

On Jun 29, 9:43 am, Edmund Storms <stor...@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

I think we need to consider the possibility that a "Yellow Press" is being created in the field of cold fusion.

Ed

On Jun 29, 2011, at 12:00 PM, Matt wrote:

Ed, we should also consider the fact that Krivit is correct in this case. If he's not, the E-Cat will be all the more remarkable considering Rossi's 'checkered' past. Time will hopefully tell.

Matt McConnell

Subj:Re: CMNS: Rossi Ecat
Date:6/29/2011 1:23:23 PM
From:storms
To:cmns@googlegroups.com

Matt,

I have considered the possibility that Rossi is wrong.

Regardless of Rossi's past, which is gossip, the facts speak for themselves. I base my belief on the following:

1. The device is very simple and converts water to steam. The flow of water is measured and steam results. Even if the steam is wet, i.e. contains droplets of water, the device is making more energy than is being applied, which is also measured. The calculations are too simple to fake.
2. The device has been examined by independent observers who are trained in science. They have no reason to lie and a huge reason to tell the truth.
3. The company in Greece has a working device that they are upgrading to a commercial product. The device is described in ways that are consistent with how I expect the generator would work.
4. The claims are consistent with past work in the cold fusion field.
5. If this is a fraud, Rossi has nothing to gain because he gets nothing if the claims are not real, which would soon be discovered if he is lying. In fact, he has a huge risk if the claims are incorrect for any reason.

If I were Rossi, I would be frustrated and angry about such treatment as well.

Ed

Subj:Re: CMNS: Rossi Ecat
Date:6/29/2011 2:36:13 PM
From:jcfisher
To:cmns@googlegroups.com

Ed,

The demonstration viewed by Krivit had input power claimed to be 3.4 amperes at 220 volts, amounting to 0.748 kilowatt. That is enough to boil water at a rate consistent with what was shown (fog emitted from the far end of the output tubing).

Krivit noted that input power had been applied for an unknown period of time prior to the demonstration. Because the E-Cat has sufficient thermal capacity to store several kilowatt-hours of thermal energy, it is likely that previously stored energy was being withdrawn during the demonstration. If this were so the output power (equal to input power plus output power from previously stored energy) could have been on order of a few kilowatts.

Although this suggests that the E-Cat is merely an energy-storage device that can be charged before and during a demonstration and discharged during the demonstration, it seems possible to me that Rossi believes that he is generating new energy that must be nuclear in origin. The matter could be easily settled by measuring both start-up energy and output energy, as I have suggested to him. But he has declined to do so, stating that it was not necessary. As yet no data have been provided to show that E-Cat output energy exceeds input energy from a cold start.

John

Subj:Re: CMNS: Rossi Ecat
Date:6/29/2011 3:04:35 PM
From:storms2
To:cmns@googlegroups.com

Yes John, some water could be boiled. However, the rest of the water would run out and the cold steam would quickly condense back to water in the hose. This did not happen.

Yes, the device could store energy and Rossi could arrange the timing so that some steam would be produced. In which case, you have to believe Rossi is doing this during every demonstration, not just for Krivit. This means Celani was also fooled by the same ruse when he saw the device work for an extended period. And, yes, the measurement could be done better.

So, if Rossi is fooling everyone, including even skeptical scientists in Italy and Greece, what does he plan to gain? If the device is shown by more careful measurements to produce nothing interesting, don't you think some people are going to be very upset? And what about the company in Greece that claims to be using one of the devices to gain control over the heat output. Do you think they are in on the scam? Do you think the Greek government is being fooled or is also in on the scam?

The skeptics who feel left out are not the only parties who have a stake in this. The whole world is watching. Do you really think a scam could be done on such a large scale involving a respected university, investors, and governments? If you accuse Rossi of a scam, you are also accusing these people of being either dishonest or incompetent. Do you really want to go there?

