

Lattice Energy LLC

Commercializing a Next-Generation Source of Safe CO₂-free Energy


Low Energy Neutron Reactions (LENRs)

Italian physicists question WLT neutron production rates

Cautionary tale of two paradigms; pitfalls with punji stakes await the unwary

***“Erroneous wave functions of Ciuchi et al. for collective modes
in neutron production on metallic hydride cathodes”***

Univ. of Rome physicists mistakenly assume simple two-body process and thus calculated lesser rates



Lewis Larsen
President and CEO


October 30, 2012

lewisglarsen@gmail.com

1-312-861-0115

Einstein clearly understood need to use collective many-body paradigm back in 1951 when he was trying to help Ernest Sternglass understand anomalous production of neutrons in hydrogen-filled X-ray tube experiments conducted at Cornell

See E. Sternglass, *“Before the Big Bang,”* pp. 86 - 87 (1997)



Lattice Energy LLC

Physics of LENRs is explained by Widom-Larsen theory

Ciuchi et al. misunderstood what we published in our papers

Incorrectly assumed electroweak neutron production in W-L theory (WLT) is just a two-body process

Physicists at Univ. of Rome question Widom-Larsen theory's neutron production rates:

 *“Low Energy Neutron Production by Inverse β decay in Metallic Hydride Surfaces”*

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1209.6501.pdf> (v1 Sept. 28, 2012) Ciuchi et al.

Abstract: “It has been recently argued that inverse- β nuclear transmutations might occur at an impressively high rate in a thin layer at the metallic hydride surface under specific conditions. In this note we present a calculation of the transmutation rate which shows that there is little room for such a remarkable effect.”

Conclusions: “A correct calculation gives a neutron production rate from (1) about 300 times smaller than what estimated in [1–3], for the value of the mass renormalization factor ≈ 20 considered there. In turn, it is questionable that values of γ can be realized, in particular for bound electrons, so large as to give rise to useful nuclear transmutation rates. A more detailed analysis of the attainable values of γ is needed to obtain more definite conclusions on this interesting phenomenon, should it exist at all.”

Given this erroneous assumption, lesser production rates from their calculations are not surprising

Lattice Energy LLC

Physics of LENRs is explained by Widom-Larsen theory

Ciuchi et al. misunderstood what we published in our papers

Our arXiv preprint response to above-cited arXiv preprint published by Ciuchi et al.:

 *“Erroneous wave functions of Ciuchi et al. for collective modes in neutron production on metallic hydride cathodes”*

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1210.5212v1.pdf> (v1 Oct. 17, 2012) Widom, Srivastava, and Larsen

Abstract: “There is a recent comment[1] concerning the theory of collective many body effects on the neutron production rates in a chemical battery cathode. Ciuchi et al. employ an inverse beta decay expression that contains a two body amplitude. Only one electron and one proton may exist in the Ciuchi et al. model initial state wave function. A flaw in their reasoning is that one cannot in reality describe collective many body correlations with only a two particle wave function. One needs very many particles to describe collective effects. In the model wave functions of Ciuchi et al. there are no metallic hydrides, there are no cathodes and there are no chemical batteries. **Employing a wave function with only one electron and one proton is inadequate for describing collective metallic hydride surface quantum plasma physics in [real world] cathodes accurately.**”

Conclusions: “No significant argument has been provided against our nuclear physics results. The experimental evidence of neutron production and nuclear transmutations in properly designed plasma discharge electrolytic cells[5] agrees with our theoretical analysis and belies the theoretical arguments given in[1] against a hefty production of neutrons in hydride cells.”

Lattice Energy LLC

Physics of LENRs is explained by Widom-Larsen theory

Ciuchi et al. misunderstood what we published in our papers

“Ultra low momentum neutron catalyzed nuclear reactions on metallic hydride surfaces”

Eur. Phys. J. C **46**, pp. 107 (March 2006) Widom and Larsen – initially placed on arXiv in May 2005 at http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/cond-mat/pdf/0505/0505026v1.pdf; a copy of the final EPJC article can be found at: <http://www.newenergytimes.com/v2/library/2006/2006Widom-UltraLowMomentumNeutronCatalyzed.pdf>

“Absorption of nuclear gamma radiation by heavy electrons on metallic hydride surfaces”

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/cond-mat/pdf/0509/0509269v1.pdf (Sept 2005) Widom and Larsen

“Nuclear abundances in metallic hydride electrodes of electrolytic chemical cells”

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/cond-mat/pdf/0602/0602472v1.pdf (Feb 2006) Widom and Larsen

“Theoretical Standard Model rates of proton to neutron conversions near metallic hydride surfaces”

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/nucl-th/pdf/0608/0608059v2.pdf (v2. Sep 2007) Widom and Larsen

“Energetic electrons and nuclear transmutations in exploding wires”

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0709/0709.1222v1.pdf (Sept 2007) Widom, Srivastava, and Larsen

“Errors in the quantum electrodynamic mass analysis of Hagelstein and Chaudhary”

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0802/0802.0466v2.pdf (Feb 2008) Widom, Srivastava, and Larsen

“High energy particles in the solar corona”

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0804/0804.2647v1.pdf (April 2008) Widom, Srivastava, and Larsen

“A primer for electro-weak induced low energy nuclear reactions” Srivastava, Widom, and Larsen

Pramana – Journal of Physics **75** pp. 617 (October 2010) <http://www.ias.ac.in/pramana/v75/p617/fulltext.pdf>

Lattice Energy LLC

Physics of LENRs is explained by Widom-Larsen theory

Ciuchi et al. misunderstood what we published in our papers

Also please see the following recent experimental papers by Cirillo *et al.*:

