

Power Generation Via LENRs

A White Paper by Steven B. Krivit

Copyright © 2017 S.B. Krivit — All Rights Reserved

Feb. 23, 2017

Introduction

For the past 100 years, most scientists thought that nuclear reactions could occur only in high-energy physics experiments and in massive nuclear reactors. But experimental research, and the illuminating Widom-Larsen theory, show otherwise: Nuclear reactions can also occur in small, benchtop experiments. Low-energy nuclear reaction (LENR) research has the potential to open the door to a new kind of nuclear power generation without harmful radiation emission, greenhouse gas production, or the possibility of runaway chain reactions.

The Widom-Larsen theory, which does not require any new physics, was published in 2006 in the peer-reviewed [European Physical Journal C - Particles and Fields](#). It provides a sensible, mathematically rigorous explanation for most of the previously incomprehensible experimental observations. As expected, the theory has sparked Internet debate; however, no substantive criticisms of the theory have been published in any mainstream peer-reviewed journals.

LENRs are neither fusion nor fission but instead provide a third potential pathway to nuclear energy. LENRs may also provide a means of transmuting elements, including rendering dangerous radioactive isotopes inert. LENR fuels may consist of ordinary hydrogen, along with metallic nanoparticles composed of nickel, titanium, palladium, other transition metals, or tungsten. At first glance, a clean, radiation-free nuclear energy technology sounds too good to be true; this issue has been one of the impediments to broader acceptance of LENRs. This paper outlines key evidence that establishes the scientific validity of LENRs, identifies issues interfering with its acceptance, and discusses future opportunities in LENR research.

Contents

Heat Sources	2
Nuclear Evidence: Shifts in Isotopic Abundances	2
Nuclear Evidence: LENR Transmutations	3
Nuclear Evidence: Small Emissions of Low-Energy Neutrons	5
LENR Power: Good Science	7
LENR Power: Poorly Reproducible	9
LENR Power: Bad News	10
The State of the Art	11
Non-Technical Impediments	12
A Path Forward	14
Opportunities	16

Heat Sources

Commercial electric power produced by the burning of coal or the fissioning of uranium derives its energy from heat-producing chemical or nuclear processes, respectively. The high-quality process heat from these sources is used to boil water, which creates steam, which then turns power generation turbines, thus creating electricity. If heat from LENRs can be harnessed in a technologically and commercially viable manner, LENRs may introduce a new class of CO₂-free energy systems: one that has the high-energy density of nuclear power along with the radiological safety and convenience of fossil fuels that are chemically combusted with oxygen.

LENRs may also provide an alternative to large central-station distribution-dependent power plants. LENRs could be deployed in much smaller-sized, scalable, distributed systems providing combined heat and power for homes and businesses. If technologies with extremely high heat-to-electric conversion efficiency are developed, LENR systems could provide power for small electronics and portable devices. Being radiation-free, they would not require heavy shielding or containment.


Nuclear Evidence: Shifts in Isotopic Abundances

Although heat production is the primary goal, technical credibility for this third path toward nuclear power has not been established by experimental heat results. Credible evidence of heat production exists in the LENR literature, but it is generally of low magnitude (milliwatts) and poor repeatability. Public confusion exists because many scientists who believe in the erroneous "cold fusion" idea regularly claim the following falsehoods:

1. Anomalous heat generation is now entirely reproducible.
2. The amount of excess energy, within batches of electrodes, is predictable and controllable.
3. LENRs have reliably produced heat 25 times greater than the electrical input.

By itself, heat production measured through calorimetry is not direct evidence of nuclear reactions. Rather, direct nuclear evidence for LENRs consists of shifts in the abundance of isotopes, transmutations from one element to a different element, small emissions of energetic charged particles and low-energy neutrons and, occasionally, tritium production. Unlike heat, all of these other products are attributable *only* to nuclear processes. The bibliographies in my 2016 books *Hacking the Atom* and *Fusion Fiasco* contain extensive scientific references to such data.