Ed

$7000 \text{ g/h} * 73^\circ * 4.18 = 593 \text{ watts}$ to heat water to boiling
 $7000 \text{ g/h} * 2200 \text{ J/g} = 4278 \text{ watts}$ to convert all water to steam.

Total power = 4871 watts

applied power = $3.4 * 220 = 748 \text{ watts}$

On Jul 9, 2011, at 5:07 AM, William Collis wrote:

Hello Mitch

Constructive criticism, whether based on scepticism or not, is a fundamental part of the scientific process. None of us are experts in every field. But some of us are sufficiently expert to be able to make constructive comments on others' work. It is frequently the case, that such comments or criticism can be rebutted. In which case we all learn something and everybody has more confidence in the science.

In the case that the constructive criticism is correct, there is the possibility to make improvements or clarifications. Again, everyone benefits.

I think your commentary on calorimetry is very constructive and useful to the field. You have noticed and brought to the attention of this forum (where others

have not), some highly pertinent observations. You have very tactfully not pressed home the corresponding conclusions. Is this an excess of modesty or of politeness? (chuckle).

Let's be polite, honest, tactful and even generous. But nobody should pressurize us into silence when we have legitimate points which need clarifying. Keep up the good work!

Scientific research is a frontier, where not everything is known with absolute precision. Critics help us all to refine that precision by pointing out anomalies. Critics have a useful, even fundamental role to play - so long as neither side descends to personal attacks.

There is nothing worse than a scientific field full of "True Believers" where criticism is not tolerated and the current dogma can never be attacked. Of course critics often exaggerate! I do this and I have been quite rightly criticized in turn for it!! But this is all part of the legitimate process. By taking a more extreme position than mere logic demands, we isolate and simplify the issues for discussion.

In answer to Ed, I don't think that we, as good scientists, should have faith in anything at all, but of course being human we do!! But what we should be able to do, is back up any opinion with evidence. In the case of contradictory positions, where there is evidence on both sides, our personal experiences may influence which side we tend to support. It doesn't matter, so long as there is constructive debate. As the French say, vive la difference!

Enough philosophy. I'd like to leave with a question stimulated by Mitch's remarks. Can somebody please explain, perhaps someone who has confidence in Rossi's calorimetry, how it is possible for steam to exit at a stable temperature - a little over boiling point, when even 1% variations in flow rate or anomalous power production ought to cause corresponding and violent changes in steam temperature?

From: Edmund Storms <storms
To: cmns@googlegroups.com
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2011 12:07 PM
Subject: Re: R: Re: R: Re: CMNS: Be sure

To be clear, I use the word belief in contrast to the word faith. I agree, faith is reserved for things like $E=MC^2$ or the laws of thermodynamics. We all have beliefs, which is a general word having unambiguous meaning, except to Abd. People lose sight of belief being the basis for most opinions. Therefore, when we

are discussing Rossi, we are comparing beliefs. Of course, some beliefs are closer to reality than others. Eventually, the belief will change to certainty.

The temperature of steam cannot go lower than 100 depending on pressure. If the steam is in equilibrium with liquid water, i.e. condensing on the inside of the tube, it will always have a constant temperature. This is the nature of steam or any gas in equilibrium with another phase. Look up the Phase Rule.

I suspect part of the confusion is that the e-Cat was not making any excess energy when it was demonstrated to Krivit, but was operating properly for Levi. As my father used to say, when confronted by a choice, choose the one having the highest probability of being right. In this case, I chose Rossi because available information gives him a higher probability. Other people make a different choice. That is why some people win at horses and some lose. Like a horse race, the winner will be known eventually.

Ed

On Jul 9, 2011, at 6:21 PM, Steven Krivit <

Mitch,

I think this is an important dialogue. Can you please help me confirm the writers?

Thanks,

Steven

At 05:38 PM 7/9/2011, you wrote:

You credited the authors correctly.

The debate of that email centers around a confusion of how the reactor works. Ed clearly thinks the core is submersed in water....The diagram I sent you will clear this up when you publish it.