Direct experimental evidence for electroweak production of neutrons via Widom-Larsen mechanism in a metallic hydride cathode of an electrolytic chemical cell:



“Experimental evidence of a neutron flux generation in a plasma discharge electrolytic cell”

D. Cirillo, R. Germano, V. Tontodonato, A. Widom, Y.N. Srivastava, E. Del Giudice, and G. Vitiello
Key Engineering Materials 495 pp. 104 - 107 (2012)

Online available since 2011/Nov/15 at www.scientific.net

Trans Tech Publications, Switzerland (2012)

doi:10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.495.104 (\$US28 if purchased online)

Source URL = <http://www.scientific.net/KEM.495.104>

Abstract: “A substantial neutron flux generated by plasma excitation at the tungsten cathode of an electrolytic cell with alkaline solution is reported. A method based on a CR-39 nuclear track detector coupled to a boron converter was used to detect the neutrons. This method is insensitive to the strong plasma-generated electromagnetic noise that made inconclusive all the previous attempts to identify neutrons in electrolytic plasma environment by means of electric detection techniques.”


Lattice Energy LLC

Physics of LENRs is explained by Widom-Larsen theory

Ciuchi et al. misunderstood what we published in our papers

Also please see the following recent experimental papers by Cirillo et al.:

Detailed theoretical explanation for neutron production and subsequent transmutations per Widom-Larsen mechanism in a metallic hydride cathode of an electrolytic chemical cell:



“Water plasma modes and nuclear transmutations on the metallic cathode of a plasma discharge electrolytic cell”

D. Cirillo, E. Del Giudice, R. Germano, S. Sivasubramanian, Y.N. Srivastava, V. Tontodonato, G. Vitiello and A. Widom
Key Engineering Materials 495 pp 124-128 (2012)

Online available since 2011/Nov/15 at www.scientific.net

Trans Tech Publications, Switzerland (2012)

doi:10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.495.124 (\$US28 if purchased online)

Source URL = <http://www.scientific.net/KEM.495.124>

Abstract: “In the conceptual framework of Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) it has been proven that liquid water is made up of two phases: 1) a coherent phase where the electron cloud of water molecules oscillates in phase with a trapped electromagnetic field within extended regions, called Coherence Domains (CD); 2) a non coherent phase formed by a gas-like ensemble of molecules filling the interstices among the CD's. The constituent molecules of the coherent phase oscillate between their individual ground state and an excited state where one electron is so loosely bound to be considered quasi-free. Therefore the coherent phase contains a plasma of quasi-free electrons. In the bulk water, as in the case of superfluid liquid Helium, each molecule crosses over continuously between the two phases. On the contrary, close to the surface of a metallic cathode in a chemical cell, the attraction between molecules and wall stabilizes the coherent phases so that the layer of interfacial water is mainly coherent and capable of holding a negative electronic charge. When the chemical cell voltage exceeds a threshold, an interfacial water-cathode metal surface plasma mode is developed. **From the collective energies continuously pumped into the plasma, the weak interaction $e^- + p^+ \rightarrow n + \nu_e$ may be induced which produces neutrons and neutrinos from Hydrogen atoms. The neutrons may then ultimately induce other nuclear transmutations on the cathode metal surface.**”


Lattice Energy LLC

WLT extends collective many-body effects to Standard Model

While written as a two-body $e^- + p^+$ reaction, what happens is many-body


In condensed matter LENRs, many-body collective effects also involve quantum entanglement

Simple two-body collision shown in Feynman diagram below:



What really happens is many-body

Now add collective rearrangements from condensed matter effects. It is not just a two body collision !!!



Above is what really occurs on metallic hydride cathodes

Lattice Energy LLC

Index to online information about the Widom-Larsen theory

Periodically updated to reflect additional new documents

(59 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llc-index-to-documents-re-widomlarsen-theory-of-lenrssept-4-2012>

Lattice Energy LLC

Commercializing a Next-Generation Source of Safe Nuclear Energy

Index to Key Concepts and Documents

Navigating the underlying concepts, experimental evidence,
and news coverage for the Widom-Larsen theory of LENRs

Information Resource Guide

Version #6 - Updated and revised up to September 4, 2012

Lewis Larsen, President and CEO



"It is of the highest importance in the art of detection to be able to recognize, out of a number of facts, which are incidental and which vital. Otherwise your energy and attention must be dissipated instead of being concentrated."

Sherlock Holmes, "The Reigate Squires" 1893

Contact: 1-312-861-0115
lewisglarsen@gmail.com
<http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen>



V6 - September 4, 2012

Copyright 2009 - 2012 Lattice Energy LLC

All Rights Reserved 1

September 4, 2012

Lattice Energy LLC

Contents

Background and objectives of this presentation	10 - 12
Widom-Larsen theory (WLT) creates a paradigm shift	13 - 16
Brief overview of Widom-Larsen theory in condensed matter	17 - 23
Quantum entanglement of many particles occurs in LENRs and elsewhere	24 - 28
Selective history of collective effects: Darwin, Einstein and Laughlin	29 - 31
Ciuchi <i>et al.</i> in light of new WLT paradigm	32 - 35
Analogous conceptual issue with many-body ULM neutron scattering	36 - 39
Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities	40 - 41
Lattice document - July 16, 2010: LENRs and advanced Lithium battery fires	42
Lattice document - April 20, 2011: LENRs in Nickel-Hydrogen E-M cavities	43
Lattice document - March 21, 2012: Coal as potential source of LENR fuels	44
Lattice document - April 4, 2012: Nucleosynthesis in lightning	45
Lattice document - May 19, 2012: Producing Gold from Tungsten via LENRs	46
Lattice document - August 23, 2012: Superconductivity and LENRs?	47
Concluding remarks	48 - 50
Ending quotation: Santa Fe Institute economist - W. Brian Arthur (2009)	51

