

### 1.5.1\* G. Taubes reports Situation around the Discovery

A typical example of biased point of view is the book written by G. Taubes, "*Bad Science—The Short Life and Weird Times of Cold Fusion.*" [Taubes 1993]. In this book written by a number of telephone interviews with many researchers, their embarrassment is vividly depicted but with different points of view than the author ignorant of real research processes. We have to remember a following fact that individual facts told by researchers revealed by Taubes are related with human drama of researchers but are different from truth concealed behind the facts. The facts are screened by subjective frame of reference and desire of the speakers. Ignorance about this common fact discriminating facts and the truth has induced large confusion in history of CFP and spoiled sound development of its science.

A few examples that tell us the embarrassment of CF researchers confronted with mysterious facts;

*"Harold Furth of Princeton had called Linford before the hearings to learn exactly what Pons had said about his light water controls in his Los Alamos seminar. Linford, who had a videotape of the seminar, found the point at which Pons answered the question about light water – that he had seen heat and then discontinued the experiment – and played it for Furth over the telephone. In Washington, Furth had apparently confronted Pons with what he had said in Los Alamos, suggesting it was proof cold fusion did not exist."* [Taubes 1993 (p. 261)]

*"Martin then talked with Bard directly and told him what he'd told Koval. Bard was unmoved and argued that the way the tritium appeared was what made him so skeptical: 'The fact that these cells run for long periods of times and all of a sudden there's a sudden rise and then nothing again. It's unusual for a system to operate that way.'"* [Taubes 1993 (pp. 371- 372)]

We may add another example of the embarrassment expressed by the pioneers in a sentence from the paper by Fleischmann et al.;

*"The most surprising feature of our results however, is that reactions (v) and (vi) are only a small part of the overall reaction scheme and that the bulk of the energy release is due to an hitherto unknown nuclear process or processes (presumably again due to deuterons)."*[Fleischmann 1989]

Then, we cite a few sentences G. Taubes used in his book to denunciate the CF researchers that tell us clearly Taubes was completely trapped in the *d-d* fusion scheme

to approach the CFP;

*“After Bockris spoke, Stephen Feldberg, a respected electrochemist at Brookhaven, remarked to him that neutrons ought to appear with the tritium, - - -.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 275)]*

*“Harold Furth of Princeton had called Linford before the hearings to learn exactly what Pons had said about his light water controls in his Los Alamos seminar.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 261)]*

*“Morrey and his colleagues later reported that the amount of helium in the active rod was compatible with background and was still a factor of thirty-six too low even to explain the infinitesimal heat.” {Taubes 1993 (p. 377)}*

Finally, we cite his several sentences showing clearly that he was malicious against CF researchers and the CFP itself.

*“After Bockris spoke, Stephen Feldberg, a respected electrochemist at Brookhaven, remarked to him that neutrons ought to appear with the tritium, and as Bockris hadn't mentioned any such radiation, he suggested that Bockris worry about the health of his researchers. Bockris replied that that was an interesting point, then commented enigmatically that maybe someone had "spiked" his cold fusion cells.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 271)]*

*“Nonetheless, the absence of neutrons strongly implied, if one had any faith in nuclear physics, that the tritium was not formed in the cell at all. Rather it must have come together, so to speak, elsewhere and entered the cell in a more circuitous manner.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 284)]*

*“Now Wolf discovered that the activity of a bottle of tritiated water was, within the experimental error, identical to the original value. For Wolf, this suspicious coincidence suggested why someone might want to invoke a retroactive revision of the original measurement.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 412)]*

*“So it was that the demise of the cold fusion effort at the University of Utah did nothing to hasten the asymptotic decline of cold fusion. The research simply continued elsewhere.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 426)]*

And Taubes' conclusion finally;

*“Within six months of the announcement of cold fusion, its public life had deteriorated into a dismaying struggle against reality in which the believers explained the insipid state of their science with all manner of causes, none of which was as simple as the reality itself. Cold fusion—as defined by Stanley Pons and Martin Fleischmann, or*

*Steve Jones, or as modified by John Bockris or Edmund Storms and Carol Talcott, or Bob Huggins-Stanford, or whomever—did not exist. It never had. There was at least as much empirical evidence, if not more, to support the existence of any number of pseudoscientific phenomena, from flying saucers to astrology.” [Taubes 1993 (p. 425)]*

This conclusion shows clearly his ignorance of science and scientific researches. After 25 years, his death sentence to the CFP sounds hollow. It is permissible if a journalist is ignorant of science but it is not possible to look over his sin that his writings with vulgar characteristics illustrated above influenced others including some scientists.