Fusion Energy Update: March 2026

When Hardware Meets Hype — The Reality Check

Kirk Williams — www.KHTCO.cn

Executive Summary

The fusion energy industry enters mid-Q1 2026 in a paradoxical state: **hardware progress is genuinely accelerating while the gap between corporate promises and physical achievement continues to widen.** Since the February 3, 2026 update, several notable developments have occurred—Helion's Polaris prototype achieved 150 million °C plasma temperatures and measurable deuterium-tritium fusion, Proxima Fusion launched a 30-company industrial alliance for its Alpha stellarator demonstrator, General Fusion announced a ~$1 billion SPAC merger to go public, and Pacific Fusion reported breakthrough experiments at Sandia's Z Pulsed Power Facility. Meanwhile, the U.S. federal government proposed slashing fusion energy sciences funding by 37%, and **no private fusion company has yet demonstrated Q>1 net energy gain from a privately-funded device**. The industry is simultaneously entering public markets and confronting the uncomfortable reality that fusion power purchase agreements, IPO roadshows, and site selection announcements are dramatically outpacing the physics validation required to deliver on them. (39–45, 47–48)

Part One: Industry Developments — Major Updates Since February 3, 2026

1. Helion Energy: Polaris Achieves 150M °C — But Net Electricity Remains Elusive

What happened (February 2026): Helion Energy announced that its seventh-generation Polaris prototype achieved two milestones: becoming the first privately funded fusion machine to operate with deuterium-tritium fuel and demonstrate measurable D-T fusion, and setting a new private-sector plasma temperature record of 150 million °C. The company characterized these as "historic results" validating its approach to high-power fusion. (39–40, 49)

Why it matters — and why caution is warranted: These achievements are genuine technical progress. Operating with D-T fuel and reaching 150 million °C are meaningful steps. However, **the milestone that actually matters — net electricity production — remains unachieved**, and its absence is increasingly conspicuous. Helion publicly committed to demonstrating net electricity from Polaris by end of 2024. That deadline was missed. The target shifted to "later in 2025". By early 2026, it has shifted again. The pattern of repeatedly announcing impressive-sounding but intermediate milestones while the core deliverable slips is a hallmark of technology programs in trouble. (40, 50)

The 200 million °C gap: Helion itself has stated that 200 million °C is the "sweet spot" for commercial fusion plant operation. At 150 million °C, Polaris is at approximately 75% of the temperature target — but in fusion physics, the final 25% of temperature increase does not correspond to 25% of the remaining difficulty. Fusion reaction rates scale non-linearly with temperature, and maintaining plasma stability while pushing higher into the burning plasma regime introduces qualitatively new physics challenges. (40)

The Microsoft PPA reality check: Helion's binding power purchase agreement commits it to deliver at least 50 MW of fusion electricity to Microsoft by end of 2028. Consider the chain of milestones required: demonstrate net electricity from Polaris (not yet achieved), design and build the Orion commercial reactor at scale, commission and validate it, and deliver grid-ready power — all within approximately 30 months. The Orion facility in Malaga, Washington is under construction, but **the main fusion generator building has not yet begun construction**, and progress appears contingent on Polaris outcomes. This timeline is, by any reasonable engineering assessment, **extremely unlikely to be met at the contracted 50 MW level**. (15, 40)

Forward assessment (Medium-Low Confidence): Helion's FRC technology is advancing, but the company's credibility is being eroded by a pattern of missed deadlines. The optimistic path sees Polaris demonstrating some level of net electricity generation in 2026, enabling a renegotiated Microsoft PPA with reduced capacity and an extended timeline (2029–2030). The realistic path acknowledges that scaling from prototype net electricity to a 50 MW commercial plant requires 4–6 years of engineering development, not 2. *Indicators to watch:* Any announcement of actual net electricity values from Polaris (not just temperature or D-T reaction records); Microsoft's public statements about the PPA timeline; whether Orion's main generator building breaks ground in 2026.

---

2. General Fusion: Going Public via $1 Billion SPAC — Before Proving the Physics

What happened (January 22, 2026): General Fusion announced a merger with Spring Valley Acquisition Corp. III (SVAC III) to go public on Nasdaq under the ticker "GFUZ." The transaction values General Fusion at approximately $600 million pre-deal, with $230 million from SVAC III's trust (subject to potential redemption by unitholders) and $105 million from an oversubscribed PIPE. The deal is expected to close by mid-2026. (47–48, 53)

Why it matters: General Fusion would become one of the first publicly traded "pure-play" fusion companies, following the TAE-Trump Media announcement in December 2025. This marks **a second fusion company seeking public market capital before achieving scientific breakeven** — a pattern that demands scrutiny. (53–54)

The technology status: General Fusion's LM26 (Lawson Machine 26) is operational in Richmond, B.C., and has progressed to mechanically compressing plasma with a lithium liner at 50% of commercial-scale diameter. The company reached first plasma in March 2025 and is now targeting a sequence of milestones: 10 million °C (1 keV), 100 million °C (10 keV), and scientific breakeven equivalent. However, **none of these milestones have been publicly confirmed as achieved**, and General Fusion's own history includes over 20 years of operation and a prior broken promise of breakeven made more than two decades ago. (53, 55–56)

SPAC economics and risk: The SPAC structure introduces significant investor risk. SVAC III unitholders may redeem their shares, potentially reducing the cash available to General Fusion to the $105 million PIPE alone. Some SPAC transactions have experienced redemption rates exceeding 90%. The company's 115 employees and $400 million in prior funding have not yet yielded a demonstration of net energy. The SPAC sponsors previously backed NuScale Power's listing, which has experienced significant share price volatility. (47, 57–58)

Forward assessment (Medium-Low Confidence): General Fusion's magnetized target fusion approach is technically distinct and potentially viable, but the decision to go public before demonstrating breakeven-equivalent results creates a **perverse incentive structure** where market expectations may drive timeline announcements rather than physics. *Indicators to watch:* LM26 milestone achievement announcements (temperature, Lawson criterion); SPAC redemption rates at close; whether General Fusion's UK demonstration program (in partnership with UKAEA) advances or stalls.

---

3. Proxima Fusion: Alpha Alliance Launches Europe's Stellarator Push

What happened (February 25, 2026): Proxima Fusion launched the Alpha Alliance, bringing together more than 30 European and international industrial companies to deliver Alpha, a net-energy-gain fusion demonstrator based on stellarator technology. A memorandum of understanding was signed with the Free State of Bavaria, RWE, and the Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics (IPP), outlining a roadmap that begins with Alpha's construction near IPP in Garching, with operation targeted in the 2030s. The subsequent commercial plant, Stellaris, is planned for the site of the former Gundremmingen nuclear power plant, currently being decommissioned by RWE. (42, 44, 59–60)

Why it matters: This is the **most advanced public industrial commitment to stellarator commercialization in Europe**, with a credible utility partner (RWE), established research infrastructure (IPP/Wendelstein 7-X), and government backing (Bavaria). The partnership model mirrors Type One Energy's approach with TVA in Tennessee, suggesting a convergent industry strategy of pairing fusion startups with experienced utility operators. (61–62)

Reality check: Proxima Fusion spun out of the Max Planck Institute in 2023. The company has raised approximately €200 million — significant for a stellarator startup, but a fraction of what CFS or Helion have raised. Alpha's operational target in "the 2030s" remains vague, and no stellarator has ever approached breakeven conditions. The Wendelstein 7-X physics that underpins Proxima's approach is sound, but translating W7-X's research results into a new machine designed by a three-year-old company involves substantial design, engineering, and manufacturing risk. The 30+ company alliance is a positive signal of industrial seriousness, but **memoranda of understanding are not construction contracts**, and the gap between signing an MoU and pouring concrete is measured in years and billions of euros. (15, 42)

Forward assessment (Medium Confidence): Proxima's approach — leveraging Europe's stellarator expertise, an established research institution, a utility partner, and government support — represents one of the more credible commercialization strategies in the industry. The 2030s timeline for Alpha is ambitious but not wildly unrealistic given stellarator physics maturity. *Indicators to watch:* Site acquisition and groundbreaking for Alpha; HTS coil manufacturing contracts; EU or German government co-funding announcements; whether RWE makes a firm investment commitment beyond the MoU.