One of the clearest examples of shifts in the abundance of isotopes in a LENR experiment was performed by Mathieu Valat, as part of his master's degree coursework at Portland State University in Oregon in 2011. The graph below shows shifts in the abundance of five palladium isotopes following electrolysis. Palladium-110 showed the greatest increase, 5 percent higher than the natural abundance. The solid pentagon represents the natural abundances of the palladium isotopes displayed. The distorted, dotted pentagon shows the same isotopic abundances after the LENR experiment. Such shifts in the abundance of isotopes can be explained only by a nuclear process; chemical fractionation cannot explain the magnitudes of isotopic shifts observed in these experiments. Nor can external contamination.



Shifts in the abundance of isotopes measured in an electrolytic LENR experiment

Other examples of such isotopic shifts include the 1989 observations made by researchers at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and at the Naval Research Laboratory. They, too, each measured shifts in the abundance of isotopes in LENR experiments but couldn't understand or explain such results at the time.


Instead, renowned nuclear physicist Edward Teller, learning of such results, speculated that a neutral particle (such as a neutron) caused the observed isotopic shifts. This information comes from the proceedings of the October 1989 National Science Foundation and Electric Power Research Institute (NSF/EPRI) Workshop on Anomalous Effects in Deuterided Metals. Only 100 copies of the proceedings were printed, in 1993. I obtained one of the original copies and, after checking with EPRI, made electronic copies publicly available in 2016.

Nuclear Evidence: LENR Transmutations

Despite the prevailing assumption in the scientific community that changing one element to another requires high-energy accelerators or large nuclear fission reactors, LENRs can cause such transmutations in benchtop experiments. The largest body of well-measured LENR transmutation results was measured and published by Yasuhiro Iwamura while he worked at Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. In a high-tech clean-room environment, for more than a decade, Iwamura and his group observed seven sets of transmutations, as mapped and summarized in the graph on the next page.


Not only did the Mitsubishi researchers observe increases in the amount of their end-product elements, but they also observed the simultaneous decrease in the amount of their starting elements. Critics — for example, David Kidwell, at the Naval Research Laboratory, and Kirk Shanahan, at the Department of Energy's Savannah River Site — have attempted to dismiss the entire set of increases as well as decreases with an unlikely and unsupported speculation of praseodymium contamination, which could not possibly explain the decrease of cesium, let alone the results of the other transmutation pairs. For example, the graph below shows the increase of molybdenum and the associated decrease in strontium. Neither Kidwell nor Shanahan has published a peer-reviewed

critique of the Mitsubishi experiments. Public confusion exists because scientists who believe in the erroneous "cold fusion" theory, which the Iwamura data disproves, have featured Kidwell as a key speaker in their conferences.



LENR transmutation results measured at Mitsubishi Heavy Industries


In contrast, the Iwamura group's papers were published in the peer-reviewed *Japanese Journal of Applied Physics*. Moreover, LENR researchers at Toyota Central Research and Development Laboratories published a confirmation of the Mitsubishi deuterium gas-permeation experiments in the same physics journal.



Typical increase of end-product elements and decrease of starting elements in Mitsubishi Heavy Industries experiment

Nuclear Evidence: Small Emissions of Low-Energy Neutrons

Even as early as August 1989, episodes of low-energy neutron emission, as well as sporadic bursts of low-energy neutrons from room-temperature experiments, had been successfully measured around the world. However, the observed neutron fluxes were too small and too sporadic to be the result of nuclear fusion or fission. But if these clearly observed neutrons were not being caused by well-understood fusion or fission processes, then by what? Nobody had any good explanations. For this reason, as with the shifts in the abundance of certain isotopes, these neutrons — direct evidence of nuclear reactions — made no sense to (and could not be explained by) scientists at that time. A hand-drawn graph, shown below, that I found in physicist Richard Garwin's archive summarizes the reported results back in 1989.



Hand-drawn graph (1989) showing reports of neutrons measured in room-temperature experiments. (Author unknown)

Garwin was a key member of the 1989 Department of Energy panel that looked at the incorrectly named "cold fusion" research and advised against any special funding for it. The y-axis is the neutron source rate in neutrons/second and is a log scale. The x-axis appears, roughly, to be time of reported observation, starting with March 1989. The values appear to be a mixture of both average (random) and burst neutron rates. News archives correlate some of the neutron reports, but some of the other labs shown on the graph had never publicly reported their neutron observations.