Lattice Energy LLC



Background and objectives of this presentation

SPASER device's electric fields (2003): surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s6/opfocus_v7_s6.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Background and main objectives of this presentation - I

Ciuchi et al.'s conceptual mistake illuminates WLT paradigm shift

- ✓ Sept. 2012: Ciuchi et al. published preprint on arXiv claiming their calculations showed that our calculated estimates of electroweak neutron production rates in metallic hydride chemical cells were way too high
- ✓ Oct. 2012: in response, Widom, Srivastava, and Larsen published preprint on arXiv in which we refuted assertions of Ciuchi et al. by showing how *Ciuchi et al.'s calculations had erroneously assumed that WLT electroweak neutron production in metallic hydride cells occurs via just a two-body process when it fact it is really the result of collective many-body processes in condensed matter*. Moreover, our calculated rates do fall within the span of reported LENR experimental measurements that range from 10^9 to 10^{16} neutrons cm^2/sec
- ✓ WLT's conceptual advance creates a paradigm shift: Widom-Larsen theory of LENRs does not involve any “new physics” *per se*. That said, at highest level of abstraction its novelty lies in that WLT for first time successfully integrates collective many-body condensed matter effects with modern electroweak theory under the umbrella of the Standard Model. It thus explains how many-body collective effects enable star-like, neutron-catalyzed nucleosynthetic processes to occur at substantial rates in condensed matter systems under macroscopically ‘mild’ temperatures and pressures; ergo, stars, supernovae, fission weapons & reactors not necessarily needed

Consequently, present thinking about sites of nucleosynthesis in the Universe may require some revision

- ✓ Summary: Ciuchi et al. were mistaken; the Widom-Larsen theory's calculations of electroweak neutron production rates in metallic hydride cells are in fact correct estimates. Importantly, collective many-body processes cannot be properly understood and correctly calculated by assuming that a few-body conceptual paradigm is applicable; this conceptual issue has important implications for types of physics and mathematics that are best used to describe, model, and better understand such phenomena. As Ciuchi et al. have learned, failure to grasp this essential feature of collective many-body processes in condensed matter LENR systems can lead the unwary into erroneous conceptual and calculational pitfalls that are lined with punji stakes

Lattice Energy LLC

Background and main objectives of this presentation - II

Ciuchi et al.'s conceptual mistake illuminates WLT paradigm shift

- ✓ Two or at most 3-body processes have been reigning paradigm in nuclear and particle physics for 83 years:
Few-body processes have dominated reaction-rate theories and calculations in physics and chemistry since Atkinson & Houtermans (1929). **Not surprisingly, apart from greater mathematical tractability, the few-body paradigm has become so deeply ingrained and endemic in most nuclear and high-energy particle physicist's thinking that few-body interactions are often assumed to be occurring *a priori* without a moment's hesitation.** This long-standing conceptual paradigm choice makes sense in the case of blazing hot, turbulent plasmas; in stars, 3-particle fusion reactions have much lower cross-sections than 2-body processes with 4-body reactions having such minuscule cross-sections that they are inconsequential in 'real world' astrophysics. **Indeed, tiny cross-section of the $p^+ - p^+$ fusion reaction is one of the main reasons why our Sun burns its hydrogen fuel very slowly over billions of years.** That said, **few-body reaction dynamics is not necessarily safe *a priori* assumption in case of condensed matter systems that may contain ensembles of highly correlated particles.** *Au contraire*, many-body collective effects are quite common in condensed matter physics and may also include quantum entanglement of large numbers of particles; e.g., surface plasmon electrons intrinsically oscillate collectively, as do many-body, micron-scale 'islands' of protons on metallic hydride surfaces; BCS superconductivity is an emergent property of large numbers of mutually interacting electrons and lattice phonons; and so forth
- ✓ Relevant quote about paradigm shifts from Thomas Kuhn, "*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*" (1962):
"Led by a new paradigm, scientists adopt new instruments and look in new places ... during revolutions scientists see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they have looked before. It is rather as if [they] had been suddenly transported to another planet where familiar objects are seen in a different light and are joined by unfamiliar ones as well."
- ✓ Objectives: after providing background info, beginning with Darwin (1922) will note selected events in collective many-body effects paradigm's timeline insofar as they relate to Widom-Larsen theory, discuss Sternglass & Einstein's contributions (1951), discuss selected details of Ciuchi (2012), and then examine new opportunities

Lattice Energy LLC

Neutron-catalyzed nucleosynthesis

Widom-Larsen theory = integration of
condensed matter collective many-body effects
+ modern electroweak theory

In doing so, WLT creates a paradigm shift

Stars, fission reactors, weapons
are not necessarily needed

SPASER device's electric fields (2003) - surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s5/opfocus_v7_s5.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Many-body collective and quantum effects enable LENRs

