

# BREAKING THROUGH

## On Being Observant. . .and Accountable

by Eugene F. Mallove, Sc.D.



A part from the unwelcome turbulence, it seemed like a fairly uneventful flight from Boston to Los Angeles. High in the stratosphere, passengers aboard the big jet had settled into the routine of the five-hour transcontinental hop—an unimaginable miracle of science and technology, had this been 1901 when the Wright brothers were still at the hang-glider stage, as Otto Lilienthal had been in 1896 in Germany at his death. But this was a century later, August 1, 2001.

In less than six weeks, an obscene terrorist plot that had been percolating underground for years would kill thousands in New York City, Washington, and Pennsylvania. Lives hung in the balance. Terrorists plotted to take advantage of the miracle of flight, the weakness of steel heated by burning jet fuel, and the force of gravity itself. Aboard that flight on August 1 was much more than a subtle clue about what would happen September 11. And, that clue *was observed*. This flight from Boston was apparently some kind of “dry run” for the day of infamy.

Aboard the flight was an exceptionally sharp man who had attended three years of MIT before leaving to pursue a successful acting career. The Emmy Award winner has appeared to date in more than twenty Hollywood movies (“Contact,” “Ghosts of Mississippi,” “The Boost,” etc.). He was the observer. James Woods is a member the MIT Class of 1969—“Fine ‘69,” the Moon landing class, and about the 100th class to graduate the illustrious “Institute.”

For about two decades I have been the secretary of that class; it has been my business to follow the accomplishments, lives, and deaths of classmates and report them in MIT’s alumni/ae magazine, *Technology Review*, which bills itself “MIT’s Magazine of Innovation.” So on Valentine’s Day 2002 when I saw the dashing actor-classmate about to be interviewed on the Fox News channel’s “The O’Reilly Factor,” I pressed the record button on our VCR.

It was the first time *in public* that James Woods had related his remarkable, chilling experience of last August. He told host Bill O’Reilly that he had observed what he considered to be suspicious behavior by four men of evident Middle-Eastern origin, who surrounded him in the First Class section. This was the key part of his revelation: “Without going into the details of what made me suspicious of these four men, although it would have been blatantly obvious to the most casual observer, I took it upon myself to go to the flight attendant and ask to speak to the pilot of the plane. The first officer came out. I reported to him that I felt that the four men. . .and I said ‘Can you look over my shoulder to see whom I’m talking about?’ He said, ‘Uh, yeah. . .’ I said, ‘I think they are going to hijack this plane, I mean everything they are doing. . .’ and I explained to him these details—which I’ve been asked to keep private, until whatever trials may

take place. Their behavior was such that I felt that they were going to hijack the plane. I also said, ‘I am very much aware of how serious it is to say on an American aircraft, in flight, the word ‘hijack.’ So I am saying this because I really have reason to believe that it is true.’” Woods recalled that on the evening of August 1, he commented to his girlfriend and his best friend, “Aside from the terrorists and the turbulence, the flight was fine.” “In retrospect,” he said, “not such a funny joke.”

On September 11, after witnessing the horrific events of that day on television, Woods contacted the FBI. Two agents came to his house at 6:45 a.m. the very next day. He would subsequently learn from them that the pilot and the flight attendant whom he had approached on August 1 each had filed a report about the incident with the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration). Woods said that he has since learned that all four of the men whom he saw acting so suspiciously on his Boston-to-Los Angeles flight were in fact terrorists! Two of them were aboard United flight 175 and American flight 77, which plowed catastrophically into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The other two men were also confirmed by the FBI to have been accomplices, he said. Woods observed that none of them had brought carry-on luggage on this long flight, and all seemed profoundly detached and furtive in their demeanor. “I thought that they were either four (undercover) law enforcement officers, or four terrorists,” said Woods.

He emphasized that he had not personally contacted the FBI *before* September 11—rumors to the contrary notwithstanding. Still, those FAA reports that were made by the flight crew thanks to his prompting just might have led to investigations that could have upset the September 11 plot. Obviously if an airline passenger made such a report today, it would be investigated with great urgency—and, one hopes, diligence. One can only speculate what might have been had Woods’ concerns made it to intelligence authorities prior to September 11 and had those in charge acted on the information.

But what does this remarkable “what if” episode have to do with the topics with which *Infinite Energy* is usually concerned? Answer: Plenty! It dramatizes the importance of being *observant* and the necessity of being responsible and accountable in matters that are of potentially overarching importance. “Be observant!” is not just a homey admonition from your seventh grade science teacher. Mine, a Mr. John Zoukowski, had told us that many times in 1959-60. I believe it sank in.

The comparison is not overdrawn: Think of those who have played a disgusting, dangerous game for the past thirteen years with the painstakingly generated *data* from cold fusion experiments bearing on excess heat and nuclear products. They have wantonly ignored that data and have mocked it mercilessly. These bureaucrats and ossified academics are neither observant nor accountable. And, they are highly irresponsible in their actions and inactions. In many cases their behavior borders on

criminally irresponsible. Lives too numerous to reckon have already been lost in the outrageous delay in applying adequate human and financial resources to the science and technology of low-energy nuclear reactions.