The graph above provides only a general overview of the breadth of reports of neutron measurements in these room-temperature experiments. Some of the experiments listed were performed at liquid-nitrogen temperature, and some were performed at a few hundred degrees above room temperature. Countries represented are the United States, Germany, Argentina, Japan, Sweden, Canada, Italy and France. The graph indicates neutron results from MIT, the University of

Rochester, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, the Atomic Energy Canada laboratory at Chalk River, and Bell Labs.

In a report to the Department of Energy in the summer of 1989, researchers at Sandia National Laboratory reported "unexpected false-positive signal neutrons and neutron bursts." Argonne National Laboratory reported neutron measurements as "false-positive, up to eight times background, not reproducible." The researchers did not explain how they knew the results were false. More likely, they assumed that nuclear reactions in benchtop experiments without the expected deadly fluxes of energetic neutron and gamma radiation were simply impossible and some as-yet-unidentified artifact was responsible for the theoretically inexplicable low-energy neutron signals.

Researchers at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, struggling to find a sensible explanation for neutron data that challenged their long-held assumptions about nuclear processes, invoked "false-positive bursts," claiming that "mechanical and/or electrical interference" was responsible for the data. However, they had no specific explanation for the source of such interference. Researchers at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory wrote that they "appear to have duplicated ... bursts of a few hundred neutrons." Unless their instruments just happened to produce false signals at the time of these experiments, their observations are very difficult to dismiss as false-positive. These discounted reports of neutrons in the 1989 electrolytic experiments have been deeply buried and long-forgotten. I have made these original reports public through the *New Energy Times* Richard Garwin "Cold Fusion" Archive.

Experiments performed at India's largest nuclear research facility, the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC), provide detailed technical evidence not only for low-energy neutron bursts but also for production of tritium, generally correlated in time, with the neutron emissions. Those results were published in the 153-page book *BARC Studies in Cold Fusion*, published by the government of India. I have, with its permission, made an electronic reprint of the book publicly available.

Summary of Results From Groups Reporting Tritium and Neutrons in BARC Electrolysis Experiments							
Serial # (Date(s))	Cathode	Shape	Area Cm ²	Anode	Neutron Yield	Tritium Yield	n/T Ratio
1 (May 21/1989)	Ti	Rod	104	SS pipe	3x10 ⁷	1.4x10 ¹⁴	2x10 ⁻⁷
2 (April 21/1989)	Pd-Ag	Tubes	300	Ni pipe	4x10 ⁷	8x10 ¹⁵	5x10 ⁻⁷
3 (June 12-16/1989)	Pd-Ag	Tubes	300	Ni pipe	0.9x10 ⁷	1.9x10 ¹⁵	5x10 ⁻⁷
4 (May 5/1989)	Pd-Ag	Disks	78	Porous Ni	5x10 ⁶	4x10 ¹⁵	1.2x10 ⁻⁹
6 (April 21/1989)	Pd	Cyl.	5.9	Pt Mesh	3x10 ⁶	7.2x10 ¹³	4x10 ⁻⁸
7 (June-Aug/1989)	Pd	Cube	6.0	Pt Mesh	1.4x10 ⁶	6.7x10 ¹¹	1.7x10 ⁻⁶
8 (Jan-Apr/1990)	Pd	Pellet	5.7	Pt Mesh	3x10 ⁶	4x10 ¹²	1x10 ⁻⁵
9 (July/1989)	Pd	Ring	18	Pt Mesh	1.8x10 ⁸	1.8x10 ¹¹	1x10 ⁻²
							SBK 2016


List of experiments performed at BARC showing bursts of low-energy neutrons and time-correlated production of tritium

Most researchers active in the field in 1989 gave up in frustration after the first year. The experiments were difficult to repeat successfully, the results appeared to make no theoretical sense, and funding became increasingly scarce.

