

## Comments on APEC Saturday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2025

Remi Cornwall

University of London Alumni Society, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU

<https://cornwall.infinityfreeapp.com/> <http://ulondon.academia.edu/RemiCornwall>

### Abstract

APEC – Alternative Propulsion Engineering Conference is run by Tim Ventura and is a forum that lets all-comers present their researches into fringe science concepts, though mainly those concerned with propulsion. This brief letter will write about two presentations – LENR and “Quantised Inertia”. I may comment on the other later presentations at some point. We find omissions in LENR experimental methodology and candidate theories based on current science but this wouldn’t exclude new science. We also find that McCulloch’s “Quantised Inertia” (and so MOND/TeV<sub>S</sub> too) violate the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle.

### Introduction

APEC[1] is commendable in giving people the chance to talk about fringe concepts or concepts frowned on by academia for lack of credentials of the presenters. Ultimately this is good for science, as progress is usually made on the continuum (and Law of Diminishing returns) between knowing too little or knowing too much (and being devoid of ideas from over-education or a too conservative nature<sup>†</sup>). It appeals to cussed/awkward-squad engineers and physicists who are head-strong enough to push forth their ideas against the mainstream and often, from the history of science, such people usher in revolutions. To be fair though, there is a lot of dross...

This report is on the conference[2] available by this link: [APEC 1/18: Catalyzed Fusion, Quantised Inertia & Aether Theory](#)

### 1. Cold Fusion/LENR – Low Energy Nuclear Reactions/LANR – Lattice Assisted Nuclear Reactions/CMNS – Condensed Matter Nuclear Science

I have already written about this here[3]: [Cold Fusion LENR/LANR/CMNS is back in the news. Is it Pathological Science or just barking up the wrong tree](#) (<https://vixra.org/abs/2401.0062>)

I will not dismiss “Cold Fusion” (or whatever it is – is it a *physical chemistry process*, such as hydrogenation or phase change or even something new that is not nuclear?) because some very good people (some personally known to me but I shan’t divulge) have said there might be something there: sporadic reports come in of excess heat or odd isotope ratios.

The presentation on Saturday 18th January 2025 seemed to be given by a very sincere, nice and rational gentleman in laboratory surroundings. I came away thinking it was more of a

---

<sup>†</sup> Or the celebrated Hector Belioz bon-mot about Camille Saens-Saint: “Il sait tout, mais il manque d’inexpérience.”

sales talk than an exposition of scientific principles for those wishing to duplicate the findings:-

- No reaction equation showing reactants, products, energy balances, known processes, putative processes.
- No mention of experiments to isolate the effect but surrounding the effect with superfluous(?) or confusing equipment like *engines*. Reductionism helps science.
- No repeatable experiments or those headed to a consensus level of repeatability mentioned.
- Eye-candy graphics and video in the presentation showing a (pink) spark in some mixture of gas and no explanation as to how to reproduce the experiments.
- No clear video or accounts of experiments working. Vague “oh it ran for 4 hours on its own”.
- Eye-candy scale-up graphics showing power plants with no indication that the basic science is all sealed.
- Mention of things like the “Thunderstorm Generator”, a car running on purely atmospheric water vapour, or an engine that could continually cycle the water of combustion and somehow achieve over-unity or an experiment that started with hydrogen and somehow ended up with carbon and boron but no evidence presented or videos, no materials reviewed by professionals (with no confirmation bias or axe to grind), no mass spectrometry or chemical qualitative/quantitative analysis.

I wrote about an Auger-like electron capture process initiated by X-rays from lattice relaxation[3], the new contribution being the bringing in of the Wigner phenomenon into discussions regarding lattice transmutations; the upshot being that similar sentiments regarding Sonoluminescence, high temperatures and X-ray generation could apply in lattices.

I shall now onto the more theoretical aspects discussed in the presentation which dwelled on electron capture but this is at odds with theory because:-

- Electron capture (EC) is governed by the Weak Interaction. That’s just how it is (unless there’s new science). The energetics of such processes are at the 100keV level rather than millions (MeV) of nuclear processes.
- Weak Interaction is a slow process/a rate limiting step (as chemists might say) that cannot possibly explain power densities alleged. EC has low probability.
- Wide ranging electron shell coherence/entanglement and even lattice interactions have no basis in the weak interaction because it is an extremely short-ranged force.
- Pressure/spacing not close enough for coherent overlap of nuclear wavefunctions for either weak or strong force range.
- The hypothesis that neutron rich nuclei are formed from electron capture, that are then compelled to form higher elements by the strong force, requires these nuclei to transport themselves over inter-atomic distances to combine with neighbours in the lattice (or gas or liquid separated by electron clouds) whilst being unstable and prone to beta emission.

