

The Right Hand Rule of Scientific Progress

Accepted dogma will always deflect acceptance of a solution. Freeman Dyson proposed that "For any speculation which does not at first glance look crazy there is no hope" or as Lenz's Law states, an induced emf produces a current to oppose change.

In 1915 Harkins proposed that a hydrogen atom "captures" its electron to produce the "neutron" that acts as "cement" and binds protons in nuclei. In 1919 Rutherford, the discover of nuclei, said Harkins was wrong but undaunted he continued to promote his neutron as the "sum" of a proton and electron. And when Chadwick discovered neutrons in 1932, Harkins lay claim but Heisenberg said his "sum of a proton and electron" neutron was different because it was "incompatible" with Bohr's atom and Heisenberg's Quantum Mechanics, and that Chadwick's neutron was a new particle that only "creates" a proton and electron at the moment of decay.

In 1940 Borghi proposed that a neutron is a "bound state" of hydrogen and again the concept was rejected for "contradict[ing] Bohr's atom and Heisenberg's Quantum Mechanics." In 1955 Borghi synthesized neutrons and attempted to present his "Experimental evidence on the emission of neutrons from cold hydrogen plasma," (Unpublished) at Vienna in 1958 but was prevented by the Experts.

In 2002 a neutron model, as a quantum state of hydrogen, was developed that calculated all known empirical neutron parameters, the Strong binding force and magnetons for nuclei, and pion, muon and electron neutrino energy values as a conservation of angular momentum on decay. In 2003 neutrons were synthesized from protons and electrons of specific energies from the model and they fused into Helium-4 with an energy release as a decay product.

In 2004, after requesting review by the Department of Energy, they stated "to collide electrons with protons to form neutrons"

and "forcing an electron and a proton to form a neutron" is "very unlikely. The process cannot happen on earth...." The DOE then stated the "fusion of four neutrons to form He-4" would violate the Pauli Exclusion Principle, but if it happened it would produce a "He-4 nucleus, two electrons and two anti-neutrinos" and would "consume more energy than they produce."

This is the same DOE that says they were mistaken about Cold Fusion after discrediting Pons and Fleischmann in 1989; that lost control of top secret classified data and materials at Los Alamos and Livermore; that has accumulated so much radioactive waste that it will take 20 years of daily shipments from around the country to gather it all at Yucca Mountain in Nevada; and who did not read the material presented or they would have realized that in neutron synthesis protons and electrons don't "collide," they are inserted into a specific quantum orbital energy state. Nor did they see that the process only requires 0.8 MeV to make a neutron and that four neutrons magnetically align to form He-4 with a release of 28 MeV, for a net 9 to 1 gain of clean non-radioactive energy.

So the Experts first rejected Harkins and Barghi because they could not show agreement with Bohr's atom or Quantum Mechanics and now Experts are rejecting a model based on Bohr's atom and Quantum Mechanics because it is "very unlikely," (see letter from DOE and response) although Electron Capture ($pX_n + e^- \rightarrow p_{-1}X_{n+1} + \nu$) to form a neutron is a standard transmutation process in the nuclear decay of the radioactive wastes they manage.

Subsequently, the Quantum Dynamic Relativity paper explaining neutrons and their $\frac{1}{2}$ -spin, nuclear force and the cause of particle wave nature and quantum behavior based on Relativity was submitted to Scientific American in response to an article on "The Mystery of Nucleon Spin" (July 1999) that closes with the question "What produces the spin of a nucleon." The Editors rejected it as not being something they can use.

So we need your help. Each time the neutron as hydrogen with a captured electron surfaces it is pontifically rejected and yet no one can explain why it isn't correct. The concept resolves all known questions in nuclear physics and needs review if for no other reason than to disprove it. We ask that you e-mail Editors at "editors@sciam.com" (or Letters to the Editors, Scientific American, 415 Madison Ave., New York NY 10017-1111) and ask them why they won't print Quantum Dynamic Relativity, mqnf.com, which answers the question they posed in Nucleon Spin. By Lenz's Law, all rejection must generate a counter flux. Enough is enough.

Thank you.

The Modulated Quantum Neutron Fusion Group

Matt Gray	Michael Ferrigam
Bill Champion	Mark Rees
Charles Rosata	Kenneth Fitzhugh
John Welch	P. Becker

Reference: "Low Energy Nuclear Reactions...." by Roberto Monti at <http://itis.volta.alessandria.it/epistem/ep4/ep4alchem.htm>