

LENR - infinite and clean energy comes sooner than expected

Preliminary remark: The interview shown <https://quer-denken.tv/lenr-die-unendliche-und-saubere-energie-kommt-frueher-als-gedacht/>

was the conclusion of a series of essays on Querdenken TV:

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es/>

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es-teil-2/>

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es-teil-3/>

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es-teil-4/>

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es-teil-5/>

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es-teil-6/>

<https://quer-denken.tv/die-zukunft-hat-schon-begonnen-und-niemand-merkt-es-teil-7/>

The interview was largely improvised, questions and answers were not given. The response (55,000 visits after 18 days) came as a surprise to us and we are happy that the topic LENR is getting further into the public consciousness.

Here is the text of the interview:

An interview with Mr. Willi Meinders with Sabine Weise-Vogt at Querdenken TV in Leipzig.

Sabine Weise-Vogt: It might be undisputed that the fate of mankind, without actually rethinking the question of energy production, is rather uncertain in the long run.

That there are technologies that make a genuine alternative to fossil energy production methods possible seems rather unthinkable and also unlikely at the moment.

Dear viewers, the following conversation is exactly about such a method, called LENR and in my studio today is Willi Meinders, whom I warmly welcome, because I am very happy that he came today and will answer us the questions around LENR.

This is a very complex subject.

And when I started "working" into this topic, because it is really very complex, I asked myself: How does someone who is not normally professionally connected with this technology come to deal with the topic as intensively as you Mr. Meinders?

Willi Meinders: First of all, I have been looking for a meaningful occupation, I say for "old age", so as not to let up mentally in any way. I hope that has not been the case to this day.

"Meaningful" also means, of course, that I have looked for a topic which I think will benefit people.

And I came across a newspaper article that was confusing for me.

For over 30 years I have been interested in nuclear fusion, which is the alternative to nuclear fission. So far, nuclear fusion has only worked on the sun and on the stars. On earth one has tried it, but it has never succeeded and it does not emerge that it could succeed.

And that's why I was quite surprised when I read in different media that the US Navy wants to produce diesel oil from water and CO₂ on board its ships, simply with the justification: All our ships run on diesel. Excluded were those who actually have nuclear power plants on board, e.g. aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines.

And there I missed the question in the article: "Yes, where does this energy come from?"

Because if you do that on land and there are such test facilities in Germany, then you need a lot of energy to produce diesel from water and CO₂.

Because I can hardly imagine photovoltaic plants or wind power plants on ships, it had to be a completely different technology.

It was apparently not possible to reduce the size of the nuclear fission plants to such an extent that they could have been used for these purposes on small ships. So it had to be something else!

And that's when I started researching, because it seemed to me to be a worthwhile topic. And there I found the website of

Dr. Reiner Seibt, which can be found on the Internet at <http://www.reiner-bautzen.de>.

He reported on a completely new technology for me, namely the low-energy nuclear reaction (LENR).

And then I learned that there is indeed a technology that, in addition to nuclear fission and fusion, is a third way of generating energy by nuclear means. And the amazing thing about it was that it can be done without any radiation at all. The measured emission corresponds exactly to the background radiation present anyway.

S. W-V.: So when I hear "nuclear", a red light flashes immediately. Nuclear means, therefore is immediately dangerous!

We are inside the old topic of what we actually want to get rid of. But you're just hinting that it's different there.

W. M.: That was exactly the right question, because that is what comes to mind.

You have to distinguish between nuclear fission, nuclear fusion and now LENR. It is nuclear fission, which we have known for many years as so-called nuclear power, and we know nuclear fusion, which is less successful on earth, except in the form of hydrogen bombs. Thank God they did not do that, because they are far too strong.

In both cases, the smallest amount of mass is lost, far less than 1%. And this lost mass, if you look at the Einstein formula: $E = m \times c^2$, then you know that this mass, when it becomes energy, is multiplied by the speed of light to the square.

I.e. from a quite small loss of mass a gigantic energy develops.