Allow nucleosynthesis to occur in condensed matter at ~STP


- ✓ For 60+ years prior to advent of Widom-Larsen theory, it was near-universally assumed that the **only environments in the Universe where neutron-catalyzed nucleosynthesis can occur is in stars, natural or manmade fission reactors, and/or detonations of nuclear weapons**
- ✓ In other words, **few-body fission or fusion processes mainly involving the strong interaction** were thought to be the only significant sources of 'catalytic' neutrons that are captured by 'target' elements which are then transmuted into other species of chemical elements, i.e. nucleosynthesis. Indeed, **all presently operating nuclear power generation reactors and future hoped-for nuclear fusion technologies are based on such processes, e.g. ITER**
- ✓ In the case of nuclear fusion reactions between particles in hot ionized plasmas, it was and is still believed that **interaction cross-sections become impossibly small (insofar as being able to develop practical power generation technologies) when the number of interacting particles exceeds three, i.e., only few-body reactions are realistic possibilities**. In charged-particle fusion plasma reactions there is also the thorny issue of high Coulomb energetic barriers that must be surmounted before fusion of like-charge particles can occur; **brute force way to supply energy required to trigger fusion is to increase the kinetic energies of particles by heating them up to millions of degrees; this is exactly what happens in stars**
- ✓ By contrast, **weak interaction** first described by Fermi in mid-1930s, theoretically explained by Salam, Glashow & Weinberg in the 1960s, and confirmed experimentally by 1980s was **thought useless for power generation except via 'passive uncontrollable' isotopic β -decays**

Lattice Energy LLC

Neutronization via electroweak $e + p$ occurs in supernovas

WLT shows how $e + p$ can also occur in condensed matter at \sim STP

Figure 6. and caption were excerpted from Meakin et al. (2008) at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0806.4972.pdf>



Quoting directly from Meakin et al.(2008): "The neutronization which takes place during the detonation is restricted to the densest, central-most regions of the stellar core because of the strong density dependence of the electron capture rates (see Figure 6)."

Lattice Energy LLC

Many-body collective and quantum effects enable LENRs

Allow nucleosynthesis to occur in condensed matter at ~STP

- ✓ Besides plasma fusion reactions that can produce neutrons in atmospheres of stars, there is another type of stellar process that can also create neutrons, but via a fast electroweak $e + p \rightarrow n + \nu$ reaction called “neutronization.” Occurs during the detonation phase of supernova explosions and has been thought by astrophysicists to proceed at high rates *only* in densest, hottest regions of innermost cores of unstable dying stars (e.g., Meakin *et al.*, 2008)
- ✓ Astrophysicists furthermore presently believe that: (a) elements between primordial Big Bang hydrogen and Iron have been produced mostly by charged-particle fusion reactions in stellar interiors and; (b) elements above the atomic mass of Iron are produced by neutron-catalyzed nucleosynthesis via the so-called *s*-process (mainly in old red giant stars) and *r*-process (mainly involves explosive supernovas); *s*-/*r*- processes mostly differ in neutron flux values
- ✓ Thus, when we published our first arXiv preprint on the Widom-Larsen theory in May 2005, “*Ultra low momentum neutron catalyzed nuclear reactions on metallic hydride surfaces*,” it was first met with enormous skepticism from physicists dumbstruck that such a process was even possible - let alone at substantial rates - in condensed matter at ~macroscopic STP; *we have since provided many more calculations and examples of experimental evidence showing that low temperature nucleosynthesis indeed occurs in lab and Nature - this is the paradigm shift*
- ✓ Given above history and astrophysicists’ previous successes by viewing nucleosynthesis in Nature as resulting entirely from few-body reactions, *it should not be surprising that Ciuchi et al. instinctively chose to use a ‘bare’ 2-particle model of an $e + p$ reaction in condensed matter*

Lattice Energy LLC



**Brief overview of Widom-Larsen theory
in condensed matter**

SPASER device's electric fields (2003): surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s5/opfocus_v7_s5.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC


W-L theory: LENRs in condensed matter

Key features of electroweak neutron production, capture, and decay

1. E-M radiation on metallic hydride surface increases mass of surface plasmon electrons
2. Heavy-mass surface plasmon polariton electrons react directly with surface protons (p^+) or deuterons (d^+) to produce ultra low momentum (ULM) neutrons (n_{ulm} or $2n_{ulm}$, respectively) and an electron neutrino (ν_e)
3. Ultra low momentum neutrons (n_{ulm}) are captured by nearby atomic nuclei (Z, A) representing some element with charge (Z) and atomic mass (A). ULM neutron absorption produces a heavier-mass isotope ($Z, A+1$) via transmutation. This new isotope ($Z, A+1$) may itself be a stable or unstable, which will perform eventually decay
4. Many unstable isotopes β^- decay, producing: transmuted element with increased charge ($Z+1$), \sim same mass ($A+1$) as 'parent' nucleus; β^- particle (e^-); and an antineutrino

→ Note: colored shapes associated with diagram on next Slide

→ No strong interaction fusion or heavy element fission occurring below; weak interaction $e + p$ or $e + d$




→ Weak interaction β^- decays (shown above), direct gamma conversion to infrared (not shown), and α decays (not shown) produce most of the excess heat calorimetrically observed in LENR systems

