Lessons from cold fusion archives and from history

The field is somewhat chaotic. Results are inconsistent and seem contradictory. There is no widely-accepted theoretical explanation. History shows that this kind of chaos is healthy in emergent science. In fields such as plasma fusion there is broad agreement and a solid theoretical basis, but not much progress. We should embrace chaos and celebrate intellectual ferment.

Despite the confusion, the literature does prove the effect is real, and it teaches how to replicate.

The literature includes many failed experiments. There are two kinds: amateur mistakes and noble failures. At Kamiokande they made amateur mistakes such as holding the palladium in their bare hands. To avoid such mistakes you should read textbooks, read the papers at LENR-CANR, and consult with an electrochemist. A noble failure would be Srinivasan spending six months at SRI trying to replicate the bulk nickel-hydrogen excess heat reported by Mills and replicated at BARC. Srinivasan concluded that he had no significant heat, and that the BARC results were in error. Success will only come thanks to failures such as this.

Research has often been dogged by unfounded assumptions which are so widely held no one notices them. An example from the history of genetics is presented. We can only hope that cold fusion is not being delayed by such assumptions.