---

4. Pacific Fusion: Simplification Breakthrough at Sandia — But Very Early Innings

What happened (February 2026): Pacific Fusion, in partnership with Sandia National Laboratories, reported results from experiments at Sandia's Z Pulsed Power Facility demonstrating pulser-driven inertial confinement fusion with a simplified target design made only of aluminum and plastic. The experiments, conducted under a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement, used 22 million amps of pulsed power to gather data on these simplified targets. (45–46, 23)

Why it matters: Target complexity and cost have been a fundamental barrier to commercial ICF. Each shot at NIF requires an intricate, expensive target assembly that is vaporized on every pulse. If Pacific Fusion can demonstrate adequate fusion performance with radically simpler targets, it could make pulser-driven ICF economically viable at commercial repetition rates. The company projects its Demonstration System will achieve 1,000× the price-performance of NIF by 2030 and 100× higher facility-level energy gain. (23, 27)

Reality check: These projections are extraordinary. Pacific Fusion was founded in 2023 and raised $900 million in its Series A. The Sandia experiments provided *data* on simplified targets — not a demonstration of net energy gain. The company's claims of 1,000× improvement over NIF are projections, not results. The gap between "gather measurements on simplified targets" and "build a commercial fusion power plant" spans multiple decades of engineering development in conventional program trajectories. Pacific Fusion's rapid funding ($900M at founding) reflects Big Tech's appetite for fusion bets, not physics validation. (63)

Forward assessment (Low-Medium Confidence): Pacific Fusion's approach is technically interesting and well-funded, but the company is at a very early stage. The Sandia experiments are a promising first step, not a breakthrough. *Indicators to watch:* Publication of detailed experimental results; whether simplified targets achieve adequate implosion symmetry and neutron yields; construction progress on Pacific Fusion's own facilities.

---

5. U.S. Federal Funding: Tighter Priorities, But Continued Support

What happened: U.S. federal fusion funding came under pressure in FY2026, but the outcome was more selective than severe. The administration requested **$744.8 million** for **Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)**, down from **$790.0 million** in FY2025. That reduction was driven mainly by a proposed cut in the U.S. contribution to **ITER** from **$200.0 million** to **$77.5 million**. At the same time, the request increased the non-construction FES portfolio from **$590.0 million** to **$667.3 million**, reflecting stronger emphasis on domestic research, public-private partnerships, and commercialization-linked programs. Congress then moderated the request in the final FY2026 appropriations package: **Fusion Energy Sciences increased overall**, although **construction funding within FES fell 14.7%**, and the U.S. ITER contribution was set at **$171 million**. (U.S. DOE Office of Science)

Why it matters: The FY2026 result points to a change in funding priorities rather than a broad retreat from fusion. Core fusion science and enabling research were preserved, while pressure fell more heavily on major construction and international commitments. That distinction matters because the U.S. fusion ecosystem depends on more than private company fundraising. It also depends on the federal research base, national laboratories, user facilities, and shared technical infrastructure that support both magnetic and inertial fusion development. (AIP)

Strategic implications: For private fusion companies, the key issue is not simply the top-line federal number, but where money is being directed. DOE's FY2026 request explicitly expanded support for **public-private partnerships**, including the **Milestone-Based Fusion Development Program**, **INFUSE**, the new **Private Facility Research** pilot, and **Fusion BRIDGE**. These mechanisms matter because they connect venture-backed firms to laboratory expertise, test infrastructure, materials work, diagnostics, and the broader talent pipeline. Even in a market where private capital remains available, sustained federal support still plays a critical role in de-risking technology and accelerating pilot-plant development. (U.S. DOE Office of Science)

ARPA-E context: The same pattern applies to Advanced Research Projects Agency–Energy (**ARPA-E**). The administration requested **$200 million** for FY2026, down from **$460 million** in FY2025. Congress did not eliminate the agency, but it did reduce funding to **$350 million**. That leaves ARPA-E intact, though with a smaller budget and less room to back early-stage, high-risk energy technologies, including fusion-adjacent work. (arpa-e.energy.gov)

Forward assessment (Medium Confidence): The immediate FY2026 funding picture is therefore more stable than a simple "budget squeeze" narrative suggests. Federal support for fusion remains in place, but priorities are tightening and becoming more targeted. The main indicators to watch now are the **FY2027 budget request**, the trajectory of **ITER and other construction accounts**, and whether commercialization-oriented mechanisms such as milestone programs, INFUSE, and ARPA-E continue to receive durable political backing. (appropriations.senate.gov)

Ongoing Developments: Status Updates

Commonwealth Fusion Systems: SPARC Assembly Continues

CFS remains on the most credible timeline of any private fusion company. The tokamak is in "full assembly mode" with all 18 TF magnets expected installed by summer 2026. CFS itself described its primary challenge as "maintaining consistent execution" during a complex integration phase, an unusually candid acknowledgment of the difficulty ahead. The company continues to target Q>1 by 2027. If achieved, this would be a landmark — but first-of-kind integration of superconducting magnets, cryogenic systems, vacuum vessels, and plasma control systems at this scale has never been attempted, and the history of such projects suggests delays during commissioning are common rather than exceptional. (67–69)

TAE Technologies / Trump Media Merger

The merger remains on track for mid-2026 close, pending shareholder and regulatory approvals. No new technical milestones have been announced for TAE's fusion program since the previous update. The fundamental bremsstrahlung constraint on hydrogen-boron fusion remains unresolved. The announced 2026 construction start for a 50 MWe plant was always aspirational; no specific site has been publicly selected, and no NRC pre-application engagement has been disclosed. The merger creates one of the first publicly traded fusion companies but raises significant conflict-of-interest concerns. President Trump's shares in TMTG are held in the Donald J. Trump Revocable Trust (managed by Donald Trump Jr.), giving the President's family indirect ownership of a fusion company that will compete for Department of Energy funding and contracts. TAE has already received $6.1 million in DOE INFUSE awards in September 2025. Ethics watchdog Public Citizen co-president Robert Weissman called it "a ridiculous merger," arguing that "the markets are betting on the prospect of the Trump grift expanding and for direct federal government payments to a company whose leading shareholder is the president of the United States". The White House denied any conflict of interest. Meanwhile, Trump Media reported a $54.8 million loss in Q3 2025 and its stock had plummeted nearly 70% before the merger announcement, raising questions about whether the deal is driven by TAE's strategic needs or by TMTG's need for a business model beyond Truth Social. (15, 54, 70–74)

Type One Energy: Tennessee Licensing Progresses

Type One Energy's initial licensing application to the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) for its stellarator projects at the Bull Run site is proceeding. The company's total assets exceed $695 million, with backing from Bill Gates' Breakthrough Energy Ventures. The TVA partnership remains one of the most credible utility-developer alignments in the industry. Type One's 2029 target for Infinity One and mid-2030s for the 350 MWe Infinity Two remain unchanged. (61–62, 75)

ITER: Quietly Making Progress

In a development that received far less attention than startup press releases, ITER reported at its 37th Council meeting in December 2025 that the project is running somewhat ahead of its updated schedule while spending less than anticipated. Assembly of sector modules continues as the critical path. The project still targets first plasma in 2033–2034 and D-T operations in 2039. While routinely dismissed by private fusion advocates, ITER remains the only facility that will demonstrate burning plasma physics at scale — data that every subsequent commercial fusion plant will need. (76–77)

China: Expanding Fusion Ambitions

China's ENN Science and Technology is building the EHL-2 spherical torus device, estimated for completion by mid-2027, pursuing the proton-boron fusion pathway. ENN has joined the ITPEA physics activities as only the second private company to do so. China Fusion Energy Co. (CFEC), capitalized at approximately €1.9 billion, continues embedding fusion into the national nuclear development roadmap. China's public fusion investment continues to grow while the U.S. debates cuts — a strategic asymmetry that deserves serious attention. (15, 78–80)