And this is the only way to explain why aircraft carriers or nuclear submarines travel around at high speed.

Aircraft carriers travel 55 km/h. They look like racing boats from the air and of course don't need to refuel.

And that has strengthened the question in me, why doesn't anyone ask where the energy comes from in this press report? Wenn´s is not nuclear fission.

S. W-V.: We are now back to the press report you mentioned earlier, where we are talking about the boats that are to be made from water and CO₂ diesel oil.

W.M.: Yes well, that's how my exciting journey into the world of low-energy nuclear fusion or nuclear reaction began. You can't say nuclear fusion because it hasn't been proven to be nuclear fusion. There is no neutron radiation.

And that's why they agreed on the term LENR.

S. W-V.: So LENR means Low Energy Nuclear Reaction.

W. M.: It's a nuclear reaction and that can be proven.

The nuclear reaction can be proved by the fact that the atomic composition of the individual atoms that were in the tiny reactor is different before the reaction process than after.

For example, nickel was used as a catalyst and after the reaction time, which can last several hours or even a year, it was not just nickel.

There were also traces of copper, for example. In any case, it is not the same anymore. One can thus reliably prove: A nuclear reaction has taken place, quite in contrast to the normal chemical processes that take place during normal combustion. It was a nuclear process.

That is what distinguishes this process from all the other combustion processes we know of.

S. W-V: A nuclear process that is not harmful!

W. M.: Only with the energy production with nuclear fission it is so that nuclear elements are used which are not stable, e.g. with uranium, which in the course of millennia or millions of years step by step changes into lead.

And this loss of mass that takes place over this long period of time, that is what we can recognize as nuclear radiation and cause this great damage.

When we talk about LENR, we are only talking about hydrogen.

Uranium has a relatively high proton number, far above iron, that is 26, uranium 82.

And hydrogen is the smallest atom of all. It is so small that it does not even have a neutron in its nucleus, but only a proton.

Neutrons serve to stabilize the atoms, i.e. the more neutrons there are, the more stable the nucleus becomes.

But because there is only one proton in the hydrogen atom, there is no need for neutrons.

But you can add it, you can add 1 neutron and then it becomes deuterium, if you add 2 neutrons it becomes tritium.

And these components are needed to make the classical nuclear fusion, which is not our topic.

Our subject is that we speak of nuclear reactions that only take place with the hydrogen atom.

S. W-V.: Does this mean that we are theoretically on the threshold of a new era of energy production with this technology?

W. M.: Yes in any case. It's just that the theory on this subject doesn't stand at all. That's a weak point in the whole story if you take the theorist's point of view alone. The ideal of basic research is to develop something on a whiteboard. You write the formulas and it is the beauty of mathematics that inspires you and also the beauty of what you have just invented.

This is the way it usually doesn't happen when something is invented.

I've heard from a scientist that when I invent something and find something, then I don't shout "Heureka", but I say "It's funny!"

"That's exactly what I didn't expect". And that's not in the research process of many last centuries or even millennia. It was actually always, when you had invented something new, a result of trial and error. And this has continued into the modern age, up to the steam engine or even up to the X-ray machine. It was marketed although one did not know how it really worked and with it also some mischief was caused.

I would say that the steam engine was the mother of the science of thermodynamics, not vice versa.

That is unfortunately what is always tried. Some scientists, thank God not all of them, try to give the impression that only that which was the result of basic research can be an invention.

This is desirable because then you have the whole pattern of what you can do with this invention in front of you. If you have understood it systematically, then everything else becomes easier.

But if by chance you invent something that is earth-shattering, then you can't follow it up just because science isn't there yet.

Science is trying to give the phenomenon LENR a role in which it itself should practically prove why it exists. But this cannot be the task of a phenomenon. A phenomenon can only prove that it exists.

Why, that is the task of science. That is where science has to start.

S. W-V: Exactly. But the phenomenon already exists anyway. So what else does it have to prove? It's about something else. So correct me if it's wrong. It's probably about being able to determine exactly HOW LENR works. Is that right?