LENR Power: Good Science

The good news about LENR as a possible future energy source is that an abundance of evidence shows, qualitatively, that some sort of new type of unusual heating process is occurring in these experiments. Here are some examples of these qualitative indicators.

Imagine seeing a pot of hot water on the stove, turning the power setting down and, instead, seeing the water oddly get hotter. In 1991, Fleischmann published the graph below. (The large arrows have been added for clarity.) With input current held constant, the temperature of the electrolytic bath increased at the same time as the voltage decreased. In ordinary electrolysis, as with heating water on the stove, the temperature of a water-based electrolyte should decrease commensurately with the decrease in input power. In this case, the opposite effect occurred, indicating the presence of a new, unexpected heating process.




Fleischmann-Pons data showing heating anomaly

Another qualitative example of the heating effect is the set of infrared (IR) video recordings made in 1994 by the U.S. Navy's Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center (SPAWAR) LENR group in San Diego. The measurements were conducted with the help of Massoud Simnad, a professor at the University of California San Diego, and Todd Evans, a researcher at General Atomics Inc. who provided the IR video camera.

The same effect, an unexpected increase of temperature with decrease of input power, was also observed by the Francesco Piantelli group in Italy, using a nickel-hydrogen gas system. Moreover,

the question of whether an excess-heat effect exists. The U.S. Navy SPAWAR LENR group members had published 30 peer-reviewed journal articles before their retirement and the discontinuation of LENR research at SPAWAR.



*SPAWAR image of LENR cathode showing melted palladium and possible evidence of flash boiling
(Note apparent frozen droplets of metal on perimeter of crater.)*

LENR Power: Poorly Reproducible

Some longtime LENR researchers and their colleagues have claimed that electrochemical LENR systems can produce 25 times more heating power than the input electrical power. This happened only once, according to published accounts. In November 2004, Arik El-Boher, a researcher with now-defunct Energetics Technologies Co., in Omer, Israel, reported this impressive electrochemical experiment, No. 64a, that produced a calorimetrically measured excess-heat gain equivalent to 25 times the electrical input power to the cell. The Energetics group was never able to repeat the result of that extraordinary experiment. In that same series of experiments, the next best experiment, No. 64b, showed a peak heat gain of 15 times, and another experiment, No. 56, showed a peak gain of 8 times.

More typical are the modest results, published in the American Chemical Society Low-Energy Nuclear Reactions Sourcebook (I served as co-editor), as reported by a consortium of scientists including those from Energetics Technologies, SRI International and ENEA, the Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and the Environment, in Frascati, Italy. The consortium reported its best efforts to replicate the Energetics Technologies No. 64a experiment. Researcher Vittorio Violante, at ENEA — claimed by his SRI International colleague Michael McKubre to be the only scientist in the world who knew how to reliably produce good working cathodes — could not reproduce the Energetics Technologies No. 64a excess-heat result.

Replication attempts were performed at SRI between 2006 and 2007. A set of 23 experiments measured excess heat that equated to an average peak of 1.38 times the electrical input power. The typical amount of macroscopic, calorimetrically measured excess heat, as has been the case nearly throughout the history of the field, was only in the milliwatt range. Four of the 23 experiments

showed a peak excess heat greater than 1 Watt: 1.800, 2.066, 1.250 and 2.095 Watts. By the time McKubre resigned from SRI International in 2016, he was still unable to produce further-improved excess-heat results. Nevertheless, these data do support the assertion that heat production occurs in LENRs. The data also show that, when batches of cathodes have performed well, significant heat production has only occurred by happenstance.

The best result in nickel-hydrogen-gas LENR experiments was reported in 1998 by Piantelli and his colleagues and published in the peer-reviewed journal of the Italian Physical Society, *Il Nuovo Cimento*. In that experiment, researchers measured peak excess heat of 38.9 Watts, with electrical input power of 101.5 Watts. That experiment produced excess heat continuously for 278 days. At its peak, the experiment produced 1.3 times as much heating power as the electrical input power that it used.