Lattice Energy LLC

W-L theory: LENRs in condensed matter


Conceptual overview: many-body interactions on LENR-active surfaces



Lattice Energy LLC

W-L theory: LENRs in condensed matter

Conceptual overview: processes occurring on LENR-active surfaces



Lattice Energy LLC

W-L theory: LENRs in condensed matter

Four basic requirements for triggering collective many-body LENRs

- ✓ Substantial quantities of Hydrogen isotopes must be brought into intimate contact with ‘fully-loaded’ metallic hydride-forming metals; e.g., Palladium, Platinum, Rhodium, Nickel, Titanium, Tungsten, etc.; note that collectively oscillating, 2-D surface plasmon (SP) electrons are intrinsically present and cover the surfaces of such metals. At ‘full loading’ of H, many-body, collectively oscillating ‘patches’ of protons (p^+), deuterons (d^+), or tritons (t^+) will form spontaneously at random locations scattered across such surfaces
- ✓ Alternatively, delocalized collectively oscillating π electrons comprising outer ‘covering surfaces’ of fullerenes, graphene, benzene, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) molecules behave very similarly to SPs; when such molecules are hydrogenated, they can create many-body, collectively oscillating, ‘entangled’ quantum systems that, in context of W-L, are functionally equivalent to loaded metallic hydrides
- ✓ Born-Oppenheimer approximation breaks down in tiny surface ‘patches’ of contiguous collections of collectively oscillating p^+ , d^+ , and/or t^+ ions; enables E-M coupling between nearby SP or π electrons and hydrogen ions at these locations --- creates local nuclear-strength electric fields; effective masses of coupled electrons are then increased to some multiple of an electron at rest ($e \rightarrow e^*$) determined by required simultaneous energy input(s)
- ✓ System must be subjected to external non-equilibrium fluxes of charged particles or E-M photons that are able to transfer input energy directly to many-body SP or π electron ‘surface films.’ Examples of such external energy sources include (they may be used in combination): electric currents (electron ‘beams’); E-M photons (e.g., emitted from lasers, IR-resonant E-M cavity walls, etc.); pressure gradients of p^+ , d^+ , and/or t^+ ions imposed across ‘surfaces’; currents of other ions crossing the ‘electron surface’ in either direction (ion ‘beams’); etc. **Such external sources provide additional input energy that is required to surpass certain minimum H-isotope-specific electron-mass thresholds that allow production of ULM neutron fluxes via $e^* + p^+$, $e^* + d^+$, or $e^* + t^+$ electroweak reactions**

Lattice Energy LLC

W-L theory: LENRs in condensed matter

Collective behavior and quantum entanglement are crucial enablers

- ✓ Many-body collective oscillations and mutual quantum entanglement of protons (as well as deuterons and tritons) and electrons (e.g., SPs on metallic hydride surfaces), in conjunction with a breakdown of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, **appear to be relatively common in nature, occurring in many different condensed matter systems**
- ✓ While these many-body collective processes chronicled by Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann *et al.* operate very rapidly and nanoscale coherence can only persist for time spans on the order of femtoseconds (10^{-15} sec) to attoseconds (10^{-18} sec), nuclear processes such as weak interaction ULM neutron production and neutron capture operate on even faster time-scales: 10^{-19} to 10^{-22} sec. **Therefore, LENRs as explained by the Widom-Larsen theory can easily take advantage of such many-body collective quantum effects as an integral part of their amazing dynamical repertoire**
- ✓ It is well-known that metallic surface nanostructures and SP electrons can have configurations that are able to effectively absorb E-M energy over a wide area, transfer and concentrate it, and in conjunction with contiguous surface 'patches' of collectively oscillating protons, create extremely high local electric fields. **According to W-L, electroweak $e + p$ ULM neutron production may then follow**

C. A. Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann (Technical University of Berlin) and his collaborators have published extensively on many-body collective proton dynamics since 1995; please see:

"Attosecond quantum entanglement in neutron Compton scattering from water in the keV range" (2007); can be found at

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/cond-mat/pdf/0702/0702180v1.pdf

"Several neutron Compton scattering (NCS) experiments on liquid and solid samples containing protons or deuterons show a striking anomaly, i.e. a shortfall in the intensity of energetic neutrons scattered by the protons; cf. [1, 2, 3, 4]. E.g., neutrons colliding with water for just 100 – 500 attoseconds ($1 \text{ as} = 10^{-18} \text{ s}$) will see a ratio of hydrogen to oxygen of roughly 1.5 to 1, instead of 2 to 1 corresponding to the chemical formula H_2O Recently this new effect has been independently confirmed by electron-proton Compton scattering (ECS) from a solid polymer [3, 4, 5]. The similarity of ECS and NCS results is striking because the two projectiles interact with protons via fundamentally different forces, i.e. the electromagnetic and strong forces."

Also see J. D. Jost *et al.*: "Entangled mechanical oscillators" *Nature* 459 pp. 683 – 685 (2009) in which "mechanical vibration of two ion pairs separated by a few hundred micrometres is entangled in a quantum way."

Lattice Energy LLC

W-L theory: LENRs in condensed matter

Chemical and nuclear processes coexist on LENR-active surfaces

- ✓ On LENR-active condensed matter surfaces, there are a myriad of different complex, nanometer- to micron-scale electromagnetic, chemical, and nuclear processes *operating in parallel*. LENRs involve interactions between surface plasmons, E-M fields, and many different types of nanostructures with varied geometries, surface locations relative to each other, and chemical/isotopic compositions. LENR 'hot spots' create intense local heating and variety of surface features such as 'craters'; over time, LENR-active surfaces experience major micron-scale changes in nanostructures/composition
- ✓ To greater or lesser degrees, many of these very complex, time-varying surface interactions are electromagnetically coupled on many different physical length-scales; **E-M resonances are important**
- ✓ In concert with many-body, collective Q-M effects, surface plasmon and π electrons also function as two-way 'transducers,' effectively interconnecting the otherwise rather distant realms of chemical and nuclear energies. **Such electrons and their interactions with nanostructures/nanoparticles enable a physics regime that permits LENRs to occur in condensed matter systems under relatively mild ~STP macroscopic conditions (cores of stars, fission reactors, or supernovas are not required)**
- ✓ Please be aware that wide variety of complex, interrelated E-M phenomena may be occurring simultaneously in parallel in different nm to μ -scale local regions on condensed matter surfaces. Some regions may be absorbing E-M energy locally, while others nearby can be emitting energy (e.g., as energetic electrons, photons, other charged particles, etc.). At the same time, energy can be transferred from regions of resonant absorption or 'capture' to other regions in which emission or 'consumption' is taking place: e.g., photon or electron emission, and/or LENRs in which **[E-M field energy] + $e^- \rightarrow e^* + p^+ \rightarrow n_{ulm} + \nu$ --- in LENRs, electrons and protons (particles) are truly destroyed**