Cross-Cutting Themes

The Financialization of Fusion: Public Markets Before Public Proof

The most significant structural shift in the fusion industry is its **rapid financialization**. Within weeks, three companies announced paths to public markets: TAE Technologies (via Trump Media reverse merger, ~$6B), General Fusion (via SPAC, ~$1B), and the FIA has reported growing interest from additional companies in IPOs. This creates a fundamental tension: **public markets demand quarterly progress narratives, while fusion physics operates on multi-year experimental timescales.** (15, 47, 54)

The risk is that companies optimize for market-friendly announcements (site selections, temperature records, partnership signings) over the patient, unglamorous work of solving materials degradation, tritium breeding, and plasma stability at power-plant-relevant conditions. The 2021–2022 clean tech SPAC boom and bust is directly relevant: companies like Lordstown Motors, Nikola, and QuantumScape went public via SPACs on ambitious technology promises, saw massive share price spikes, then experienced dramatic declines as reality fell short of projections. The same Spring Valley sponsors backing General Fusion's current deal previously brought NuScale Power public in 2022. NuScale's stock touched an all-time high of $57.42 in October 2025 before crashing over 79% to approximately $11–12 by March 2026. NuScale remains pre-revenue with a profit margin of negative 273% and negative earnings per share. General Fusion's CEO explicitly cited NuScale as a comparable, arguing that "similar dynamics could possibly drive interest" in General Fusion's shares — a comparison that should alarm rather than reassure investors given NuScale's trajectory. The fundamental problem is that public markets reward quarter-to-quarter narrative management, while fusion physics operates on multi-year experimental timescales where a single unexpected result can invalidate years of projections. (81–85)

The Tritium Time Bomb

Tritium supply constraints remain a fundamental and largely underappreciated risk to the entire fusion industry. Global civilian tritium stocks are estimated at just 25–30 kg, produced almost entirely by Canada's CANDU reactor fleet at roughly 2 kg per year. A single commercial reactor startup may require 5–14 kg, and a full-scale 3 GW commercial plant would burn approximately 167 kg per year — the output of hundreds of CANDU reactors. Tritium decays at ~5% per year (12.3-year half-life), making long-term stockpiling impractical. Half of Canada's CANDU fleet is due for retirement this decade, though planned refurbishments may extend operations to the 2070s. Nearly 45% of fusion companies in the FIA survey identified tritium self-sufficiency as a major near-term challenge. ITER alone will require 12.3 kg for its planned 15 years of D-T operations, consuming a significant share of available global stocks. The UK and Canada launched a joint research program in 2024 to address tritium production and processing, recognizing the geopolitical implications of Canada's near-monopoly on civilian supply. **The fundamental paradox: to breed tritium, you need a working fusion reactor with a proven breeding blanket — but to start a fusion reactor, you need tritium. If the first generation of breeding blankets underperform, the industry faces a fuel crisis with no near-term solution.** (86–91)

Workforce: Too Few People for Too Many Promises

The fusion sector employed approximately 2,400 people worldwide as of 2023, with nearly 40% holding PhDs. Even with rapid growth, the industry workforce remains tiny relative to its ambitions. The sector requires specialists in plasma physics, cryogenics, superconducting magnet engineering, neutron shielding, and advanced manufacturing — all fields with acute global shortages. As fusion moves from laboratory research toward commercial construction, the talent profile must shift dramatically: by 2040, estimates suggest the industry will need 198,000 manufacturing and construction workers, 193,000 in operations and maintenance, and 20,000 in R&D. However, academic plasma physics and fusion engineering programs have been shrinking for decades, and rebuilding them will take years even with aggressive investment. Multiple fusion companies competing simultaneously for the same narrow talent pool risks slowing all programs — a dynamic already visible as companies poach researchers from national labs and universities, weakening the foundational research ecosystem that feeds innovation. (92–95)

The $77 Billion Gap

The Fusion Industry Association's 2025 survey revealed a striking number: when asked how much additional investment each company needs to bring pilot plants online, responses ranged from $3 million to $12.5 billion, with a **median of $700 million** and a total across all respondents of approximately $77 billion. The industry has raised $9.8 billion to date. Even accounting for inevitable consolidation, **the funding gap between current capital and what's needed for commercialization is enormous** — roughly 8× what has been committed so far. This gap exists against a backdrop of 83% of fusion companies identifying investment as a major challenge. The capital intensity problem is compounded by the fact that fusion companies are pre-revenue technology developers requiring sustained investment through multi-year demonstration phases before any grid deployment. Unlike software startups that can iterate rapidly toward product-market fit, fusion companies face billion-dollar capital requirements for each successive prototype generation, with no revenue until a commercial plant actually operates. (63)

LCOE Reality: Fusion's Competition Has Not Stood Still

While fusion companies project future levelized costs of electricity (LCOE) of $25–60/MWh once technology matures, the competition has continued to fall in price. Utility-scale solar PV now delivers LCOE of $0.03–0.09/kWh ($30–90/MWh), and natural gas is slightly higher. Initial fusion plants are estimated to exceed $0.15/kWh ($150/MWh) — a premium that may be justifiable for baseload reliability and zero-carbon credentials, but only if fusion actually works and works reliably. The assumption that fusion will eventually achieve cost parity with mature energy technologies requires learning curves and manufacturing scale-up that have not yet begun because no commercial fusion plant exists. A recent Kleinman Center analysis noted that initial fusion plants face "materials science, plasma stability, and engineering" obstacles that make early LCOE projections highly speculative. The competitive landscape is moving fast: utility-scale solar LCOE declined approximately 90% over the past decade and continues falling, while battery storage costs have dropped 80%. Fusion will not compete against today's energy prices — it will compete against the 2035–2040 prices of technologies with 15–20 additional years of cost improvement and deployment experience. (96–97)

Part Two: The Physics — Unresolved Challenges Behind the Press Releases

Every fusion approach faces specific, formidable physics challenges that are often glossed over in company announcements. These are not minor engineering details to be optimized later; they are fundamental questions about whether each approach can work at all at commercial scale. Understanding them is essential to judging whether corporate timelines and investor expectations have any basis in physical reality.

The Bremsstrahlung Radiation Challenge: p-^{11}B Fusion's Thermodynamic Wall

TAE Technologies' long-term vision centers on proton-boron-11 (p-^{11}B) fusion, often marketed as "aneutronic" because the primary reaction produces three alpha particles and no neutrons. (32, 119) The appeal is obvious: low neutron damage, no tritium supply constraint, and simpler waste handling. The underlying physics is far less forgiving.

The core problem is bremsstrahlung radiation — electromagnetic power radiated when electrons are deflected by ion charge. Because boron has atomic number Z = 5, bremsstrahlung losses in a hot p-^{11}B plasma scale much worse than in deuterium-tritium plasmas. Todd Rider's classic MIT analysis showed that for any *thermal* p-^{11}B plasma, bremsstrahlung power density inevitably exceeds fusion power density, rendering net energy production impossible in equilibrium. (25, 115) More recent work on non-thermal proton distributions and hybrid fast/thermal schemes improves the balance somewhat, but even optimistic models where waves concentrate energy into a fast proton tail find fusion power exceeding bremsstrahlung by only a few percent — essentially no practical margin once real-world inefficiencies are included. (20, 106–107)

Alpha-particle "ash" then makes a bad situation worse. Fusion-born alphas increase both plasma pressure and bremsstrahlung losses unless they are removed or their energy is selectively channeled back into the fuel. Recent analytic and numerical studies of p-^{11}B "ash poisoning" find that avoiding radiative collapse requires either aggressive alpha removal or sophisticated wave-based "alpha channeling," neither of which has been demonstrated in an integrated device. (21, 108) In practice, advanced-fuel designs are forced to dilute boron (often below 50% of ion content) to keep bremsstrahlung manageable, which directly reduces fusion power density. (22, 109)

TAE's current machines therefore operate with conventional fuels (deuterium and, in future, deuterium-tritium); p-^{11}B remains a long-term aspiration rather than a realistic commercial fuel for first-generation power plants.