The problem, as theorist Lewis Larsen, co-author of the Widom-Larsen theory explains, is that the solution to reliable production of heat depends on: a) correct theoretical understanding of the mechanism, b) proper parameters and engineering at the nanoscale level, and c) understanding of surface physics, among other requirements. Larsen likens the efforts thus far by electrochemists, materials scientists, and metallurgists, who have attempted to reliably produce LENR heat without precision nanotechnology, to the crude use of hand tools. In fact, some researchers have used hammers and hand-cranked cold rollers to fabricate their electrodes. Nevertheless, LENR research results have shown higher power output levels, higher power gain levels and greater energy gains than even the best thermonuclear fusion experiment.

LENR Power: Bad News

In 2011, a number of well-known researchers in the LENR field compromised their integrity. They began promoting heat claims made by an Italian con man, [Andrea Rossi](#), that had no credible scientific support whatsoever. The scientists included Michael Melich, Edmund Storms, Michael McKubre, David Nagel, Mitchell Swartz, and Mahadeva Srinivasan, all of whom had been researching or managing LENR research since 1989. Physics Nobel laureate Brian Josephson joined in the Rossi promotion, as well.

Before moving to Miami, Florida, Rossi was convicted of fraud in a previous business venture, ran two other energy schemes, caused environmental damage in northern Italy, contaminated the ground with dioxin, and served time in Italian prisons twice. More than 100 news stories in a variety of Italian newspapers, over a decade, confirm [Rossi's Italian financial and environmental criminal history](#).

After finishing his first energy scam, Rossi was awarded a contract from the U.S. Army based on his claim that he could produce thermoelectric devices that would yield unprecedented heat-to-electricity conversion efficiency. Rossi told the Army he would make devices that could produce 800-1,000 Watts each, but Rossi's devices [produced only 1 Watt](#) of direct-current electricity.

In 2011, Rossi claimed to have developed working versions of 1 Megawatt industrial thermal power plants, yet his incredible system thermal performance was never truly independently verified. Despite Rossi's assertions, there was never any verified sale of any such power plant. All evidence

indicates that his current power plant claims are just another fraud. In July 2011, I met Rossi, interviewed him, observed and videotaped his device and, on returning to the U.S., consulted with dozens of engineers and technical experts. I concluded that his claims were unsupported, and I published the reasons for my conclusion.

Despite Rossi's track record and my published investigation, from October 2012 to June 2013, Industrial Heat, a North Carolina-based company, paid Rossi \$11.5 million for his claimed technology. Ignoring Rossi's history and public criminal record, Industrial Heat trusted and allowed Rossi to perform the initial due diligence system test on its behalf. In the next phase of the agreement, Industrial Heat attempted its own independent system test without Rossi's presence. It didn't work. Had it worked as claimed, Industrial Heat was to pay Rossi another \$89 million. On April 6, 2016, after that year-long test, Rossi preemptively sued Industrial Heat in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida for non-payment of the \$89 million. On Aug. 6, 2016, Industrial Heat counter-sued, accusing him of fraud. On Nov. 16, Judge Cecilia M. Altonaga denied Rossi's motion to dismiss the counter-lawsuit. Her description of Rossi's actions included "complete fabrications ... using fatally flawed methodologies," confirming what I had reported in 2011. The court case is proceeding.

David Nagel, a retired Naval Research Laboratory manager who is now a research professor at George Washington University, has been one of Rossi's most eager promoters. Nagel also owns a LENR consulting company called NUCAT. In May 2011, Nagel gave a presentation at the 15th International Conference on Emerging Nuclear Energy Systems, in San Francisco, California. According to his slides, he said that Rossi's apparatus had heated an Italian factory in 2007 for 24 hours per day for six months and, as a result, had reduced the factory's electricity bill by 90 percent.

Meanwhile, in Rossi's nearly empty garage in Bologna, Italy, which he called a laboratory, Rossi and his collaborators always seemed to be wearing heavy coats while working on his nickel-hydrogen gas system. Nagel also said that Rossi had 97 systems operating in four countries. However, credible evidence of a single such system, or any independent evidence of Rossi's extraordinary excess-heat claims, does not appear to exist.