W. M.: Yes, that would be highly desirable. And the research is already relatively far advanced. Two things are clear. Nuclear reactions take place in the filling in the small reactors. These only have a maximum pencil size. It is also clear that the reactions are most likely triggered by resonances. Either by electromagnetic oscillations or by the influence of lasers. But it always seems to be some kind of resonance.

And there, according to my understanding, the similarities in research already stop. And on that everything plunges.

That is, I call it the trade secrets of LENR research: How is my filling knitted, and what are the resonances I use?

Of course, the variants are so huge, the variation possibilities, that you can keep such a secret until the end of your life.

Because who finds by chance very specific mixtures in the filling of nickel or lithium hydride or anything else, which are suitable with very specific resonances to be moved to generate energy.

This is why it is unknown and why people like Andrea Rossi are lucky that they have invented this, of course through systematic research, but also by chance.

S. W-V.: Yes. So two things. One of them is the name Andrea Rossi. And what interests me before that, how exactly is the energy yield at LENR?

W. M. That's very far-reaching. First of all, you have to say that it's revolutionary if someone can generate more energy from a small reactor than was supplied to the reactor from a reactor filling.

You always have to distinguish something. As a rule, electrical energy is supplied and thermal energy is produced. And the two are not always comparable. But at the moment when I get much more energy out of a small device than was put into it, it's sensational.

And as a measure for this energy gain, the so-called COP - Coefficient of Productivity has become established, which says, if I have a COP 3 or COP 4, for example, then I have 3 or 4 times as much energy out of this small device than I have put in before. This is awesome!

Heat pumps can do that, too, but they don't produce energy, they extract energy from the environment to concentrate it elsewhere.

So these devices (LENR) really produce energy. And they do, quite safely, up to a COP that may be over 500. I.e. the energy yield is gigantic. The COP at Rossi, I'm not allowed to speak in his name, I suppose at 50 or 70 or even a little more.

I.e. the energy gain is gigantic and is also related to the fact that the small reactors sometimes run in self-sustain mode, i.e. they don't need this stimulation at all and even continue alone for a moment.

And what is so amazing is that the small reactors run stable and can be switched on and off since a few years.

That means it doesn't take long, you put a switch on and they start to produce energy. So far thermal energy, up to 500-600 C°.

S. W-V.: So it seems to be, or is that the circumstances how to get the energy, that there are relatively short ways there.

So if I now compare this with a nuclear reactor, both the switching on and the switching off is, apart from the fact that this is a highly dangerous thing, what is behind it, yes a very complex and dangerous story.

W. M.: Yes, LENR is completely simple.

If I were to describe it to an outsider, you could almost say it's like a glowing immersion heater without a plug but still glows.

So it is a small sleeve, like my little finger, and in the filling there are mostly mixtures of lithium hydride, i.e. lithium as carrier for hydrogen, which then excites the hydrogen and releases it to a nickel metal grid.

The result is a thermal energy that could also be described as heat.

In scientific engineering this term is not common, but it is heat up to 600-700 degrees. I've also heard that it can be increased up to 1000 degrees.

The actual limits for the reactors also result from this: What temperatures can this small reactor withstand?

And most metals end up somewhere at 1000 degrees, maybe there will be some high-performance ceramics.

I.e. you have to be on the safe side, because the reactors should last for years.

So it is basically a simple technique with a lot of theoretical knowledge in the background, but not yet a sufficient explanation.

You asked me some questions about this earlier. Of course, it also plays a role in this technology - is it really safe?

I mean the reactors are relatively small, if a spark plug burns out nothing terrible happens. And what actually happened to these reactors, in the past, was, or still is, the case when experiments are made to simply burn them out. And that means that the outer shell of the reactor did not withstand the heat and therefore they really look a bit like a burnt-out spark plug.

But other emissions, whether radiation or anything else, are not measured. I.e. at least not above the natural background radiation. That means it is actually completely harmless.