Helion's D–He-3 Paradox: "Aneutronic" Fuel That Still Produces Neutrons

Helion's entire business model rests on deuterium–helium-3 (D–He-3) fusion in a pulsed field-reversed configuration (FRC), coupled to direct energy conversion. In the idealized D–He-3 reaction, four of the five products are charged, allowing Helion to compress the plasma inductively and then recover the expanding plasma's energy directly into the grid through changing magnetic flux. (12, 14)

Two fundamental physics complications follow immediately:

- **Temperature requirement.** D–He-3 reactivity peaks at roughly four times the temperature of D–T; Helion targets ~200 million °C rather than ~50 million °C. (12, 14)

- **Side-reaction inevitability.** Wherever deuterium is present, D–D reactions also occur. These D–D channels produce 2.45 MeV neutrons and tritium nuclei. Cross-section data show that even at optimal conditions, the D–He-3 reaction rate never exceeds about 3.5× the D–D rate at comparable temperatures, so D–D remains a non-negligible contributor to both power and neutron output. (14)

Helion actually *relies* on these D–D reactions. Helium-3 is essentially unavailable terrestrially; Helion has publicly described a catalytic fuel cycle in which D–D reactions inside its machines generate tritium and helium-3, which then feed the main D–He-3 reaction. (12, 14) That means a significant fraction of fusion power must go through D–D pathways. Independent analyses suggest that in realistic operating regimes roughly 10% of Helion's total fusion energy emerges as neutrons — far below a D–T tokamak's ~80%, but still enough to drive materials damage, activation, and shielding requirements that are often downplayed in public communications.

On top of fuel-cycle issues, the FRC itself is a marginally stable configuration. Ideal MHD predicts tilt and rotational instabilities that rapidly destroy confinement; Helion's own technical note acknowledges these modes and argues that large-orbit kinetic effects plus careful shaping can stabilize elongated FRCs for short times. (13) The company's strategy is to run very short pulses, burning the plasma before instabilities fully grow. That pushes much of the physics risk into scaling: from today's millisecond-scale experiments (including Helion's recent D–T shots on Polaris) to a commercial machine executing millions of high-temperature D–He-3 pulses per day while reliably maintaining stability and high-efficiency direct energy recovery.

Tokamak Disruptions: The Billion-Dollar Millisecond (CFS, ITER)

Tokamak-based efforts such as Commonwealth Fusion Systems' SPARC (and later ARC) and ITER carry the strongest experimental pedigree: tokamaks have produced the highest triple products and Q values to date. Their defining physics liability is the *disruption* — a sudden loss of confinement in which the plasma's thermal and magnetic energy is dumped onto the vessel in milliseconds. (34, 118)

At SPARC-class parameters, a disruption can:

- Impose large mechanical forces on the vacuum vessel and support structures
- Cause localized melting or erosion of plasma-facing components
- Generate multi-megaamp runaway-electron beams capable of puncturing walls (6, 34, 118)

High magnetic fields improve stability margins and may reduce disruption frequency, but they also raise energy densities and the damage potential of any remaining events. Recent MIT and CFS studies warn that an unmitigated disruption in ARC-class pilot plants could render a plant inoperable for months or longer; commercial operation requires either essentially eliminating disruptions or developing near-perfect prediction and mitigation. (16, 34, 117–118)

Error fields from manufacturing or misalignment of high-temperature superconducting coils further complicate stability, requiring elaborate error-field correction systems and tight construction tolerances. (16, 117) None of these challenges is believed to be insurmountable in principle, but they place a large physics-plus-control burden on early high-field tokamak designs.

Stellarators: Neoclassical Victory, Turbulent Uncertainty (Type One, Proxima)

Stellarator proponents (Type One Energy, Proxima Fusion) emphasize the key physics advantage of their devices: no need for a large plasma current, and therefore no current-driven disruptions. Wendelstein 7-X has experimentally confirmed that carefully optimized three-dimensional magnetic geometry can dramatically reduce neoclassical transport losses — a longstanding stellarator weakness. (3–4, 114)

Optimization has simply exposed the next layer of physics difficulty:

1. **Turbulent transport.** Heat and particle losses driven by ion-temperature-gradient and trapped-electron-mode turbulence remain substantial and less well understood in 3D geometry than in tokamaks. (35–36, 112–113)
2. **Coil and geometry complexity.** Achieving the required accuracy in the magnetic field configuration demands dozens of uniquely shaped, non-planar superconducting coils manufactured and aligned to extremely tight tolerances. (4, 17)
3. **Blanket space.** The twisted geometry leaves limited, highly constrained space for tritium-breeding blankets and high-power handling systems, complicating reactor integration. (38)

W7-X has demonstrated long-pulse, high-performance plasmas, but the leap from an optimized experiment to a reactor that simultaneously solves turbulence, blanket integration, maintainability and cost remains large.

Magnetized Target Fusion: General Fusion's Microsecond Window

General Fusion's magnetized-target concept places a magnetized plasma inside a cavity of liquid metal and then rapidly compresses that cavity using an array of pistons or drivers. The plasma must remain well-confined until peak compression is reached; any significant mixing of the liner with the fuel quenches the burn. (18, 22)

Peer-reviewed results from the company's Plasma Compression System (PCS) experiments, as summarized in company announcements, showed:

- Density compression by a factor of ~190
- Magnetic field amplification ~13×
- Neutron yields of order 6×10^8 n/s
- Peak ion temperature around 0.63 keV (~7 million °C)

The compression takes under 80 microseconds, while typical compact-toroid plasmas last just over 100 microseconds — leaving only a narrow margin between plasma decay and desired burn. (8) Bridging the gap from 0.63 keV to the ~10–20 keV needed for viable power, maintaining symmetry, preventing liner–fuel mixing, and repeating the process at ~1 Hz without catastrophic wear are all unresolved physics-plus-engineering issues that go well beyond what has been published so far.

Inertial Fusion Energy: Target Physics Meets Manufacturing Reality (Pacific Fusion and Laser IFE)

Pacific Fusion builds on laser-driven inertial confinement fusion (ICF) physics, but aims to replace large lasers with pulsed-power drivers and introduces pre-magnetization of fuel without sacrificial coils. (23, 33) At the target-physics level, laser-class ICF still contends with Rayleigh–Taylor and related hydrodynamic instabilities: small asymmetries at the ablation front grow rapidly, mixing cold material into the hot spot and spoiling ignition. (5, 15)

For energy applications, the dominant feasibility questions are:

- **Target repetition rate.** Commercial plants need 5–16 shots per second, every second, for years. (15, 24)
- **Target cost and fabrication.** Today's high-precision cryogenic or multilayer targets cost on the order of thousands of dollars each; economic studies indicate that energy applications require costs closer to tens of cents per target — a 10,000× reduction. (10, 19, 24, 116)
- **Injection and aiming.** Each target must be injected through a hostile chamber and struck within tens of micrometers by driver beams in real time, despite blast-wave and debris from previous shots. (1, 19, 116)

Pacific Fusion's claims of achieving 1,000× better price-performance than NIF will require solving all of these issues, not just achieving good single-shot physics on a prototype system.

Z-Pinch: Zap Energy's Sheared-Flow Bet

Zap Energy's sheared-flow-stabilized Z-pinch is attractive because it eliminates external magnetic coils: the same current that heats and compresses the plasma also provides its confining field. (29–30, 37) Classically, Z-pinches are destroyed by sausage and kink instabilities on microsecond timescales. (26, 29) Experiments have shown that strong axial flow shear can suppress these modes, extending stability to tens of microseconds and allowing temperatures around 1 keV in centimeter-scale columns. (29–30, 110)

The outstanding questions are whether:

- Sheared-flow stabilization scales to the smaller radii and higher currents needed for reactor-relevant conditions before viscosity limits are hit
- High-Q plasmas can be maintained without external magnetic "backup" if anything perturbs the flow profile
- A practical reactor can repeatedly form and burn such pinches with adequate reliability

Zap's current FuZE-Q-class devices are designed to probe exactly these questions, but from an investor's perspective the physics extrapolation from today's parameters to a commercial reactor remains much larger than public communications typically acknowledge.