Nevertheless, Nagel told *Chemical & Engineering News* in October 2016 that he doesn't think that Rossi is a fraud. In fact, Nagel told *C&EN* that Rossi's nickel-hydrogen gas system produces excess heat at a rate of 400 times greater than the input electrical power, rather than the scientifically credible Piantelli results of 1.3 times. Promotion of Rossi and his claims by qualified scientists with broad knowledge of LENRs, like Nagel, have caused untold damage to the reputation of the field.

The State of the Art

The current state of legitimate research is difficult to determine. In the U.S., a few individuals and small companies claim to be close to delivering commercial LENR technology. Similar "near-commercial" claims been made for nearly three decades, with new claimants fading away as quickly as they appear. In my opinion, no company is close to delivering a commercially usable LENR thermal source.

A number of large, well-established organizations in the U.S. likely are performing LENR research, but they are being careful to stay out of the spotlight. For example, Boeing and NASA have publicly revealed some of their research and development work and patenting activity in the subject. Visitors from a wide variety of international institutions and industrial companies, as shown by their IP addresses, have visited the *New Energy Times* Web site for many years.

Three years ago, Atomic Energy Canada Ltd. (AECL) produced a 150-page internal report that surveyed the subject, based on publicly available information. Royal Dutch Shell spoke with some LENR researchers a few years ago to learn about the research. LENR research is being sponsored by the National Natural Science Foundation of China and the Japanese government through its New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization.

Within days of my reporting in 2015 about the Japanese issuance of its request for proposals for LENR research, the government removed the request-for-proposal file from its Web site. This is one sign among a broad set of indicators that suggest that technology companies and organizations are seriously interested in LENRs but that they do not want such activities in the public spotlight. The reasons for this reluctance likely are based on competitive interests as well as the field's slowly dissipating stigma.

Non-Technical Impediments to Broad Acceptance of LENRs

The state of LENR science cannot be understood without examining the human issues. LENR suffers from four major non-technical impediments.

The first impediment is the lingering stigma from the erroneous 1989 announcement by Martin Fleischmann and Stanley Pons of room-temperature "fusion" in a test tube.

The second impediment is that the experimental phenomenon of nuclear reactions in room-temperature experiments without emission of dangerous energetic radiation has been difficult for many scientists to accept.

American theoretical physicist and Nobel laureate Julian Seymour Schwinger was one of the rare prominent physicists to confront his peers and openly support LENR research. "The pressure for conformity is enormous," Schwinger wrote. "I have experienced it in editors' rejection of submitted papers, based on venomous criticism of anonymous referees. The replacement of impartial reviewing by censorship will be the death of science."

Despite the substantial body of experimental data and the credible Widom-Larsen theory, the heretofore heretical proposition that an entirely new type of radiation-free nuclear process may have been discovered poses a conceptual paradigm-shift problem for the present scientific establishment. This is clearly evident in documents written by volunteers selected by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) in 1989, whose job it was to independently evaluate the evidence for "cold fusion" on behalf of the country. Most telling are the statements in a draft of the "fusion products" section of the DOE "cold fusion" panel report, publicly revealed for the first time in my 2016 book *Fusion Fiasco*.

Physicists Robert Schiffer and Richard Garwin were tasked with evaluating the experimental evidence for nuclear products. Instead, they revealed that they could not believe the confirmatory nuclear evidence given to them by U.S. and Indian laboratories. Instead, they simply removed the data. Schiffer wrote the draft of the section and sent it to Garwin for review. Here are two excerpts:

If there w_e_r_e such a process as room temperature fusion, it would require not only

- (a) the circumvention of fundamental quantum mechanical principles, that have been carefully tested against numerous measurements of barrier penetration (such as the systematics of spontaneous fission and alpha radioactivity lifetimes and those of nuclear cross sections), but also
- (b) drastic modifications of branching ratios in the D + D reaction, a n d
- (c) **the invention of an entirely new nuclear reaction process.**

'Alice laughed. "There's no use trying," she said: "one can't believe impossible things."

