
From: Jnewburn1@aol.com
Date: Sun, 14 Mar 2010 18:27:35 EDT
Subject: NET - Issue 34
To: michael.mckubre@sri.com
CC: steven@newenergytimes.com

Dear Dr. McKubre,

As a follow-up to Mr. Krivit's e-mail to you on March 12, we would like to confirm that the New Energy Institute board does not generally get involved in specific journalism or editorial matters with New Energy Times.

The exception to this, however, is in the unlikely event that New Energy Times or Krivit fails to adhere to standard journalistic practices or the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics.

The purpose of our "hands-off" philosophy is to provide maximum journalistic independence and journalistic freedom for New Energy Times.

The board is aware that Krivit has invited you to submit a rebuttal of unlimited length with an unlimited quantity of images with any concerns you may have with regard to Issue 34. In addition, you have the option to submit additional comment along the standard letters policy.

If, for any reason, you find that New Energy Times/Krivit does not provide you with a fair opportunity for rebuttal, I encourage you to contact me promptly, in writing, as this would then be an issue that I would present to the full board for consideration.

Best regards,

Jim Newburn
443-794-7813
410-997-3815

March 21, 2009
San Francisco

American Chemical Society "Cold Fusion" Press Conference

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3F6_NoQUIEU

Video clip in: 36:53

KRIVIT: Dr. McKubre, When I was discussing the values, the changed values for SRI experiment M4 with Pam Boss, she told me that Peter Hagelstein explained that he or his colleagues explained this correction. Where can I find some documentation about both the exact error as well as the math for the correction?

MCKUBRE: Well I didn't ever remember Peter explaining that. In the preliminary report we issued to the Electric Power Research Institute which was a report private to [EPRI] that now is public contained I think a value of the mass-balance for helium-4 and heat which was, I think it was, from memory, and this is sixteen years ago, maybe, now, 85 +/- 10 percent. When we recalibrated the volumes that were involved in determining that mass balance the value became a more correct value, it was 105 +/- 10 percent. Now those two values are experimentally the same. I would prefer the lower value since you can't get more product than your reaction produces. But the correction was observed, reported to the Electric Power Research Institute which were the sponsors of that work. I also made a comment about it in the conference at Lerici in the year 2000 at ICCF-8 during my presentation. So the published value, the first published value is in the conference proceedings and the first published value contains the correct value of that mass balance, 105 +/- 10 percent. Is that the information you were looking for?

Video clip out: 38:53

From: Steve Krivit
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 8:42 PM
To: Schimmoller, Brian
Subject: Press Inquiry Re: TR-107843

Hi Brian,

Can you please tell me if EPRI has on record any corrections or errata for either of these reports and if so, how I might obtain such?

Development of Energy Production Systems from Heat Produced in Deuterated Metals,
Volume 1, TR-107843-V1, June 1998
Development of Energy Production Systems from Heat Produced in Deuterated Metals,
Volume 2, TR-107843-V2, November, 1999

Thanks,

Steve

Steven B. Krivit
Editor, New Energy Times

Subject: RE: Press Inquiry Re: TR-107843
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 13:44:24 -0400
From: "Schimmoller, Brian" <bschimmoller@epri.com>
To: "Steve Krivit" <>

Steve,

After checking, there is no record in our system of any corrections or errata published for those reports, and the retired project manager tells us that he's not aware of any corrections or errata either.

If you've discovered something that raises some questions, we'd be very interested in hearing about it.

Brian

Krivit spoke with Schimmoller on a phone call later that day. Schimmoller said that he had spoken with Albert Machiels, one of the project managers who's name was listed on the EPRI report. Schimmoller said that Machiels had spoken with Tom Passell, the other project manager who's name was listed on the EPRI report. Neither of them knew of any erratum.

Subj:Re: New Energy Times special report

Date:12/10/2011

From:michael.mckubre@sri.com

To:cmns@googlegroups.com

I doubt that any on this list needs to be told this but neither I nor anyone else at SRI "fabricated" data associated with M4 (or anything else that I am aware of). We had occasion to reanalyze those data, found an error in the EPRI report (a private document at that point), and communicated that promptly to the only person who was aware or cared (in the mid-to-late '90's) - the EPRI Program Manager. Later published reports in the open literature are (I believe) correct, and I have had no reason to doubt or refine them in the past dozen years.

People sometimes question the value a "traditional" scientific education but this case highlights one of its clear benefits. Poor Steve simply does not know what he does not know. His sustained semantic confusion about fusion (despite Ed's many corrections) and failure to understand the issues surrounding helium mass balance, have spoiled his view, to which he is entitled, but for which he is not credentialed. I don't want to pick a fight with Steve ("Never pick a fight with someone who buys his ink by the barrel" and share fully the view stated by Lew: "We all need to end the 'war' and behave more like scientists instead of polemicists". I also don't want to irritate or demean the many "civilian scientists" on this list who have contributed much, in many cases brilliantly. But to reinforce the point made by Dennis one must learn, primarily, from the primary sources. Interpretation of data without access to the lab notebooks and detailed knowledge of the procedures actually employed, is worse than fruitless, as this case demonstrates.

-Mike