There is also no waste which would have to be deposited afterwards because they emit radiation, there is nothing there.

S. W-V.: So if you say that like that, then I think all the time, it's actually too good to be true. And then why isn't there a huge outcry from the people. A big problem what mankind has could be relatively simple and easy to get under control.

W. M.: Yes, there was this outcry in 1989. The electrochemists Fleischmann and Pons experimented with electrolysis and used palladium as cathode.

And palladium is a metal just like nickel has lattice structures. You have to know that metals don't have a smooth surface, but the further you go

into the atomic structure, the more the atoms in it don't even touch, but form a lattice. The atoms are all next to each other.

And one can imagine that hydrogen can penetrate into palladium or nickel. And an English researcher discovered 250 years ago that 500 times as much hydrogen can be poured into palladium. Just like that.

That was the birth of LENR. The reactions that resulted came much later.

And Fleischmann and Pons had then made experiments with palladium, I think it was in deuterium, a hydrogen atom which additionally had a neutron and the water became warm and not cold again.

I. e. they had set an unknown process in motion, where all were of the opinion: It is not nuclear fission, because there was no uranium in it, but only hydrogen: then it can only have been nuclear fusion.

And this judgement, which came not only from Fleischmann and Pons, but above all from the many science journalists who were there, was a huge mistake to call it that. Because it could not be nuclear fusion in the true sense of the word. Because nuclear fusion takes place at much higher temperatures and because emissions can be measured.

None of this was the case with this experiment, and yet the heat was there. And this premature triumphal howling led to the fact that one did not take it seriously and one also did not take it seriously because the experiment could not be replicated at first. Not only by Fleischmann and Pons, but also by the many people who had seen it and tried to recreate it. And they forgot for example to degas the palladium. You have to remove any oxygen before the hydrogen can penetrate. So many mistakes have been made.

Everybody talked about the failure of this experiment, but nobody talked about the fact that it worked again and again in the following years.

S. W-V.: But one did not know exactly why?

W. M.: No, not until today. The same MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) that said it was "junk science", the same MIT will celebrate the 30th anniversary of LENR research next week.

I.e. one has gone a long way. The experiments became more and more promising and better. And if I may now come to Mr. Rossi, he is one of the pioneers, not him alone, but I say the snow plough that walked in front of everyone and overcame all resistance.

S. W.-V.: So Andrea Rossi is Italian and in which function exactly is he on his way as a scientist?

W. M.: He is actually a chemist and he was self-employed for a long time. He started with attempts to convert waste into crude oil. He had a patent for that. And this process is practiced all over the world, sometimes with more or less success. Because it is energy-intensive again. Rossi's patent has unfortunately expired, and he has been badly played along with it in Italy. That still hangs in the balance today.

Very briefly, he was envied for producing oil synthetically and there are far too many people who are interested in oil on the one hand and many more people who are interested in waste disposal in Italy on the other. And he was the right person in the wrong place.

Then he met a scientist, I think at the University of Bologna, who was working in the field of LENR.

And there it was also about the penetration of hydrogen into palladium then still, later into nickel. And Rossi perfected this process. He no longer used metal strips, but a powder to make penetration even easier. He really knew how to develop a method to generate energy from it, with resonances, with electromagnetic resonances.

In the beginning he actually filled the hydrogen from a container, of course only tiny amounts. The heat source should not be hydrogen. And later the hydrogen was bound in lithium hydride and the lithium hydride was part of the filling, thus simplifying the process.

He then made progress in Italy, his experiments became known, became widely known. There have also been failures. And if such a failure came, the failure was cheered out loud, because one cheered something, which could not be in the opinion of the majority. His many successes were noted but this was not communicated. He was also not carried on hands as he should have been. For that would have been the appropriate reaction.

S. W.-V.: In what period had he made these attempts?

W. M.: I remember a date, that was 2009. His attempts became known and the DTRA (Defense Threat Reduction Agency) sent a scientist to Rossi, that was Toni Tether. He reported, only a few years ago he wrote an e-mail on request: "Yes, I was there and Rossi actually generated a lot of energy from a small device, I think it was 23 times what could have

come out of it over several hours and we slowly got tired and I have to say: This thing works!" And he left again.