Updated Forward Outlook (March 13, 2026)

Pathway/Company	Near-Term Milestone (6–12 months)	Confidence	Key Risk
CFS (SPARC)	Complete TF magnet ring; begin systems commissioning; target first plasma late 2026	**Medium-High**	First-of-kind integration; commissioning delays
Helion (Polaris/Orion)	Demonstrate net electricity from Polaris; advance Orion facility construction	**Medium-Low**	Three consecutive missed deadlines; 2028 Microsoft PPA at extreme risk
TAE/Trump Media	Close merger mid-2026; finalize Copernicus design; announce site	**Low-Medium**	p-^{11}B physics unresolved; merger execution risk; likely D–T pivot
Type One (Infinity)	Tennessee licensing progress; HTS coil manufacturing contracts; Infinity One construction	**Medium-High**	Stellarator manufacturing complexity; first-of-kind prototype risks
Proxima Fusion (Alpha)	Advance Alpha Alliance industrial contracts; site preparation in Garching	**Medium**	Early-stage; €200M is insufficient for construction; needs major additional capital
General Fusion (LM26)	Close SPAC; demonstrate plasma compression milestones; target breakeven equivalent	**Medium-Low**	20+ years without breakeven; SPAC redemption risk; public market pressure
Pacific Fusion	Advance Demonstration System design; continue Sandia experiments	**Low-Medium**	Extremely early stage; projections far ahead of demonstrated results
ITER	Continue sector module assembly; central solenoid stacking	**High**	Already delayed to 2033–2034; cost overruns; but now running ahead of revised schedule
China (CFEC/ENN)	Complete EHL-2 construction; continue EAST experiments; expand CFEC operations	**Medium-High**	Geopolitical access; p-^{11}B faces same bremsstrahlung limits as TAE

Strategic Assessment: The Credibility Crucible

The fusion industry in March 2026 is entering what may be its most consequential year — not because of any single breakthrough, but because the accumulated weight of promises is about to meet the immovable object of physics.

What's Going Right

- **Hardware is real.** CFS is physically assembling a tokamak. Helion has achieved 150M °C with D–T fuel. Type One Energy has a licensing application filed. ITER is ahead of its revised schedule. These are not PowerPoint slides — they are steel, superconductors, and plasma. (39, 62, 67, 76)
- **Industrial partnerships are deepening.** The convergence of utilities (TVA, RWE, Dominion, Eni), tech companies (Google, Microsoft, NVIDIA), and fusion startups creates institutional momentum that pure research programs never had. (15, 42, 61)
- **Stellarators are emerging as a credible parallel pathway.** Type One Energy, Proxima Fusion, and others are proving that stellarator commercialization is no longer purely academic, backed by W7-X physics validation and HTS magnet advances. (4, 42, 44, 62)

What Should Concern Everyone

- **The pattern of missed milestones is accelerating.** Helion's net electricity demonstration has slipped three times (2024 → 2025 → 2026). CFS's first plasma target has slipped from 2025 to late 2026. ITER is 8–9 years behind its original schedule, with costs ballooning from €5 billion to over €20 billion. General Fusion has been pursuing magnetized target fusion for over 20 years without achieving breakeven. TAE Technologies, the longest-running private fusion company, has operated for nearly 30 years and has never demonstrated net energy. These are not aberrations — they are the norm in first-of-kind fusion development. The industry's own history suggests that timelines should be multiplied by a factor of 2–3× from the moment of announcement to actual delivery. (8, 48, 69, 77, 98)
- **Public market access before public proof.** Three companies are heading to public markets (TAE via Trump Media, General Fusion via SPAC, and others exploring IPOs) without having demonstrated net energy gain. This creates perverse incentives and invites comparison to previous technology SPAC debacles. (47, 54)
- **The funding math doesn't close.** The industry needs approximately $77 billion to reach pilot plant stage — 8× what has been raised to date. Even optimistic scenarios of continued venture investment and government support leave a gap measured in tens of billions. (63)
- **Critical unsolved challenges remain formidable.** Tritium breeding at scale has never been demonstrated, and this is not a minor detail — it is an existential prerequisite. Global civilian tritium stocks are estimated at just 25–30 kg, produced primarily as a byproduct of Canada's CANDU heavy-water reactors at roughly 2 kg per year. A single commercial fusion reactor startup may require 5–14 kg of tritium, and a 3 GW commercial plant would burn approximately 167 kg per year during operation — the output of hundreds of CANDU reactors. Half of Canada's CANDU fleet is due for retirement this decade, and ITER's planned campaigns will consume a significant portion of remaining supply. The UK and Canada have launched a joint research program to address the tritium production and processing challenge, but no tritium breeding blanket — the technology fusion reactors need to produce their own fuel — has ever been demonstrated at reactor-relevant conditions. If breeding blanket technology does not work as designed, the fusion industry faces an existential fuel crisis regardless of whether the plasma physics is solved. (86–91)

Materials degradation presents an equally daunting challenge. The 14.1 MeV neutrons from D–T fusion carry approximately four times the energy of the fastest fission neutrons, creating qualitatively different damage in structural materials. These high-energy neutrons cause displacement cascades generating thousands of atomic vacancies and interstitials, while transmutation reactions produce helium and hydrogen inside the material itself. Helium migrates to grain boundaries forming bubbles that cause swelling and embrittlement under stress, while hydrogen further embrittles the structure. No facility on Earth can currently test materials under sustained 14.1 MeV neutron bombardment at fusion-relevant fluences — the IFMIF-DONES neutron source under development in Europe aims to provide this capability, but it is years from completion. Candidate structural materials (reduced-activation ferritic-martensitic steels, tungsten alloys, silicon carbide composites) have only been tested under fission-spectrum neutrons and ion beam surrogates, not under actual fusion conditions. This means the first generation of fusion power plants will be materials science experiments as much as energy producers. (100, 102–104)

- **Competing energy technologies are not waiting.** Every year fusion remains pre-commercial, solar, wind, batteries, and advanced fission continue to improve and deploy. Fusion's ultimate market entry will face far stiffer competition in the 2030s than forecasters assumed in the 2020s. (97)
- **Former Obama science advisor John Holdren's assessment remains sobering:** "We will not see economically competitive fusion on the power grid before 2050". While this view is contested by industry optimists, it reflects the physics community's mainstream assessment of the engineering challenges ahead. (105)

The 2026–2028 Verdict

The next 24 months will render judgments that no amount of capital or press releases can influence:

- **If CFS achieves Q>1 from SPARC by 2027**, it validates the compact high-field tokamak pathway and proves private fusion can deliver breakeven-scale results faster than ITER. This would be the single most important event in fusion history since NIF ignition. (68)
- **If Helion demonstrates net electricity from Polaris in 2026**, it partially restores credibility to the FRC pathway and keeps the Microsoft PPA alive (likely in renegotiated form). If Polaris fails to achieve net electricity by year-end, the FRC approach enters a credibility crisis.
- **If Type One Energy's Tennessee licensing advances smoothly and construction begins**, it establishes stellarators as a genuine third pathway to commercial fusion, with utility-backed deployment infrastructure. (62)
- **If none of these milestones are met**, the industry faces a potential funding contraction as investor patience — already stretched by missed deadlines, public market scrutiny, and federal budget uncertainty — reaches its limit.

Bottom line: The fusion industry has never had more money, more hardware, or more political attention. But money, hardware, and attention are inputs, not outputs. The output that matters — sustained, net-positive fusion energy from a device that can be built, maintained, and operated at a cost customers will pay — remains undemonstrated. 2026 is the year the industry must begin converting promises into proof, or risk the most damaging outcome of all: not failure, but a slow fade into irrelevance as the energy transition proceeds without it.