Lattice Energy LLC



**Quantum entanglement of many particles
occurs in LENRs and elsewhere**


SPASER device's electric fields (2003): surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s6/opfocus_v7_s6.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Many-body quantum entanglement helps enable LENRs

Has been observed experimentally in 430-atom organic molecules

“PFNS10 and TPPF152 contain 430 atoms covalently bound in one single particle. This is ~350% more than that in all previous experiments and it compares well with the number of atoms in small Bose–Einstein condensates (BEC), which, of course, operate in a vastly different parameter regime: The molecular de Broglie wavelength λ_{dB} is about six orders of magnitude smaller than that of ultracold atoms and the internal molecular temperature exceeds typical BEC values ($T < 1 \mu\text{K}$) by about nine orders of magnitude. **Although matter wave interference of BECs relies on the de Broglie wavelength of the individual atoms, our massive molecules always appear as single entities.**”



“Our experiments prove the quantum wave nature and delocalization of compounds composed of up to 430 atoms, with a maximal size of up to 60 Å, masses up to $m=6,910$ AMU and de Broglie wavelengths down to $\lambda_{dB}=h/mv \approx 1$ pm ... **In conclusion, our experiments reveal the quantum wave nature of tailor-made organic molecules in an unprecedented mass and size domain. They open a new window for quantum experiments with nanoparticles in a complexity class comparable to that of small proteins, and they demonstrate that it is feasible to create and maintain high quantum coherence with initially thermal systems consisting of more than 1,000 internal degrees of freedom.**”

Artistic view of most complex and massive molecules (PFNS-10, TPP-152) brought to quantum interference by Gerlich et al. (2011)

Lattice Energy LLC

Many-body quantum entanglement helps enable LENRs


May be functionally important in much larger ensembles of atoms

“Another biological process where entanglement may operate is photosynthesis, the process whereby plants convert sunlight into chemical energy. Incident light ejects electrons inside plant cells, and these electrons all need to find their way to the same place: the chemical reaction center where they can deposit their energy and set off reactions that fuel plant cells. Classical physics fails to explain the near-perfect efficiency with which they do so.”

“... In a quantum world, a particle does not just have to take one path at a time; it can take all of them simultaneously. The electromagnetic fields within plant cells can cause some of these paths to cancel one another and others to reinforce mutually, thereby reducing the chance the electron will take a wasteful detour and increasing the chance it will be steered straight to the reaction center.”

“The entanglement would last only a fraction of a second and would involve molecules that have no more than about 100,000 atoms. Do any instances of larger and more persistent entanglement exist in nature? We do not know, but the question is exciting enough to stimulate and emerging discipline: quantum biology.”

“Living in a quantum world - small-scale physics has a ‘spooky’ power over the world at large,” Vlatko Vedral, *Scientific American* pp. 38 - 43 (2011)



“Not only is the universe stranger than we imagine, it is stranger than we can imagine.”

Often misattributed to Sir Arthur Eddington; more likely adapted from J.B.S. Haldane (1927)

Image credit : Kenn Brown, Mondolithic Studios
Cover of *Scientific American* June 2011

Lattice Energy LLC

Many-body quantum entanglement helps enable LENRs

Many-body collective quantum effects seem to be widespread in Nature

Phenomenon is well-established, measured experimentally:


- ✓ Protons found within a wide variety of many-body molecular systems spontaneously oscillate coherently/collectively; their quantum mechanical (QM) wave functions are thus effectively entangled with each other and also with nearby collectively oscillating electrons; amazingly, this behavior occurs even in comparatively 'smaller,' 'simpler' molecular systems such as $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{PdCl}_6$, ammonium hexachlorometallate (see Krzystyniak *et al.*, 2007 and Abdul-Redah & Dreismann, 2006). Quoting from the paper by Krzystyniak *et al.*, "... different behaviors of the observed anomaly were found for LaH_2 and LaH_3 ... As recognized by Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann *et al.* Coulombic interaction between electrons and protons may build up entanglement between electrons and protons. Such many body entangled states are subject to decoherence mechanisms due to the interaction of the relevant scattering systems with its environment ... one can conclude that the vibrational dynamics of NH_4^+ protons as fairly well decoupled from the dynamics of the [attached] heavier nuclei."
 - ✓ Elaborating further from Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann (2005), "Further NCS experiments confirmed the existence of this effect in quite different condensed matter systems, e.g., urea dissolved in D_2O , metallic hydrides, polymers, 'soft' condensed matter, liquid benzene, and even in liquid H_2 - D_2 and HD."
- ➔ "Anomalous neutron Compton scattering cross sections in ammonium hexachlorometallates," Krzystyniak *et al.*, *Journal of Chemical Physics* 126 pp. 124501 (2007)
 - ➔ "Irreversible hydrogen quantum dynamics and anomalous scattering behavior in liquids and solids," Abdul-Redah & Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 31 pp. 269 - 276 (2006)
 - ➔ "Attosecond protonic quantum entanglement in collision experiments with neutrons and electrons," C. Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann, *Laser Physics* 15 pp. 780 - 788 (2005)
 - ➔ Please also see book chapter by Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann *et al.*, "Attosecond effects in scattering of neutrons and electrons from protons", in *Decoherence, Entanglement, and Information Protection in Complex Quantum Systems*, Akulin *et al.* eds., NATO Science Series II Vol. 189 Springer Netherlands (2005)
- With regard to the dynamics and orientation of benzene molecules and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons as they are adsorbed on a metallic catalyst's surface please see:
- ➔ "Aromatic adsorption on metals via first-principles density functional theory," S. Jenkins, *Proceedings of the Royal Society* 465 pp. 2949 - 2976 (2009); quoting from it, "[Benzene] adopts a flat-lying ... geometry, binding to the surface through donation of electrons through one or both of its degenerate HOMOs and back-donation into one or both of its two degenerate LUMOs."

