, and better said:

> <http://www.mtaonline.net/~hheffner/Rossi6Oct2011Review.pdf>

Technically your comments on COP may be correct, but of course the test was not designed to show the reactor could run for very long periods with little input power. If this is not the case, then a lot of people have been lying!

Brian

