

**Subject:**Re: FuseNet Association Scientific Integrity Issues

**Date:**Mon, 14 Jan 2019 13:30:01 +0000

**From:**Phys Fusetnet <phys\_fusetnet@tue.nl>

**To:**Steven B. Krivit <>

**CC:**FuseNet Executive Office <feo@fusetnet.eu>, piero.martin@unipd.it  
<piero.martin@unipd.it>, Jan Mlynar <mlynar@ipp.cas.cz>, roddy.vann@york.ac.uk  
<roddy.vann@york.ac.uk>, ulrich.stroth@ipp.mpg.de <ulrich.stroth@ipp.mpg.de>,  
carlos.hidalgo@ciemat.es <carlos.hidalgo@ciemat.es>, peter.beyer@univ-amu.fr  
<peter.beyer@univ-amu.fr>, benova\_phys@deo.uni-sofia.bg <benova\_phys@deo.uni-  
sofia.bg>, robert.geisser@areva.com <robert.geisser@areva.com>,  
jean.marinescu@europarl.europa.eu <jean.marinescu@europarl.europa.eu>

Dear Mr. Krivit,

Thanks again for your letter.

We support your effort in getting facts and statements right, and this might be a hard task, as media copy each other's statements. However, do you consider it really of added value to copy in all the board members and all the university members, suggesting that FuseNet intentionally spreads falsehoods, after our recent communication? I think we can cooperate in a more positive way.

Now, let us move to the contents of your letter.

The full corrected statement on <https://www.fusetnet.eu/node/39> read:

*The fusion reactor itself has been designed to produce 500 MW of thermal output power for 50 MW of net input power, or ten times the amount of power put in. Scientifically, this will be the proof of principle that more power can get out of the fusion process than is used to initiate it. Note that no net electricity is produced yet, since the thermal power still has to be converted to electricity and the input power disregards the efficiency of the heating systems.*

With this added explanation, the reader is offered the nuance you are fighting for, but it may be improved. You make a suggestion that mentions "injected thermal power" which is technically not correct. So, perhaps an even better formulation of the first sentence may be:

*The fusion reactor itself has been designed to produce 500 MW of thermal output power for 50 MW of net injected power, a plasma power amplification factor of ten ( $Q=10$ ).*

Then we should leave the additional nuancing notes – explaining that no electricity is produced and the input power disregards the efficiency of heating systems – in place such that the public reader better understands the meaning of the amplification.

This should be an improved, correct, transparent way to state what is aimed for at ITER. We hope you are satisfied.

We encourage you to keep up the good work, with a positive tone.

Kind regards,

Roger Jaspers - FuseNet Chair  
Guido Lange - FuseNet Executive Office

On 6 Jan 2019, at 02:14, Steven B. Krivit wrote:

Dear FuseNet Board of Governors,

I direct your attention to the enclosed letter regarding continued false and misleading claims by your organization.

Best regards,

--

Steven B. Krivit

Publisher and Senior Editor, *New Energy Times*

369-B Third Street | Suite 556 | San Rafael, California | USA 94901

[www.stevenbkrivit.com](http://www.stevenbkrivit.com)

[www.newenergytimes.com](http://www.newenergytimes.com)

Author of *Hacking the Atom: Explorations in Nuclear Research, Vol. 1*

Author of *Fusion Fiasco: Explorations in Nuclear Research, Vol. 2*

Author of *Lost History: Explorations in Nuclear Research, Vol. 3*

Editor-in-Chief Wiley & Sons *Nuclear Energy Encyclopedia: Science, Technology, and Applications*

Co-editor of *Low-Energy Nuclear Reactions and New Energy: Technologies Sourcebook Volume 2 (ACS Symposium Series)*

Co-editor of *Low-Energy Nuclear Reactions Sourcebook Volume 1 (ACS Symposium Series)*

LENR Contributor to the Elsevier *Reference Module in Chemistry, Molecular Sciences and Chemical Engineering*

LENR Contributor to the Elsevier *Encyclopedia of Electrochemical Power Sources*

<20190105-Krivit-to-FuseNet-Board.pdf>