Lattice Energy LLC

Many-body quantum entanglement helps enable LENRs

Are also involved in abiotic superconductivity and biological systems

- ✓ In many-body W-L surface 'patches', both the proton and SP electron subsystems are characterized by strongly correlated, entangled particles and long-range Q-M coherence up to the physical dimensions of a given patch, which can range from several nm up to as large as ~100 microns
- ✓ Superconductivity *also* happens to involve operation of many-body collective effects; perhaps not surprisingly, **there is published experimental data suggesting that high-temperature superconductivity (HTSC) may be deeply connected to LENRs in condensed matter**
- ✓ Apart from the seminal experimental work of Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann *et al.*, the experimentally verified fact (Cirillo *et al.* 2012) that ultra low momentum (ultra-long Q-M wavelength) delocalized band-state neutrons are produced via collective electroweak reactions in W-L patches **implies that the same degree of delocalization must also be true for protons present in a patch and very likely also for SP electrons. This argues in favor of idea that a form of HTSC might well be occurring in such patches**
- ✓ **There is also very intriguing published experimental data that electroweak neutron production might even be occurring in biological systems, e.g. certain bacteria; for further details, please see 50-page Lattice paper at: <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/bacteria-lenrsand-isotopic-shifts-in-uraniumlarsenlattice-energy-dec-7-2010-6177275>**



Credit: Y. Liu (Penn State Univ.)
p-wave superconductor: Sr_2RuO_4

Lattice Energy LLC



**Selective history of collective effects:
Darwin, Einstein and Laughlin**

SPASER device's electric fields (2003): surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s6/opfocus_v7_s6.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Selective history of many-body collective effects

Darwin (1920) and thirty years later, Einstein (1951)

- ✓ An early advance in thinking about many-body collective effects was published by C.G. Darwin, "*Motions of charged particles*," *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6 (1901-1925) pp. 537 - 551 (1920)
- ✓ Inspired by seminal ideas in Darwin's 1920 paper, in 1951 Ernest Sternglass (then a PhD candidate in physics at Cornell) conducted experiments with a hydrogen-filled X-ray tube operating under a 20,000 Volt applied potential in which he tried to produce neutrons via the $e + p$ reaction, not *really* expecting to see anything happen. **To his great surprise, Sternglass succeeded and unequivocally detected significant neutron fluxes. None of the physicists then at Cornell understood why the experiment had worked, so Hans Bethe suggested that Ernest discuss his inexplicable experiments with Einstein**
- ✓ Sternglass then discussed his experimental results with Einstein: incredibly, **Einstein simply looked at Sternglass' data and then immediately realized that the observed neutron production must involve some sort of many-body collective effects with electrons.** Specifically quoting from pp. 86 in Sternglass' 1997 book, "*A few days after I sent my letter to Einstein, a reply arrived that did in fact contain a possible explanation of my anomalous result with rather disheartening implications for my attempt to do without the neutrino. After pointing out that an electron would have to acquire an energy of 780,000 Volts to form a neutron, Einstein suggested that perhaps more than the energy produced by the applied potential [20,000 Volts] might become available if more than one electron were to give up its energy to a proton at one time, something that is conceivable according to quantum theory. He ended his letter by saying that since the results of the experiments were clearly important, further pursuit of the method would be necessary.*"
- ✓ Inexplicably, and despite strong encouragement from Einstein and Bethe, Sternglass decided to *drop* his promising experiments and do his thesis work on something else; the anomalous neutron results were never published in a journal. To learn more about this incredible saga, please see the Lattice document dated November 25, 2011 at: <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llc-lens-ca-1950s-sternglass-expt-einstein-bethenov-25-2011>
- ✓ In our "*Primer*" paper published in *Pramana - Journal of Physics* (2010) we have a whole Section 4.1 pp. 629 - 631 titled, "*Darwin electrodynamics*." **Sixty years later, we have implemented Einstein's prescient vision in our work**

Lattice Energy LLC

Selective history of many-body collective effects

Laughlin (Nobel prize in physics, 1998) wrote a book about it (2005)

"I am increasingly persuaded that all physical law we know about has collective origins, not just some of it."


"... I think a good case can be made that science has now moved from an Age of Reductionism to an Age of Emergence, a time when the search for ultimate causes of things shifts from the behavior of parts to the behavior of the collective Over time, careful quantitative study of microscopic parts has revealed that at the primitive level at least, collective principles of organization are not just a quaint sideshow but everything --- the true essence of physical law, including perhaps the most fundamental laws we know ... nature is now revealed to be an enormous tower of truths, each descending from its parent, and then transcending that parent, as the scale of measurement increases."