And that was probably the starting signal that Rossi was moved to America. Because he was also relatively badly hit economically in Italy. . However, I can't speak for him, I only give back what I am told.

He did it with admirable staying power and strangely enough in Europe, especially in Sweden and Russia, he was more known than anywhere else.

S.W-V.: And if I may now add, if you would ask: Why was it not discovered in Germany?

W. M.: It is simply the case that German science has a completely different structure on this point. In 2005, when a scientist from a technical university came forward, and published in the university organ that he had found irrefutable evidence for the cold fusion in the USA, he was "removed". That was a few years before the American Anthony Tether went to Italy. How is that connected now?

It doesn't depend on the lack of talented scientists in Germany.

It depends, and this may sound a bit unusual, both in Russia and even more so in the USA, on the fact that the military is also a research institution. Nuclear power has also been discovered.

Nuclear power first of all for bombs, for submarines for aircraft carriers. Not to make mankind happy with it, but to become unbeatable with submarines and aircraft carriers. The idea that these things could also be put on land came much later. Maybe not a good one, but it was done. Maybe you remember Three Mile Island, that also flew into the air.

An incident that hardly anyone talks about anymore.

Well, I want to say that German science is much more structured and it doesn't have the possibilities for such creativity as the American military or NASA can.

I can't imagine any physics professor hearing from a researcher here or there that he did something. "Meyer: go there and have a look."

That's not gonna work. First of all there is the travel application and - do we have the money for it at all or is that not nonsense anyway? And in Germany everybody would say: Can't be, can't be nuclear fusion.

Everything is correct in itself, but as I said, important inventions are often not the result of basic research, and they are nevertheless important and earth-shattering!

S. W.-V.: But on the other hand, LENR probably has a patent?

W. M.: Yes, not just one, but several. NASA has patents, the American army even goes so far as to grant licenses for the patents. So you can buy a LENR patent from the American Army for use. They also want to market it.

And it's not about power generation, as far as I can remember, but the patent they market, it's about the transmutation properties of LENR.

I told you that transmutations occur in this nuclear process, i.e. the elements actually change, they have a different nuclear composition.

And this is being researched in Japan, as well as in the Ukraine and the USA, in order to be able to detoxify radioactive waste in later years. In other words, simply transmuting a radioactive element into a non-radioactive one. Then it would lose the properties of radioactivity. Simply lose.

S. W.-V.: That means there are so many possibilities through this technology. The more you tell, the more incomprehensible it becomes that we know virtually nothing about it, that there is hardly any reporting on it in Germany, or perhaps you have something to the contrary to report?

W. M.: No, it's actually from the beginning, I say suppressed sounds so conspiratorial, I say not taken seriously, as well as not perceived in a suitable way. And then you are quickly at hand to make such judgments. And I have tried again and again myself, and what we do here is a part of it, I have tried again and again to make it known. And I notice that one obstacle is certainly not stupidity from the people who should be interested, but people are just too busy with the things they have to do professionally, which cause them difficulties enough to deal with something completely new. We have been overrun by news in the past decades, you can't really keep up. And then a new technology is unwelcome simply because people say to themselves: "Well, not that, too, that's all going to mess things up again. That is one of the reasons.

The other reason, as I said, is that it doesn't fit into any scheme and it is now becoming apparent that science also recognises that we are dealing here with a completely new branch of science.

The branch of science has not only parts that come from physics, but also parts that come from chemistry and also from materials science and God knows where from. It is actually a conglomerate of different things. Basically, sociology even belongs to it at the end. What effects does this have? What effects does this have on the community? Because you have to introduce yourself: This is the first form of energy that is not based on opening up a source somewhere, you put a fence around it, you put up a guard and say: This is mine now, but you can only use it by paying me.