- Given above, it is not clear how higher atomic numbers can easily be formed from “scaling the staircase” from hydrogen with electron capture, which reduces atomic number.
- No real account of how plasmoids were relevant to the discussion: how nuclear transmutation was achieved or how direct electrical conversion from these entities could be achieved.
- No explicit showing of how generation of products quantitatively lead to heat production. Surely Power =  $dm/dt \cdot c^2$  if it's nuclear? That would require incredibly sensitive mass measurements but aren't there proxies (neutrons, gamma)? This is an old topic the community has skirted around for *decades* by saying “lattice effects make it different”. There is no theory to account for this.

## 2. “Quantised Inertia” (MOND/TeVSe hypotheses too)

The next discussion was about “Quantised Inertia” and given by its proponent, Dr Mike McCulloch of Plymouth University, UK.

I have previously written about Mike McCulloch's[4] work, briefly in the sense that it started my own enquiry about the Galactic Rotation problem and drew together my other thoughts about[5], coming from my own propulsion project[6-8]. Sabine Hossenfelder[9] also said Quantised Inertia was based on shaky theory. Specifically I wrote that if he believes that inertia is caused by radiation pressure from an Unruh horizon, the effect is absolutely miniscule (take the Black Body temperature, plug into Stefan-Boltzmann law to work out intensity, work out the pressure/force from this, you get:  $F = -\int_A P d\vec{A} \cdot \vec{n} = -\int_A \frac{2\pi^4 \hbar a^4}{15c^7} d\vec{A} \cdot \vec{n}$ ,  $\vec{n} = \frac{\vec{a}}{|\vec{a}|}$  where  $F$  is your force,  $a$  is your acceleration).

Watching the new (18/01/2025) presentation drew out further absurdities: **Inertia was already quantised very early on in the history of Quantum Theory.** As soon as Planck suggested  $E = \hbar\omega$  in 1900 and then Einstein explained the Photoelectric Effect *and* co-discovered (or brought together best/most coherently all the ideas kicking around at the time from Maxwell, Lorentz, Poincare, Fitzgerald regarding Special Relativity) in 1905, it only needed a 4-vector transformation to suggest  $p = \hbar k$  (de Broglie 1924) – Special Relativity had already sealed that formula.

For a free, unbounded particle  $k$  is continuous (just as say the Hydrogen spectrum is continuous above the ionisation energy) and can tend to zero. There is no minimum acceleration figure.

Let's take McCulloch's hypothesis and see where it takes us:-

If  $p = \hbar k$  then  $\frac{dp}{dt} = \hbar \frac{dk}{dt}$  this is an application of Ehrenfest's Theorem.

The wavenumber,  $k$ , would give us a length scale for the process and an idea of  $\delta t$  from the velocity. So let us write:-

$$ma = \hbar \frac{\Delta k}{\frac{1}{\Delta k} \cdot \frac{1}{v}} \quad \text{eqn.1}$$

Where  $a$  is the acceleration,  $v$  is the velocity and  $\frac{1}{\Delta k}$  is the wavelength or length scale associated with the process changing the wavenumber; dividing this by the instantaneous velocity (indeed, if the velocity is high and the acceleration low) gives the timescale. If we assume constant acceleration (let alone a minimal “quantised acceleration” figure) we can write:-

$$\frac{m}{\Delta t} = \hbar (\Delta k)^2 \Rightarrow \Delta k_{HUP} = \sqrt{\frac{m}{\hbar \Delta t}} \quad \text{eqn.2}$$

“HUP” for “Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle” and this would set a limit to how precisely we could measure a change in wavenumber (the number of waves per unit distance) given the mass of the particle and the time scale of the process.

If we substitute in Mike McCulloch’s/MOND[10, 11] suggested minimal acceleration figure of about  $2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ m/s}^2$  into eqn. 1, we’d get,

$$\Delta k = \sqrt{\frac{2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ m}}{\hbar v}} \approx 10^{-5} \left[ \sqrt{\text{meters} / \text{s}} \right] \sqrt{\frac{m}{\hbar v}} \quad \text{eqn.3}$$

Taking the ratio of eqn. 2 and eqn. 3,


$$\frac{\Delta k_{HUP}}{\Delta k_{McCulloch}} = 10^5 \left[ \text{s} / \sqrt{\text{meters}} \right] \sqrt{\frac{v}{\Delta t}} \quad \text{eqn.4}$$

Unity would mean the same results as the HUP. A value greater than 1 would mean that **Mike McCulloch’s hypothesis would measure more precisely than the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle dictates** with no special artifice (such as statistical averaging): just set

$$\sqrt{\frac{v}{\Delta t}} > 10^{-5}$$

This is clearly absurd.

