

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : Good news or nut case?

Re: Good news or nut case?

Author: : pcray1231

Date: : 2013/5/14 9:48:17

URL:

While the experiments on cold fusion are carried out by the same hacks, at least it has some feasible physics explanation, unlike perpetual motion machines and zero-point energy devices. I mean, it's not "supported" by current physics, in that a physicist wouldn't PREDICT it's possible. But it's not specifically outlawed either (whereas perpetual motion/unity and harnessing zp energy are impossible by the known laws of physics).

We know fusion would produce energy. The problem is that you have to have a way to make it fuse, typically lots of heat and pressure, like in the sun, i.e. "hot fusion". While none is currently known, it is somewhat feasible that the right catalyst, combined with the right set of elements, and the right type of energy input, could create fusion which produces more energy than it uses.

That said "hot fission" is a mature industry, and has the same or better energy density. If we were smart about things, it too could solve virtually all of our energy problems. We choose not to let it.

About the only advantage of "cold fusion", were it feasible, is the size of the device. If you could get it to work, it's possible you could put it in a fairly small package, small enough to power cars and airplanes, rather than just power plants and aircraft carriers.

So yeah, I'd like to see cold fusion. I do not believe it has been successfully done, or that anyone is all that close. The problem with this hack community is that they start with the conclusion, and want to "announce" results without going through proper scientific channels of peer-review and reproducibility. Most of the time they are either hoaxes, or misunderstandings by well meaning but, frankly, bad researchers.