I.e. there was always some material value behind this energy that could be made more expensive, no matter which way. That is not possible with LENR! LENR consists only of intellectual property.

I.e. if the patents have all expired (and the inventors try to delay everything a little bit by means of supplementary patents), but mostly it is over after about 20 years, then this form of energy intellectual property is the property of mankind.

S. W.-V.: Does this mean that any person cannot earn infinitely much money with it?

W. M.: No, that is no longer possible. I mean now, when it's ready for the market, and this is becoming apparent, then hotspots for LENR will emerge all over the world. There will be coal-fired power plants that will be converted to Rossi's ECAT SK or others.

There are also other devices that we have not yet mentioned that generate electricity directly. Norront in Sweden, for example, which is also about to be launched on the market.

And others such as Brilliant Light Power in the USA are also companies that can produce electricity directly from LENR.

At the end of the day, one asks oneself: "What is the point of having power plants at all if you can actually have the heat or energy source at home?"

In the industrialized countries, it will only be the case that the heat generation will only go into the power plants when parts of the power plant have been installed.

Every European and American will say: "Why is this possible with them and not also with us?"

Why do they put the reactors in the power station?" There are also gigantic transmission losses. The pipelines run over land simply because they get hot and this heat means that energy is lost. That is why they run through the air, otherwise they could simply be buried. But that does not work, at least not so easily.

And then the question arises: why these transmission losses?

Why do we not take the reactors home?

Over a decade ago there was an article, probably from NASA, which was called: The nuclear power plant in your basement. He described exactly this situation.

S. W.-V.: Exactly, and that would be possible applications for LENR!

W. M.: Yes, the reactor of Andrea Rossi, the E-CAT SK has about 22 kW thermal energy and would be the ideal size to place it as heating in a cellar. It does not yet have the safety certificate for this. This means that it has to be certified somewhere and it only has that for the commercial, industrial sector.

I also wonder whether it would be right to produce it now. If he should ever go on strike, then the helpful neighbour with the pipe wrench will come in case of doubt. And that is not appropriate for such a device. This means that such a device must first run for a decade or less in industry, e.g. for industrial applications for the food industry that have to heat canned food or for the production of paper and the like. And even more importantly, when heating greenhouses in somewhat inhospitable regions.

These are the applications that will come next.

What will come next? There will be these smaller units and the engineering offices of Rossi and others (they are of course more than engineering offices) that are able to produce small series, but they are not in themselves the right institutions to go with large series to the market, I just say that as my opinion.

Why should I train experts to assemble devices like the Rossi reactor, which looks like a refrigerator from the outside, even a bit smaller.

There are pipes in it, cold water is pumped into it, then hot water comes out again. This is also known from heaters. The interior is different of course, but there is also a heat exchanger inside. So why should you train others?

That is already mastered. Even today, heaters are produced. They function technically differently and the manufacturing process is not comparable but similar and above all the installation process is absolutely comparable.

And that's why this kind of technology belongs in the hands of companies like Junkers, Siemens or Whirlpool etc.. That's where it belongs.

S. W.-V.: But as I said, that's exactly what hasn't happened yet. It's blocked, however. And there's the question, why exactly are there so many critical voices against this technology?

W.M.: I say it's not necessarily blocked. It remains unmentioned and in this respect the new term "gap press" applies. That it is simply not reported.

But my readers, who are potential customers write all the time to me, "tell me when this technology will finally come?" That's basically all very welcome.

If there are people who say that everything can't be like this, it's envy or competition. By competitors I mean those who produce something like that, but technically something different, something modified. Those who also sometimes have a bit of a dirty trench warfare. But above all it is those who are interested in the carbon industry.

If, for example, a big newspaper has an investor who also holds shares in a big oil company, they will be careful not to report about it.

I've already seen them report negatively on good attempts at LENR or patents even though the successes were obvious. Simply because they say to themselves that this is all nonsense.

So there are really people who are against it and they come from the carbon industry.