Mitch

From: Steven Krivit
To: Mitch Randall <

Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2011 6:50 PM
Subject: Re: Storms and Collis Dialouge

This image, right?

Date: Sat, 9 Jul 2011 18:34:18 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Mitch Randall"
Subject: Re: Storms and Collis Dialouge
To: "Steven Krivit" <

Yes, that image. ...because obviously Ed thinks that since Levi didn't see water coming out, then no water came out. But he doesn't have a mental picture of the auxiliary port and the fact that it is different than the output hose.

Mitch Randall

Subj:Re: CMNS: control of Rossi device
Date:8/2/2011 8:24:51 AM
From:storms2
To:cmns@googlegroups.com

Fortunately Abd, it does not matter if you think Rossi is a fraud or I think he is not. If Rossi is real, he will show his e-Cat to potential investors and buyers and they will know without a doubt whether the claim is real or not. These are the only people who matter. If Rossi is a fraud, this will quickly become obvious without any effort on your part.

Nevertheless, the debate, speculation, and analysis has been useful because it has revealed information that would otherwise have been hidden and it has been entertaining. Unfortunately, it is a waste of time in the long run.

As for the future, to the extent that the e-Cat really works as claimed and gains market penetration, the entire field of cold fusion will grow rapidly and provide jobs for those of us who have slaved in the dark for so long. If the e-Cat only works well enough to start the process of energy conversion by the world, the rest of us will find ways to make it better. On the other hand, if as you fear the claim is totally wrong, the skeptics will rejoice. Mankind can again look down the abyss created by conventional energy sources and the field will limp along using money supplied by people who have an open mind and social responsibility.

Personally, I hope the e-Cat works as claimed and I will do everything I can to promote the idea and work to make it better. Kicking Rossi at this stage just

because the claim is not fully proven seems counter productive to everyone. We desperately need the Rossi claim to be real. Rossi is taking a huge risk and has many problems of greater importance than the doubts of the egocentric skeptics. He needs all the support we can give him as long as there is no proof that the claim is false. At this stage, the source of such proof has to be provided by people who have access to the e-Cat. These people say the claim is real. Our choice is to believe them or not.

Ed

From: Brian Josephson <
To: CMNS <cmns@googlegroups.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 5:02 AM
Subject: CMNS: sinister forces

Someone set up a White House petition "investigate the usefulness of the Energy Catalizer, a creation of the Italian inventor Andrea Rossi.", at <http://wh.gov/j3P>, and posted this information as a comment in the E-cat FAQ comment section. Someone else flagged it as spam (I've designated it 'not spam' to restore it). Sinister, what?

Brian

On Nov 17, 2011, at 9:33 AM, Mitch Randall wrote: Brian,

That is interesting.

I also think it is interesting that you attempted to restore it as non-spam.

- 1) If the "Energy Catalizer" works, there is absolutely no need for a White House petition. Agreed?
- 2) If you (read: our community) is shown to support something that is eventually shown to be a fraud, you (read: we all) suffer a loss of credibility.

So as I see it, an individual in our community evangelizing the as-yet-unconfirmed "Energy Catalizer" is putting the credibility of the entire community at risk without any benefit.

Can you explain your reasoning?

Best regards,

Mitch Randall

Subj:Re: CMNS: sinister forces
Date:11/17/2011 10:47:28 AM
From:storms2
To:cmns@googlegroups.com

MITCH, I suggest you add a third possibility.

3. If you (read: our community) is shown NOT to support something that is eventually shown to be REAL, you (read: we all) suffer a loss of credibility.

From my study of the Rossi claims, the possibility of this being fraud is zero. The possibility of it being real is 100%. The possibility of it being a successful product at this stage is 25%. Therefore, failure of the community to support Rossi would be contrary to everything the community has been trying to accomplish and contrary to the future of the world with respect to finding a clean energy. The stakes are too high to play games.

Ed