"I daresay you haven't had much practice," said the Queen. "When I was your age, I always did it for half-an-hour a day. Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast."

from 'Through the Looking Glass'

APPENDIX B

????COULD WE DO WITHOUT THIS????

Reproduce BARC tables

Reproduce Bockris tables

APPENDIX C Considerations in tritium concentrations.



Excerpts from Oct. 4, 1989, draft of fusion-products section of "cold fusion" assessment report submitted to the Department of Energy

Garwin's handwritten "yes" confirmed to Schiffer his agreement to remove experimental evidence of tritium and neutrons that conflicted with their theoretical understanding of nuclear science. ([PDF](#)) On Page 6 of this document, I have reproduced one of the BARC tables — of tritium and neutron emissions — that Schiffer and Garwin elected not to show to the Department of Energy and the American public.

Garwin is well-recognized as an accomplished nuclear scientist, but not on the subject of LENRs. He and I have communicated about LENRs extensively, even once over tea and cookies at his kitchen

table. I have discussed the Widom-Larsen theory and many experimental results with him. As my books [Fusion Fiasco](#) and [Hacking the Atom](#) show, his skepticism about LENRs is based on vague arguments and insinuations of experimental errors that are not substantive.

In fact, an entirely new nuclear process that involves neither fusion nor fission *has* been theoretically explained by Lewis Larsen and his co-author Allan Widom. The Widom-Larsen theory explains the details of LENR physics as well as all of the good experimental results in the field. A basic explanation of this theory was published in [Scientific American](#) magazine in 2016, and a second academic paper was published in the peer-reviewed [Pramana - Journal of Physics](#) in 2010.

I have had extensive conversations with Larsen; Widom has chosen to remain out of the spotlight. Garwin has read at least some of the Widom-Larsen theory papers, and he has read portions of my 2016 book *Hacking the Atom*, which provides an in-depth explanation of the theory for lay readers. In my discussions with Garwin, he has not identified a single flaw in the theory. However, neither experimental data nor a viable theory has convinced Garwin.

The third impediment is the insistence on the part of followers of Fleischmann and Pons that LENRs are explained by nuclear fusion. At the American Chemical Society national meeting in 2008, I identified eight major categories of inconsistencies between deuterium-deuterium fusion and LENRs. These are listed in Chapter 29 of *Hacking the Atom*. I have met and known virtually all the key LENR scientists in the field who were alive as of 2000. It seems that no amount of scientific data will convince these scientists that their idea of "cold fusion" is better explained by non-fusion processes.

German theoretical physicist Max Planck (1858-1947) explained that "a new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." Planck's insight, informally expressed as "science advances one funeral at a time," shows every indication of being proved yet again.

The fourth impediment is the damage done to the credibility of the field by a few well-known LENR scientists who have engaged in research misconduct, if not fraud. The *New Energy Times* Reference Site lists the respective investigations.

The impact of all these impediments is that good scientists and legitimate organizations are hesitant to, at least openly, work in the field, despite the fundamentally good science and potential world-changing technologies that may come from it. A similar reluctance exists for potential angel investors, sponsoring organizations, and institutions. The field of LENRs is littered with landmines: political, scientific, and sociological. *Hacking the Atom* informs interested parties about the research, its history, the players, and the potential pitfalls.

A Path Forward

The key to developing the LENR thermal phenomenon from a science curiosity to a commercial technology lies in the proper use of nanotechnology, with a systematic program to elucidate and explore the basic science underlying LENR. Devices must be fabricated with defined nanoscale-level

structures so the tiny LENR hot spots, which now randomly produce temperatures in the thousands of degrees, can be precisely duplicated, engineered, manufactured, and controlled.

Based on Larsen's calculations, a square meter of a planar LENR device could theoretically produce a 4.28 MW thermal power source. This is an immense amount of power, roughly 4,000 times the amount of power generated by an ideal solar panel of the same size. (*Hacking the Atom*, Chapter 36)

Observers of LENR research, who understand its foundation of credible scientific research, often wonder what will be required to attract the interest and resources necessary to solve the scientific and technological problems. Some observers have said that only a macroscopic repeatable demonstration of a heat-producing device will overcome the non-technical impediments. This will almost certainly never happen. Nobody who develops such a device will be giving any public demonstrations. Instead, such people will secure large strategic partners and do their best to quietly get the first revolutionary products out into the global marketplace.