And I think the resistance that we still have to expect there is much greater than the unpleasant events that we are witnessing around the sugar or tobacco industry, where manufacturers and companies want to use their hands and claws to secure their profits in the future as well.

Health or not, that does not matter at all, yields are what counts.

And here I have a small hope that this will happen naturally on the one hand, but that the interests will split up more and more. I have observed that the major investors are systematically withdrawing from their carbon investments. Rockefeller was one of the few who announced this loudly.

Although they also say they are doing it because it is not good for the environment. After all, they have benefited from it for decades. I don't mean to imply any bad intentions, but it all sounds strange.

I think that just as they are on the one hand freeing themselves from their investments in the oil and coal sectors, so they will try to invest in the future project LENR.

And Black Rock, as a big investor, said that in an internal paper years ago that they were keeping a close eye on the LENR scene.

That is, I hope that greed will play against greed, that the new greedy will fight a battle with the old greedy. Only it will not create all investors to separate itself from their oil participation.

So people will continue to fight by all means to ensure that oil and coal continue to be burned. Coal is still the cheapest source of energy and it will exist for hundreds of years.

All I know is they've fought enough wars for oil in the past.

S. W.-V.: In any case. Again back to Andrea Rossi, who really plays an important role there. If you look him up at Wikipedia, then you can actually assume that what is being circulated about LENR and propagated about him is actually something that is not true at the front and back.

W. M.: Yes, I'm basically terribly sorry for the many serious authors who work for Wikipedia. They are idealists, they do it partly free of charge, probably for nothing and it has become a source of knowledge.

But I can only recommend: When researching Wikipedia, keep to the level about the difference between blackbird and throttle. Wherever interests might play a role, those who have interests in certain specific areas have early access to Wikipedia. Unfortunately, this was the case with LENR and people can't be reached anymore.

A knowledgeable reader in the USA tried it once. He said that living together is like in Franz Kafka's novel "The Castle". You just can't get in. And the inaccessibility, the confusion and the lack of transparency of Wikipedia is legendary. If you or I make a website, then the imprint is below, there you can find who wrote what, he is also responsible. With Wikipedia this is not so!

You meet a community that partly gives itself nicknames.

It's the same with Andrea Rossi in particular, who blames this story with its transformation into garbage to oil, in a way that's not true and has absolutely nothing to do with LENR. Then he is accused of propagating cold fusion, which he has denied over and over again. Only if one accuses him of this once, then a scientist will come forward who says: What he does is charlatany.

One would have to say, yes, if he were to claim it would be cold fusion, but Rossi claims exactly the opposite. And the top of all these stories is that Wikipedia says that the Rossi patent has been rejected. Everyone can easily read that the patent for Rossi's E-CAT device was granted in 2015. And this patent is now valid worldwide. And not only Rossi has been granted the patent, of course also NASA, the American Army, Airbus, etc.

People are working on Rossi and it is amazing that he has resisted this over all the years.

I think it's terrible what Wikipedia does and you can't say what Wikipedia does, but you have to say what small parts of Wikipedia do. Almost identical in words in USA and Germany.

What they are doing throws a very bad light on this institution, which as a whole truly does not deserve it. That is terrible!

S. W.-V.: And with Rossi it is also the case that he has the patents not only in one country, but worldwide.

W. M.: Yes, in all industrial countries of the world and where it has not yet been granted, it has now been registered. Of course, it applies in all European countries.

Nobody asks for it, nobody is interested.

Or let me add again: Airbus was granted a LENR patent in 2018. Granted! Not registered. Granted!

And this patent can be opened by anyone, it is written in German, of course also in English. But it's in German and it clearly says so: We have here a completely new energy source and that is based there on the fact that one conducts hydrogen in metal lattices and can cause it with resonances to set heat free. It's in there.

And in another paragraph it says that one also thinks of using it for use in vehicles. In the air, in space travel, on the rail, on the road, on the water.

These are the possible applications. This is not in any German newspaper.

No television station feels obliged to say that either. Or simply to ask: "Say, what are you writing, are you serious?"