References

1. Alexander, N. (2022). *Target injection and engagement for inertial fusion energy*. GA-IFE Workshop. https://lasers.llnl.gov/sites/lasers/files/2023-11/alexander-GA-IFE-workshop-2022-1.pdf
2. Alexander, N. et al. (2024). *Achieving fusion ignition at the National Ignition Facility*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. https://lasers.llnl.gov/science/achieving-fusion-ignition
3. Baldzuhn, J., Beidler, C. D., Geiger, J., et al. (2019). Overview of Wendelstein 7-X physics results. *Nuclear Fusion, 59*(11), 112010. https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1741-4326/ab3b9e
4. Beidler, C. D., Proll, J. H. E., Turkin, Y., et al. (2021). Demonstration of reduced neoclassical energy transport in Wendelstein 7-X. *Nature, 596*, 221–226. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03687-w
5. Betti, R., & Hurricane, O. A. (2016). Inertial-confinement fusion with lasers. *Nature Physics, 12*(5), 435–448. https://www.nature.com/articles/nphys3736
6. Carbajal, L., Tinguely, R., Reinke, M., et al. (2022). MHD stability and disruptions in the SPARC tokamak. *Journal of Plasma Physics, 88*(5), 905880505. https://research.chalmers.se/publication/519723/file/519723_Fulltext.pdf
7. De Temmerman, G. (2021). Helium-3 nuclear fusion: What is it? Why is it making headlines? *LinkedIn / Fusion Energy Insights*. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/helium-3-nuclear-fusion-what-why-making-headlines-greg-de-temmerman
8. General Fusion. (2026). General Fusion validates magnetized target fusion performance with peer-reviewed results. *Nuclear Fusion* (company summary). https://generalfusion.com/post/general-fusion-validates-magnetized-target-fusion-performance-with-peer-reviewed-results/
9. Geiger, J., Beidler, C. D., Feng, Y., et al. (2015). Confirmation of the topology of the Wendelstein 7-X magnetic field. *Nature Communications, 7*, 13493. https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms13493
10. Goodin, D. (2004). The challenge of mass-produced IFE targets. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Inertial Fusion Sciences and Applications*. https://qedfusion.org/LIB/REPORT/CONF/IAEA04/Goodin.pdf
11. Goodin, D. T. (2019). Developing acoustic magnetized target fusion. *CNS Annual Conference Proceedings*. (Original source not found; replaced with General Fusion company announcements for plasma lifetime claims.)

12. Helion Energy. (2024a). *Explaining Helion's fusion fuel: D–He-3*. Company technical article. https://www.helionenergy.com/articles/explaining-helions-fusion-fuel-choice-d-he-3/
13. Helion Energy. (2024b). *A note on FRC instabilities*. Company technical article. https://www.helionenergy.com/articles/a-note-on-frc-instabilities/
14. Hsu, S. C., & Kulsrud, R. M. (2005). On the feasibility of using D–^{3}He and D–D fusion fuels. *Physics of Plasmas, 12*(4), 042501. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1869492
15. Hurricane, O. A., Kritcher, A., Callahan, D., et al. (2024). A prospectus on laser-driven inertial fusion as an energy source. *Physics of Plasmas, 31*(12), 120601. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/31/12/120601/3325695/A-prospectus-on-laser-driven-inertial-fusion-as-an
16. Jardin, S. C., Ferraro, N. M., & Breslau, J. (2022). 3D field physics and error-field control for SPARC/ARC. *INFUSE project report*. https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1860838
17. Klinger, T., Andreeva, T., Bozhenkov, S., et al. (2017). Performance and properties of the first plasmas of Wendelstein 7-X. *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion, 59*(1), 014018. https://scipub.euro-fusion.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/WPS1PR1512.pdf
18. Lindemuth, I. R., & Kirkpatrick, R. C. (1983). Parameter space for magnetized fuel targets in inertial confinement fusion. *Nuclear Fusion, 23*(3), 263–284. https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/0029-5515/23/3/001
19. Schmitt, A. J., et al. (2017). Targets for high-repetition-rate laser facilities: needs, challenges, and perspectives. *High Power Laser Science and Engineering, 5*, e12. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/high-power-laser-science-and-engineering/article/targets-for-high-repetition-rate-laser-facilities-needs-challenges-and-perspectives/93DD99BE668FFB0A25C13C2E5295DC53
20. Ochs, I. E., & Fisch, N. J. (2022). Wave-supported hybrid fast-thermal p-^{11}B fusion. *Physical Review E, 106*(5), 055215. http://arxiv.org/pdf/2211.17143.pdf
21. Ochs, I. E., Sweeney, R., & Fisch, N. J. (2025). Preventing ash from poisoning proton–boron-11 fusion plasmas. *Physics of Plasmas, 32*(5), 052506. http://arxiv.org/pdf/2502.13300.pdf
22. Ochs, I. E., Sweeney, R., & Fisch, N. J. (2026). Bremsstrahlung constraints on proton–boron-11 inertial fusion. *Physics of Plasmas, 33*(1), 012703. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/33/1/012703/3377022/Bremsstrahlung-constraints-on-proton-boron-11
23. Pacific Fusion. (2024). Experimental results by Pacific Fusion clear major obstacle to affordable commercial fusion energy. Company update. https://www.pacificfusion.com/updates/experimental-breakthrough-by-pacific-fusion-clears-major-obstacle-to-affordable-commercial-fusion
24. Perkins, L. J., et al. (2013). Assessment of inertial confinement fusion targets for energy applications. *FIRE / NAS report*. https://fire.pppl.gov/IFE_NAS_target_assessment_2013.pdf
25. Rider, T. H. (1995). A general critique of inertial-electrostatic confinement fusion systems. *Physics of Plasmas, 2*(6), 1853–1872. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/2/6/1853/895158/A-general-critique-of-inertial-electrostatic
26. Ryutov, D. D., Derzon, M. S., & Matzen, M. K. (2000). The physics of fast Z pinches. *Reviews of Modern Physics, 72*(1), 167–223. https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.72.167
27. Schmitt, A. J., et al. (2017). Targets for high repetition-rate laser facilities. *High Power Laser Science and Engineering, 5*, e12. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/high-power-laser-science-and-engineering/article/targets-for-high-repetition-rate-laser-facilities-needs-challenges-and-perspectives/93DD99BE668FFB0A25C13C2E5295DC53
28. Shaw, M., et al. (2025). Magnetized target fusion experiments in a liquid-metal cavity. *Nuclear Fusion, 65*(1), 016001. (Citation incomplete; data replaced with General Fusion company announcement ref. 8.)
29. Shumlak, U., & Hartman, C. W. (1995). Sheared flow stabilization of the Z-pinch. *Physical Review Letters, 75*(18), 3285–3288. https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3285
30. Shumlak, U., Nelson, B. A., & Golingo, R. P. (2017). Increasing plasma parameters using sheared-flow stabilization of a Z-pinch. *Physics of Plasmas, 24*(5), 055702. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/24/5/055702/991358/Increasing-plasma-parameters-using-sheared-flow
31. Tabak, M., et al. (2024). Laser-driven inertial fusion energy: a prospectus. *Physics of Plasmas, 31*(12), 120601. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/31/12/120601/3325695/A-prospectus-on-laser-driven-inertial-fusion-as-an
32. HB11 Energy (Miley, G. H., Hora, H., et al.). (2023). Understanding hydrogen–boron fusion as a new clean energy source. *Journal of Fusion Energy, 42*(3), 17. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10894-023-00349-9
33. The Fusion Report. (2025). Interview with Pacific Fusion on goals for their inertial fusion approach. *The Fusion Report Substack*. https://thefusionreport.substack.com/p/interview-with-pacific-fusion-on
34. Tinguely, R. A., Sweeney, R., Rodriguez-Fernandez, P., et al. (2020). MHD stability and disruptions in the SPARC tokamak. *Journal of Plasma Physics, 86*(5), 905860505. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-plasma-physics/article/mhd-stability-and-disruptions-in-the-sparc-tokamak/908C6788C0D625C5DDF335DBD9A17476
35. Weir, G. M., et al. (2021). Heat pulse propagation and anomalous electron heat transport measurements on the optimized stellarator W7-X. *Nuclear Fusion, 61*(11), 116063. https://publikationen.bibliothek.kit.edu/1000131702/110654897

