

gists reach a consensus on it. In any case, Hancock should have at least mentioned his alleged evidence.



Ian Bryce on Rossi's E-Cat Simulation (From May/June 2019)

In 2019, you published the article “Rossi’s E-Cat: Exposé of a Claimed Cold Fusion Device,” by Ian Bryce, about an Italian-born inventor named Andrea Rossi. Bryce described how he discovered how Andrea Rossi faked his results: “On January 19, 2012, the likely answer came to me in my sleep.” Bryce speculated that Rossi had been feeding hidden power through a ground wire. I have recently learned that Rossi is active again and, for the first time, I have seen Bryce’s article.

Bryce also wrote about the investigation I had previously reported: “Although suspicious of Rossi and publishing many speculations, [Krivit] was never able to find any trick in the demonstrations. I informed him of my findings and expected him to run an article, but he refused. Sour grapes, perhaps?”

In fact, Bryce was aware of Rossi’s water/steam trick that I and my readers exposed six months earlier. Nevertheless, we had also mentioned Bryce’s theory in a February 13, 2012, article.¹ Bryce’s theory, however, was predicated on his assertion that Rossi’s device did produce a massive outflow of steam. Nobody has ever witnessed this. Bryce’s

theory assumes that scientifically valid measurements of heat or steam output in Rossi’s experiment existed. As I and other people explained to Bryce on February 15, 2012, they didn’t.² By that time, not one of Rossi’s experiments had been instrumented properly to measure heat or steam production.

I went there and filmed it. I published the video on June 20, 2011.³ In fact, several months before SI published the Bryce article, SI published an article by Sadri Hassani, who specifically cited my investigation and my video recording in which I discovered Rossi’s trick: sending unvaporized water down a hole in the wall.

The first scientists who saw my video of the tiny puffs of steam coming out of the black hose burst out laughing. Rossi’s device clearly was not producing thousands of watts of steam. On July 30, 2011, I published a 200-page report.⁴ It contained three dozen detailed technical analyses, calculations, and diagrams by experts worldwide, including scientists, mechanical engineers, steam engineers, inventors, physicists, and even a NASA rocket scientist. The power output rate from the steam was approximately equal to the power input rate from the wall plug.

References

1. <https://news.newenergytimes.net/2012/02/13/rossis-australian-investment-opportunity-falls-through/>
2. <https://web.archive.org/web/20120217094208/http://blog.newenergytimes.com/2012/02/13/rossis-australian-investment-opportunity-falls-through/>
3. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-8QdVWY98E>
4. <http://newenergytimes.com/v2/news/2011/37/NET370.shtml>

Steven B. Krivit
San Rafael, California

Ian Bryce responds:

First, I acknowledge that Steven Krivit wrote correctly around 2011 that a deficiency in Rossi’s demonstrations was that the water/steam

ratio was not properly measured.

But by then, I had rejected this theory as not fitting the observations.

At the March 29 demonstration, Essén and Kullander recorded a detailed temperature history of the start-up and running process. I reverse engineered their data and hence estimated power flows. This was described in detail in my reference Bryce 2019c, earth wire hypothesis for each E-cat test. It is still available online. The relevant figure is reproduced here.

This reveals a thermal power output during start-up of approximately 800 watts. During steady state, the power is often around 800 W, assuming only 10 percent is steam. Meanwhile, the electrical power input was 345 W.

Thus, Krivit’s steam/water hypothesis does not fit the facts, while the earth wire does.

I also outlined further predictions of the earth wire hypothesis, later confirmed, including:

Rossi’s constant attendance at the blue box—ready to turn off the secret supply;

The thermal power dropping briefly to zero—as if an observer approached the power measurement;

The excess power usually matching the capacity of the earth wire used—3,000 watts;

And Rossi’s reactions—to refuse Smith’s offer of \$1M to allow an independent observer, and to call us “Aussie roadkill”—hardly from a potential Nobel laureate!

Note also that Krivit’s stream/water theory was only one hypoth-

esis, buried among dozens in his 200-page report, while I published what I maintain is the only plausible explanation in a one-page report.

Later developments: I recently visited skeptical organizations in Europe to discuss Rossi and E-cat and other matters. These included two groups at CICAP in Italy, where Rossi performed the tests, and two at VoF in Sweden, where he received the strongest support from scientists.

As in all science, progress is made not by “proofs” but by surviving attempts to disprove, and our work has survived intact.

Rossi has used a long list of devices to demonstrate “cold fusion.” His latest is a light source that he claims uses Zero Point Energy.

Has Rossi profited? Recall that a group of investors called Industrial Heat contracted \$89 million for a demonstration of a one megawatt plant in 2015. But Rossi would not allow their engineers to attend the test! Industrial Heat declined to pay, and Rossi sued them. They reportedly settled out of court. I am told that Rossi used his settlement to buy properties, and he now lives on the returns.

We can conclude that our exposé has been well covered in the skeptical literature, in Wikipedia, and on many blogs. Due diligence by any new investor will quickly reveal this history. Even ardent followers are having second thoughts. I understand that Rossi’s funding has dried up, and he is now considered irrelevant.