Like the passengers aboard flying fuel tanks and in buildings threatened by suicidal terrorists, our lives hang in the balance every day. We inhabit a berserk planet in which oil is the currency of criminal dictators and manipulators. Fiery deaths occur every day in the transportation sector. Choking air pollution from the hydrocarbon economy takes lives by the thousands. And, whether or not one accepts the evidence for man-made CO<sub>2</sub>-induced global warming, the hypothetical *threat* is there. Wars over the security of the false currency of limitation—oil—consume national treasuries and thousands of lives. Yet there is the data, screaming out from countless pages—ignored, unobserved, ridiculed. The cold fusion data place an *absolute lower limit on the available nuclear-scale, radiationless, pollution-free energy* from a gallon of ordinary water: 300 gallons of gasoline energy equivalent. The energy of all the known oil reserves on Earth from a tiny cubic kilometer of ocean.

Alright, James Woods' actions did not save 3,000 lives in New York City on September 11. But that's not the point; they *could have*. Immigration papers of the plotters could have been checked and travel histories correlated. That might have been just enough to shake up these four, stall for time, and prevent at least this atrocity (if not others that may still come.) What if the pilot and the flight attendant hadn't filed their reports? Then, short of James Woods himself going directly to the FAA or to the FBI prior to September 11, there might not have been any other factor threatening to unravel the terrorist plot.

What if in 1989 the MIT hot fusioneers had stepped back from their arrogance and bigotry and actually thoroughly investigated the anomalous calorimetric data in their possession, which hinted at the reality of the excess heat effect from a hastily constructed Fleischmann-Pons cold fusion cell? [See an account of this travesty in *IE* No. 24.] What if they had been *observant* rather than oblivious? There would have been no "null result" sixteen-author MIT "Albagli *et al.*" paper topping the roster of the DOE Cold Fusion Panel's report in 1989. If not that, then what if President Charles Vest of MIT had actually had enough intellectual curiosity and integrity to get to the bottom of the scandal of press manipulation, lying, and data shifting at MIT, that is, *scientific fraud*? What if any *one* of the twenty-three Panel members had stepped out of line to protest the outrageous rush to judgment? Nobel laureate Norman Ramsey did, but then failed to follow through, signed the report, and has been hiding under a rock ever since. Zero accountability. Ditto for Professor Mildred Dresselhaus of MIT, who *knew and knows* that open questions remain and did nothing about it while in her top DOE science position during the Clinton Administration.

The litany of poor observation and lack of accountability goes on and on. In February 2000, President Clinton's White House asked me for a report on cold fusion, per the urging of Sir Arthur C. Clarke. It was rendered—all 8,500 words (posted at [www.infinite-energy.com](http://www.infinite-energy.com)). No response for ten months and then Clinton's pathetic "thank you" note of January 18, 2001 goes out: "Thank you for your memorandum, 'The Strange Birth of the Water Fuel Age'. . . I was glad to have your insights about the critical challenges in the field of high technology, and I commend your commitment to improving our world. I hope that you will remain involved in the important issues of this new century. . ." Blah, blah, blah. . . Oh please, spare me!

As for the present President, still no response to a nearly identical entreaty to the one sent to Clinton, this time published beginning on the cover of *Infinite Energy* No. 40, post-September

11. Nor do I expect a response, not even a thank you note. A response of *any* kind might mean the inconceivable: bowing slightly to the one simple and unarguably reasonable request to both presidents: "Mr. President, you need do only one thing now: Publicly state that you are going to investigate this matter and then do it." Be observant! Be accountable! Don't give us any money. Don't pass any laws. Just give us the benefit of acknowledging that an important issue needs to be resolved—and the mess that issued from Washington in 1989 will clean itself up. Hordes of previously silent and timid media pundits, who fancy themselves to be high-class science journalists but are mere lackeys of propagandists, will then emerge from dark holes. They will be forced by the simple utterance of those forbidden words—*cold fusion*—to write volumes about it as though it were a new Enron scandal, though it is far worse. We'll give them a ready-made moniker: HeavyWatergate. Go for it! Get your Pulitzers!

In the dim, dark past—for example in the late nineteenth century—being observant in science typically meant watching carefully for anomalies that might open new windows on nature. One such opening occurred when Wilhelm Roentgen was observant and serendipitously discovered X-rays in 1895. It turns out that one A.W. Goodspeed of Philadelphia had inadvertently made an X-ray photograph five years earlier (February 1890), but had not recognized its significance. He was insufficiently observant and held back the progress of science for some five years. That is about the same period it took establishment science to recognize the Wright brothers' flight of December 17, 1903, even though they had operated their flyer for five years thereafter in full public view.

It is a new day. Official Science is at war with anomalies that threaten its foundations. Led by its most egregiously self-satisfied and arrogant branch, Official Physics, its micro-minded buffoonish commentators have a scorched Earth policy for all that is truly new. Let any anomaly, such as cold fusion, challenge its sacred Texts, and it is open season on its discoverers and observers. Science is dead. Scientism reigns.

What happened to cold fusion is but the tip of the larger iceberg of tyrannical suppression—in physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, and cosmology. Cold fusion is a mere pebble on a mountain of new observations that need to be explored. But how to bring that about when the reigning paradigm preaches scientific celibacy: the rigorous *avoidance* of any and all observations that conflict with Space-Time, Big Bangs, Little Bangs, Coulomb Barriers, and the opinions of your local university's Quantum Mechanic? Sorry, I don't have a really good solution to this, short of beating the beast over the head with an irrefutable demonstration device on market. Failing that, one can only try one's best to observe and discern what may be important and true amid the data fog and bombardment by irrelevant stimuli, and to seek others who may listen. □□□

#### ERRATA

In the "Breaking Through" editorial of Issue No. 41, part of the text should have read: "Aetherometry demonstrates that what traverses Space is not transverse electromagnetic radiation (and certainly not sensible heat), but longitudinal ambipolar electric [not *electromagnetic*, which was the error] radiation emitted from the Sun."