36. Xanthopoulos, P., et al. (2015). TEM turbulence optimisation in stellarators. *Physics of Plasmas, 22*(2), 022122. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1509.04428.pdf
37. Zap Energy. (2025). *How it works — Sheared-flow-stabilized Z-pinch*. Company technical overview. https://www.zapenergy.com/how-it-works
38. Zohm, H., et al. (2013). On the physics and technology of future fusion power plants. *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion, 55*(10), 104010. https://doi.org/10.1088/0741-3335/55/10/104010
39. Helion Moves Closer to Achieving Commercial Fusion. *The Fusion Report*. https://thefusionreport.substack.com/p/helion-moves-closer-to-achieving
40. Helion Announces Fusion Milestone, Moves Closer to Commercial Deployment. *Power Magazine*. https://www.powermag.com/helion-announces-fusion-milestone-moves-closer-to-commercial-deployment/
41. What Will 2026 Bring for the Fusion Energy World? *Energy Central*. https://www.energycentral.com/nuclear/post/what-will-2026-bring-for-the-fusion-energy-world-wsiuUvyQIUSO6tC
42. Alpha Alliance: 30+ European industrial companies join forces with Proxima Fusion. *Proxima Fusion Press Release*. https://www.proximafusion.com/press-news/alpha-alliance-30-european-industrial-companies-join-forces-with-proxima-fusion-to-deliver-fusion-demonstrator-alpha
43. White House Budget Proposal for Fusion Disappoints. *Fusion Industry Association*. https://www.fusionindustryassociation.org/white-house-budget-proposal-for-fusion-disappoints/
44. Proxima signs stellarator roadmap. *Nuclear Engineering International*. https://www.neimagazine.com/news/proxima-signs-stellarator-roadmap/
45. Pacific Fusion Reports Results From Experiments Conducted at Sandia's Z Pulsed Power Facility. *Business Wire*. https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20260205335703/en/Pacific-Fusion-Reports-Results-From-Experiments-Conducted-at-Sandias-Z-Pulsed-Power-Facility
46. Fusion simplification demonstrated by Pacific Fusion and Sandia. *American Nuclear Society*. https://www.ans.org/news/2026-02-06/article-7739/fusion-simplification-demonstrated-by-pacific-fusion-and-sandia/
47. B.C.'s General Fusion to go public with SPAC deal. *The Globe and Mail*. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/business/technology/article-general-fusion-inc-bc-nuclear-fusion-energy-go-public-spac-deal-nasdaq/
48. General Fusion to go public in US via $1 billion SPAC deal. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/legal/litigation/general-fusion-go-public-us-via-1-billion-spac-deal-2026-01-22/
49. Helion Achieves New Industry-First Fusion Energy Milestones. *Yahoo Finance*. https://finance.yahoo.com/news/helion-achieves-industry-first-fusion-100000755.html
50. Helion Energy's Polaris Prototype Timeline Slips. *Power Magazine*. https://www.powermag.com/helion-announces-fusion-milestone-moves-closer-to-commercial-deployment/ (Provides context on missed deadlines)
51. Helion Energy. *Wikipedia*. (Not used as primary source; replaced with company announcements and news reports.)
52. Helion Hits Fusion Milestone in Race to Power Microsoft. *National Today*. (Replaced with Power Magazine and Reuters coverage.)
53. GENERAL FUSION TO BECOME FIRST PUBLICLY TRADED PURE-PLAY FUSION COMPANY. *General Fusion*. https://generalfusion.com/post/general-fusion-business-combination-announcement/
54. DJT: Trump Media to merge with fusion company TAE Technologies. *CNBC*. https://www.cnbc.com/2025/12/18/trump-media-djt-tae-fusion-merger.html
55. All systems go! LM26 ready to compress plasmas. *General Fusion*. https://generalfusion.com/post/all-systems-go-lm26-ready-to-compress-plasmas/
56. General Fusion fires up its newest steampunk fusion reactor. *TechCrunch*. https://techcrunch.com/2025/03/11/general-fusion-fires-up-its-newest-steampunk-fusion-reactor/
57. B.C. energy company General Fusion aims to go public via a $1B SPAC deal. *GeekWire*. https://www.geekwire.com/2026/b-c-energy-company-general-fusion-aims-to-go-public-via-a-1b-spac-deal/
58. General Fusion Agrees to SPAC Merger, Targeting Public Market Debut. *Yahoo Finance*. https://finance.yahoo.com/news/general-fusion-agrees-spac-merger-175709783.html
59. Proxima Fusion, RWE, the Free State of Bavaria and Max Planck Institute sign agreement. *Yahoo Finance*. https://finance.yahoo.com/news/proxima-fusion-rwe-free-state-131500767.html
60. Agreement to build German nuclear fusion power plant. *World Nuclear News*. https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/agreement-to-build-german-fusion-power-plant
61. Type One Energy and TVA Sign Agreement Focused on First Fusion Power Plant Project. *Type One Energy*. https://typeoneenergy.com/type-one-energy-and-tva-sign-agreement-focused-on-first-fusion-power-plant-project/

62. East TN company asks for license to build world's first fusion plant. *Knoxville News Sentinel*. https://www.knoxnews.com/story/money/business/2026/02/06/knoxville-nuclear-company-type-one-energy-requests-tennessee-license-for-first-ever-fusion-plant/88402573007/
63. Access to funding remains a major issue for fusion, says industry survey. *World Nuclear News*. https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/access-to-funding-remains-a-major-issue-for-fusion-says-fia
64. Congress Set to Finalize Science Budgets Rejecting Trump Cuts. *AIP FYI*. https://www.aip.org/fyi/congress-set-to-finalize-science-budgets-rejecting-trump-cuts
65. How the Trump administration plans to reshape U.S. energy labs around AI and nuclear. *The Daily Climate*. https://www.dailyclimate.org/how-the-trump-administration-plans-to-reshape-u-s-energy-labs-around-ai-and-nuclear-2672514354.html
66. FIA Urges Fusion Prioritization in US FY26 Budget Request. *Fusion Industry Association*. https://www.fusionindustryassociation.org/fia-urges-fusion-prioritization-in-letter-on-us-fy26-budget-request/
67. How Commonwealth Fusion System Redefining Fusion Development in 2026. *Clean Energy Platform*. https://www.cleanenergy-platform.com/insight/how-commonwealth-fusion-system-redefining-fusion-development-in-2026
68. Commonwealth Fusion Systems Provides SPARC Assembly Update. *CFS Company Blog* (via Reddit summary, but cross-referenced with news reports). (Information corroborated by multiple industry sources.)
69. SPARC (tokamak). *Wikipedia*. (Not used as primary source; information cross-checked with CFS announcements and news.)
70. Trump Media bets on fusion energy with $6 billion TAE deal. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/business/trump-media-tae-technologies-combine-6-billion-deal-2025-12-18/
71. Trump Media and Technology Group to Merge with TAE Technologies. *TAE Technologies*. https://tae.com/trump-media-and-technology-group-to-merge-with-tae-technologies/
72. Trump Media's $6 billion merger plan sparks 'conflict of interest' concerns. *Newsweek*. https://www.newsweek.com/trump-media-merger-tae-nuclear-fusion-company-11242605
73. CEO of nuclear fusion firm Trump Media is merging with in $6B deal. *Fortune*. https://fortune.com/2025/12/18/trump-media-nuclear-fusion-tae-technologies-michl-binderbauer/
74. Trump Media to merge with fusion startup TAE Technologies in $6B deal. *American Nuclear Society*. https://www.ans.org/news/2025-12-19/article-7632/trump-media-to-merge-with-fusion-startup-tae-technologies-in-6b-deal/
75. Stellerator fusion project advances in Tennessee. *Nuclear Engineering International*. https://www.neimagazine.com/news/stellerator-fusion-project-advances-in-tennessee/
76. ITER project back on track. *Nuclear Engineering International*. https://www.neimagazine.com/news/iter-project-back-on-track/
77. ITER fusion reactor to see further delays, with operations pushed to 2034. *Ars Technica*. https://arstechnica.com/science/2024/07/iters-timeline-for-fusion-stretched-out-even-further/
78. EHL-2. *ENN Energy Research Institute*. https://en.ennresearch.com/researchfield/Compactfusion/EHL_2/
79. China's ENN joins the ITPEA physics activities. *ITER*. https://www.iter.org/node/20687/chinas-enn-joins-itpea-physics-activities
80. ENN's Roadmap for Proton-Boron Fusion Based on Spherical Torus. *arXiv:2401.11338*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.11338
81. General Fusion Agrees to SPAC Merger, Targeting Public Market Debut. *TradingView*. https://www.tradingview.com/news/gurufocus:6f66cd40c094b:0-general-fusion-agrees-to-spac-merger-targeting-public-market-debut/
82. General Fusion's $1 billion deal and the return of the SPAC. *Latitude Media*. https://www.latitudemedia.com/news/general-fusions-1-billion-deal-and-the-return-of-the-spac/
83. Nuscale Power Corp (SMR) Live Share Price. *INDmoney*. https://www.indmoney.com/us-stocks/nuscale-power-corp-share-price-smr
84. SMR - Nuscale Power Corp Stock Price. *Barchart.com*. https://www.barchart.com/stocks/quotes/SMR
85. NuScale Power Corporation Share Price (SMR). *MarketScreener*. https://in.marketscreener.com/quote/stock/NUSCALE-POWER-CORPORATION-137238735/
86. Fusion Energy Leadership Through Tritium Production Capacity. *Federation of American Scientists*. https://fas.org/publication/fusion-energy-leadership-tritium-capacity/
87. Fusion power may run out of fuel before it even gets started. *Science*. https://www.science.org/content/article/fusion-power-may-run-fuel-even-gets-started
88. Largest tritium facility underway in England to advance fusion power. *ASCE*. https://www.asce.org/publications-and-news/civil-engineering-source/article/2025/05/19/largest-tritium-facility-underway-to-advance-fusion-power
89. Tritium resources available for fusion reactors in the long term. *UKAEA*. https://scientific-publications.ukaea.uk/wp-content/uploads/CCFE-PR1767-1.pdf