S. W.-V.: One could at least ask one with the other and ask further questions.

W. M.: Yes. And what's even crazier: A few years earlier a member of the European Parliament asked the Commission a question: "Have you heard that there are now promising experiments with LENR in the USA and that it has been recognised by recognised experts and institutions as functioning?"

The Commissioner's answer was: "Yes, we have taken note and we point out that research can be financed with EU funds. And in view of the fact that other industrialised countries are very advanced in research, it would also be appropriate for the EU to do something about it."

That is not in any newspaper!

S. W.-V.: The publication that exists in Germany, in German-speaking countries, outside the mainstream, what would that be?

W.M.: The last newspaper in Germany to write positively about LENR, with a very small back door, the poor editors have to keep it open in case they fail with any research, that was the Berliner Zeitung, that was already one year ago.

They wrote about a successful attempt in Stockholm, either at a technical university or an engineering school. Rossi also demonstrated his reactor in front of 70 experts from industry, there were also physicists and a physicist commented. I think it was the Aftenposten or Dagbladet in Norway, and the Berliner Zeitung had followed it up and reported positively that it could be a completely new source of energy. And at the very end it says: But it is also doubted.

S. W.-V.: On the other hand, the facts are on the table.

W. M.: The facts of the function are on the table. There are always incomprehensible attempts by some scientists to urge the phenomenon LENR to prove how it works.

That makes about as much sense as saying:

"It's colder at night than outside."

They do it again and again and with this argumentation and their attempts they constantly lead themselves ad absurdum. But it is so. They can't think of anything better. But thank God many scientists now come up with the idea of hooking themselves up and fulfilling their task and researching: How does this come about at all? It works, but why? That is the question.

S. W.-V.: Yes. You've been working so hard for so many years now with the blog you have. We will certainly continue to pursue this matter, because it is an infinitely exciting topic and whether it is really sustainable. In contrast to many other technologies. Speaking of the future. What do you want with regard to LENR?

W. M.: Yes, on the one hand I hope that it will finally be recognized. I think that LENR will get the final recognition if the companies that already use the Rossi Reactor since mid-November 2018 will commit themselves to it.

S. W.-V.: So in a very current process in which we find ourselves?

W. M.: Yes, here these processes still run under NDA, i.e. under confidentiality agreement. Because I don't think any company wants the journalists, etc., to be at their door suddenly after they've made a commitment. At least not all of them at once.

But it is to be expected, in the next months, I hope not that it will take years, that in the next months, also from outside companies, which had nothing to do with it before, it will be confirmed: "Yes, we use such devices, they work and we save a lot of money". That's the real breakthrough. The breakthrough proof that it works was years ago. But LENR also has to prove its function in practice.

What I wish for now is that this recognition will take place, that the reactors, not only those of Rossi but also of others, will be built in large numbers. And the chances are good, because it is a completely normal industrial production process in series production. And the industrialized countries can do nothing better than series production.

In other words, thousands and thousands of devices can leave the assembly lines every day once series production has started.

And then these devices should first replace the coal, then replace the oil, then replace the gas, in between perhaps or even first replace the nuclear power plants. And then when everything has been done that will surely take decades, everything has to be installed, then one could ask

oneself with the so-called alternative energies, with the renewable energies: Can they withstand the competition with LENR? And they probably won't. After all, LENR will probably end up being much cheaper than wind or solar power.

Just because the grid is not absolutely necessary is enough. But here we are talking about scenarios that lie far in the future. So far we should be grateful for every windmill that is set up and every solar module.

S. W.-V.: An infinitely exciting topic Mr. Meinders, I thank you very much for the conversation and for the many dense information. And as I said, we will continue to pursue this, you have a very interesting blog to which I would like to refer, which we also show below in accompanying text. And I wish you for the future everything, all the best, a lot of strength and I wish all of us the LENR soon for all of us an alternative to what we have so far in energy production will be. Thank you very much!

W.M.: Gladly, thank you!