Other matters related to his putative propulsion device neglect all consideration of the scholarly Hidden Momentum literature base, as mentioned before[6-8].



**When the facts change,  
I change my mind—  
what do you do, sir?**

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES

## References

Mirror for my papers here: [https://vixra.org/author/remi\\_cornwall](https://vixra.org/author/remi_cornwall)

1. Ventura, T. *Alternative Propulsion Engineering Conference (APEC)*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.altpropulsion.com/>.
2. Ventura, T. *APEC 1/18: Catalyzed Fusion, Quantised Inertia & Aether Theory*. 2025; Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGauflPlpBk>.
3. Cornwall, R.O. *Cold Fusion LENR/LANR/CMNS is back in the news. Is it Pathological Science or just barking up the wrong tree*. 2024; Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/113430013/Cold\\_Fusion\\_LENR\\_LANR\\_CMNS\\_is\\_back\\_in\\_the\\_news\\_Is\\_it\\_Pathological\\_Science\\_or\\_just\\_barking\\_up\\_the\\_wrong\\_tree](https://www.academia.edu/113430013/Cold_Fusion_LENR_LANR_CMNS_is_back_in_the_news_Is_it_Pathological_Science_or_just_barking_up_the_wrong_tree) or <https://vixra.org/abs/2401.0062>.
4. Cornwall, R.O. *The Fisher-Tully Law solely with 1915 General Relativity and Dark Energy*. MDPI Pre-prints 2024; Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/117246324/The\\_Fisher\\_Tully\\_Law\\_solely\\_with\\_1915\\_General\\_Relativity\\_and\\_Dark\\_Energy](https://www.academia.edu/117246324/The_Fisher_Tully_Law_solely_with_1915_General_Relativity_and_Dark_Energy) or <https://vixra.org/abs/2404.0050>.
5. Cornwall, R.O. *"Reconciling the Cosmological Constant with the Energy Density of Quantum Field Theories of the Zeropoint"*. 2021; Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/50327052/Reconciling\\_the\\_Cosmological\\_Constant\\_with\\_the\\_Energy\\_Density\\_of\\_Quantum\\_Field\\_Theories\\_of\\_the\\_Zeropoint](https://www.academia.edu/50327052/Reconciling_the_Cosmological_Constant_with_the_Energy_Density_of_Quantum_Field_Theories_of_the_Zeropoint).
6. Cornwall, R.O., *A Mechanism for Propulsion without the Reactive Ejection of Matter or Energy*. Preprints, 2019 [https://www.academia.edu/38062548/A\\_Mechanism\\_for\\_Propulsion\\_without\\_The\\_Reactive\\_Ejection\\_of\\_Matter\\_or\\_Energy](https://www.academia.edu/38062548/A_Mechanism_for_Propulsion_without_The_Reactive_Ejection_of_Matter_or_Energy).
7. Cornwall, R.O., *The Energetics of the an ExB propulsor that avoids the Hidden Momentum pitfall*. Preprints, 2019 [https://www.academia.edu/41062130/The\\_Energetics\\_of\\_the\\_an\\_ExB\\_propulsor\\_that\\_avoids\\_the\\_Hidden\\_Momentum\\_pitfall](https://www.academia.edu/41062130/The_Energetics_of_the_an_ExB_propulsor_that_avoids_the_Hidden_Momentum_pitfall).
8. Cornwall, R.O., *Candidates for EM propulsion - slide presentation*. Preprints, 2021 [https://www.academia.edu/49712716/Microsoft\\_PowerPoint\\_APEC](https://www.academia.edu/49712716/Microsoft_PowerPoint_APEC).
9. Hossenfelder, S. *Quantum Inertia Drive put to Test. It didn't go as planned*. 2024; Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TSMJZmLMwrY&t=495s>.
10. McCulloch, M. *Physics with an edge*. 2024; Available from: <https://physicsfromtheedge.blogspot.com/>.
11. Wikipedia. *Modified Newtonian dynamics*. Available from: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modified\\_Newtonian\\_dynamics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modified_Newtonian_dynamics).