90. UK and Canada team up to solve nuclear fusion fuel shortage. *Science|Business*. https://sciencebusiness.net/news/uk-and-canada-team-solve-nuclear-fusion-fuel-shortage
91. Will fusion run out of fuel? *ITER*. https://www.iter.org/node/20687/will-fusion-run-out-fuel
92. Securing the Fusion Workforce for the Future: The Talent Challenge. *Rullion*. https://www.rullion.co.uk/insights/Securing-the-Fusion-Workforce-for-the-Future/
93. Don't break the pipeline: Ensuring a workforce for the burning plasma era. *FIRE*. https://fire.pppl.gov/FESAC_WP_workforce_MIT.pdf
94. Workforce Development Through Research-Based Plasma Physics. *arXiv:2303.06390*. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.06390.pdf
95. Building a Fusion-Ready Workforce: Why STEM and Trades Education Are Key. *Power Magazine*. https://www.powermag.com/building-a-fusion-ready-workforce-why-stem-and-trades-education-are-key-to-americas-energy-future/
96. Fusion Energy Can Be The Most Cost Competitive Source Of Baseload Power. *PR Newswire*. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/fusion-energy-can-be-the-most-cost-competitive-source-of-baseload-power-at-the-same-level-as-renewables-301150014.html
97. Fusion's Greatest Challenges. *Kleinman Center for Energy Policy*. https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/research/publications/bringing-fusion-energy-to-the-grid-challenges-and-pathways/
98. Giant international fusion project is in big trouble. *Science*. https://www.science.org/content/article/giant-international-fusion-project-big-trouble
99. Trump Media is merging with fusion power company TAE Technologies in $6B+ deal. *TechCrunch*. https://techcrunch.com/2025/12/18/trump-media-is-merging-with-fusion-power-company-tae-technologies-in-6b-deal/
100. Characterisation of Fusion Reactor Materials Using Neutron Transmission. *Fusion CDT*. https://fusion-cdt.ac.uk/project/characterisation-of-fusion-reactor-materials-using-neutron-transmission-and-activation-experiments-with-14-mev-neutron-sources-materials-strand-project/
101. (Removed – weak source)
102. Review of Advanced Manufacturing Technologies for Fusion Energy. *NRC*. https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML2413/ML24137A055.pdf
103. A Multiscale Investigation of the Mechanisms Controlling Materials Degradation in the Fusion Energy Environment. *OSTI*. https://www.osti.gov/biblio/2221775
104. Fusion power: a challenge for materials science. *UKAEA*. https://scientific-publications.ukaea.uk/wp-content/uploads/Published/PTRoySocVOL368p3315.pdf
105. Is Fusion Commercialization in Sight? Not Yet, Says John Holdren. *Belfer Center*. https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/fusion-commercialization-sight-not-yet-says-john-holdren
106. Feasibility of proton-boron fusion under non-thermal conditions. *Physics of Plasmas, 32*(1), 012101. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/32/1/012101/3329097/Feasibility-of-proton-boron-fusion-under-non
107. Wave-supported hybrid fast-thermal p-^{11}B fusion. *Physical Review E, 106*(5), 055215. https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.055215
108. Preventing ash from poisoning proton-boron-11 fusion plasmas. *Physics of Plasmas, 32*(5), 052506. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/32/5/052506/3347125/Preventing-ash-from-poisoning-proton-boron-11
109. Bremsstrahlung constraints on proton-boron-11 inertial fusion. *Physics of Plasmas, 33*(1), 012703. https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article/33/1/012703/3377022/Bremsstrahlung-constraints-on-proton-boron-11
110. Increasing plasma parameters using sheared-flow stabilization of a Z-pinch. *Physics of Plasmas, 24*(5), 055702. https://plasma2.physics.wisc.edu/pub_files/journal/Shumlak306.pdf
111. (Removed – duplicate)
112. Heat pulse propagation and anomalous electron heat transport measurements on W7-X. *Nuclear Fusion, 61*(11), 116063. https://publikationen.bibliothek.kit.edu/1000131702/110654897
113. TEM turbulence optimisation in stellarators. *Physics of Plasmas, 22*(2), 022122. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1509.04428.pdf
114. Design of W7-X enables it to overcome obstacles, scientists find. *Princeton Research*. https://research.princeton.edu/news/design-w7-x-fusion-device-enables-it-overcome-obstacles-scientists-find
115. A general critique of inertial-electrostatic confinement fusion systems. *Physics of Plasmas, 2*(6), 1853. https://pubs.aip.org/pop/article/2/6/1853/895158/A-general-critique-of-inertial-electrostatic
116. Targets for high-repetition-rate laser facilities: needs, challenges, and perspectives. *High Power Laser Science and Engineering, 5*, e12. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/high-power-laser-science-and-engineering/article/targets-for-high-repetition-rate-laser-facilities-needs-challenges-and-perspectives/93DD99BE668FFB0A25C13C2E5295DC53

117. INFUSE project: CFS-LLNL SPARC 3D Field Physics. *INFUSE*. https://infuse.ornl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/CFS-LLNL-SPARC-3D-Field-Physics-and-Support-of-the-Non-Axisymmetric-Coil-Assessment.pdf
118. MHD stability and disruptions in the SPARC tokamak. *Journal of Plasma Physics, 86*(5), 905860505. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-plasma-physics/article/mhd-stability-and-disruptions-in-the-sparc-tokamak/908C6788C0D625C5DDF335DBD9A17476
119. Understanding hydrogen-boron fusion as new clean energy source. *Journal of Fusion Energy, 42*(3), https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10894-023-00349-9