Larsen disagrees that such a public demonstration device is necessary to inspire and encourage widespread research and development. He points out that certain experimental methods can consistently show evidence of nuclear reactions, and new researchers may be able to see results for themselves:

Mitsubishi's thin-film palladium-oxide heterostructure gas-permeation experiment is very reproducible with respect to creating transmutation products. Similarly, a properly designed exploding-wire or carbon-arc experiment will produce microscopic quantities of spectroscopically detectable transmutation products every single time. Every transmutation product is accompanied by production of heat. However, there are relatively small numbers of microscopic LENR-active sites in such experiments today, and therefore dramatic, measurable macroscopic amounts (Watts) of excess heat will not be observed.

If the Widom-Larsen theory and proper nanotech fabrication techniques are utilized, thin-film and dusty plasma devices can be designed that contain vastly larger numbers of active LENR sites and will consequently produce substantial amounts of macroscopic excess heat. Once reproducible fabrication of large numbers of LENR-active sites per unit of volume or area is successfully achieved, commercialization for power generation is then mostly a matter of scale-up and integration of LENR thermal sources with various types of off-the-shelf energy conversion subsystems, including thermophotovoltaic devices that directly convert heat to electricity.

According to Iwamura, the transmutation results from his LENR gas-permeation experiments were closely but not identically replicated by Toyota. Osaka University and Iwate University also reported similar replications.

The apparatus for the Mitsubishi experiments cost several million dollars. Other types of experiments are much less expensive. These include exploding-wire experiments (Chapters 18 and 19 in *Fusion*

Fiasco, Chapter 22 in *Hacking the Atom*) and the Proton-21-type experiments. See my "Review of Low-Energy Nuclear Reactions," published by Elsevier in 2013.) References for carbon-arc experiments, performed in the U.S., India and China, are in Chapter 3 of *Hacking the Atom*. While transmutation results in these other experimental designs are not as unequivocal as those in the expensive Mitsubishi experiments, any findings of shifts in the abundance of isotopes or transmutation of one chemical element to another would be very difficult to dismiss.

Opportunities

The lingering stigma of "cold fusion" and the continuing reluctance in the broader scientific community makes it unlikely that any high-ranking U.S. Department of Energy employee will risk initiating a LENR research program at this time. Venture capitalists in the U.S. are also unlikely to move LENR technology forward; the likely five- to 10-year investment horizon on LENR commercialization is well beyond the typical two- to three-year turnaround that is attractive to most venture capitalists.

Two paths forward are more likely:

1. A well-funded, publicly acknowledged research and development program sponsored by a large, established for-profit corporation that has a crucial strategic interest in development and direct use of LENR technology. Examples include multinational oil and gas companies to use LENRs as CO₂-free process heat, battery manufacturers to use portable battery-like LENR power sources that would vastly outperform chemical batteries, and aerospace manufacturers to use LENRs for ultra-high-performance onboard power sources in manned or unmanned aircraft or spacecraft.
2. Sponsored programs having the aim of broad education and advancing basic science rather than commercial research and development. Examples of potential sponsors include a federal agency like the National Science Foundation or a nonprofit corporation like the Electric Power Research Institute.

On Feb. 14, 2017, the *New York Times* reported that "India's rapidly worsening air pollution is causing about 1.1 million people to die prematurely each year and is now surpassing China's as the deadliest in the world." LENRs represent an opportunity for a potential new energy technology based on virtually unlimited supplies of fuel materials: hydrogen (as a source of protons) along with lithium, carbon, and various metallic elements. Moreover, LENRs represent an opportunity to develop a revolutionary new source of sustainable, CO₂-free energy in a world heavily dependent on the burning of non-renewable fossil fuels.

About Steven B. Krivit: <http://stevenbkrivit.com/about-steven/>

Contact Steven B. Krivit: <http://stevenbkrivit.com/contact-steven/>