

Maddox, J., *Farewell (not fond) to cold fusion*. Nature (London), 1990. **344**(6265): p. 365.

This paper is available from:

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v344/n6265/pdf/344365a0.pdf>

A copy is also available here:

<http://newenergytimes.com/v2/inthenews/1990/Nature-Farewell.shtml>

Here are some selected quotes from the paper:

A year after the famous Utah press conference, cold fusion is a diminishing focus for professional belief. The authors of last year's fuss now have a responsibility to make the details of their work public. . . .

[A]s the article on page 375 makes plain, the cold fusion fuss is discreditable to the scientific community as a whole. The reasons are plain. First, it has licensed magic in the particular sense that reports of remarkable phenomena - it could next be unicorns again - claim equal credence even when they fly in the face of expectation. Second, by extension, it has shown up the frailty of the collective confidence in theoretical science; why else should so many serious people have been bamboozled for so long? Third, it has revealed the malign influence of extraneous considerations in modern science; Pons and Fleischmann would surely have published a full account of their work long before this if they had been concerned with the general understanding. . . .

. . . [T]he time has come when Pons and Fleischmann should say openly, and in as much detail as their interlocutors in Utah this week require, exactly what they had done a year ago, what they have been doing since and what reason they have in which others can have confidence for believing that cold fusion is still to be taken seriously. The suggestion at the press conference a year ago was that a means of extracting energy from deuterium had been found. Persisting believers restrict themselves to more modest claims for phenomena which are, above all, not regularly reproducible. What has irretrievably foundered is the notion that cold fusion has great economic potential. The time has come to acknowledge that. It would be a cruel deception of a largely amused public not to admit that simple truth. And it would be a serious perversion of the process of science to obfuscate the failures of the past year by reference to the difficulties of measurement in an admittedly difficult field.