"Like Columbus or Marco Polo, we set out to explore a new country but instead discovered a new world."

Robert Laughlin, "*A Different Universe - Reinventing Physics from the Bottom Down*," Basic Books, 2005, pp. xv and 208

Readers, welcome to the New World!

Lattice Energy LLC



Ciuchi *et al.* in light of new WLT paradigm

SPASER device's electric fields (2003) - surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s5/opfocus_v7_s5.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Comparison of mathematics exposes paradigm shift

Ciuchi *et al.*'s older paradigm assumes few-body reactions: More appropriate new W-L paradigm assumes many-body reactions:

$$\Gamma(e^-p^+ \rightarrow n + \nu_e) = |\psi(0)|^2 v \sigma \quad (1)$$

wherein the amplitude for finding one electron at position \mathbf{r} and one proton at position \mathbf{R} is

$$\psi = \psi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}), \quad (2)$$

v is the relative velocity and σ is the e^-p^+ cross section.



Above equations describe what is effectively a 'bare' two-particle, few-body calculation

Below we see a correct, collective many-body $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ particle formulation that enables more accurate calculations of estimated $e + p$ rates:

$$C_T = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_j) \right\rangle_T$$



The wave function problem not properly taken into account by Ciuchi *et al* is that the time honored Eqs. (1) and (2) hold true if and only if there is precisely one electron and one proton in the initial incoming quantum state. If one is trying to treat N protons and N electrons then the charge neutral wave function Eq.(2) would have to be replaced by

$$\Psi = \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_N) \quad (3)$$

with spins and other degrees of freedom left implicit. Thus, for (say) $N \sim 10^{16}$ participating in a surface plasmon, the probability $|\psi(0)|^2$ employed by Ciuchi *et al* does not in reality exist. The many body version of the probability of finding an electron on top of a proton is described by the correlation function

$$C = \frac{1}{N} \langle \Psi | \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_j) | \Psi \rangle \quad (4)$$

or the quantum field theory equivalent. What is here crucial is that the cathode is hot. It is sufficiently hot for the cathode to glow optically and light up the laboratory. Thus one must employ a thermal average

$$C_T = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_j) \right\rangle_T \quad (5)$$

at an optical noise temperature that we have theoretically estimated [3] to be $T \sim 5000K^\circ$ in agreement with experiment [5]. As one must, we employ C_T and *not* $|\psi(0)|^2$ for the plasma physics problem at hand. It is this truncation from the many body collective aspect [C_T] to the two body [$|\psi(0)|^2$] which is at the heart of the difference in their and our estimate of the rates. The plasmon modes contributing to Eq. (5) determine the parameter β as shown in our work [2, 3] on metal hydride cathodes.

Lattice Energy LLC

Widom & Larsen LENR rate calculations preprint (2007)

Eqs. (9) and (10) provide rough order-of-magnitude estimates: Neutron and gamma photon scattering also many-body processes:

An order of magnitude estimate can already be derived from a four fermion weak interaction model presuming a previously discussed[12] electron mass renormalization $m \rightarrow \tilde{m} = \beta m$ due to strong local radiation fields. Surface electromagnetic modes excited by large cathode currents can add energy to a bare electron state e^- yielding a mass renormalized heavy electron state \tilde{e}^- , with

$$\tilde{m} = \beta m. \quad (7)$$

The threshold value for the renormalized electron mass which allows for the reaction Eqs.(1) and (2) is

$$\beta > \beta_0 \approx 2.531. \quad (8)$$

For a given heavy electron-proton pair ($\tilde{e}^- p^+$), the transition rate into a neutron-neutrino pair may be estimated in the Fermi theory by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{(\tilde{e}^- p^+) \rightarrow n + \nu_e} &\sim \left(\frac{G_F m^2}{\hbar c} \right)^2 \left(\frac{mc^2}{\hbar} \right) (\beta - \beta_0)^2, \\ \Gamma_{(\tilde{e}^- p^+) \rightarrow n + \nu_e} &\sim 9 \times 10^{-24} \left(\frac{mc^2}{\hbar} \right) (\beta - \beta_0)^2, \\ \Gamma_{(\tilde{e}^- p^+) \rightarrow n + \nu_e} &\sim 7 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Hz} \times (\beta - \beta_0)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

If there are $n_2 \sim 10^{16}/\text{cm}^2$ such ($\tilde{e}^- p^+$) pairs per unit surface area within several atomic layers below the cathode surface, then the neutron production rate per unit




FIG. 1: A low order diagram for $e^- + p^+ \rightarrow n + \nu_e$ in the vacuum is exhibited. In condensed matter metallic hydrides, the amplitude must include radiative corrections to very high order in α .

Electroweak neutron production rates that have actually been implicitly measured in various types of LENR experiments range from $\sim 10^9$ up to $\sim 10^{16}$ neutrons cm^2/sec

In first-principles calculations of estimated $e + p$ reaction rates in electric current-driven metallic hydride electrolytic chemical cells that we published in our 2007 arXiv preprint, "*Theoretical Standard Model rates of proton to neutron conversions near metallic hydride surfaces*," we finally estimated electroweak neutron production rates to be **$\sim 10^{12}$ to $10^{14} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$** which is well within the range of reported experimental measurements. **Our theory is thus in good agreement with the best available experimental data**

Interestingly, astrophysicists presently believe that neutron fluxes produced in the *s*-process range from 10^5 to $10^{11} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$; *r*-process being higher at $> 10^{22} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$

Note text highlighted in boxes to right: scattering of W-L ultra low momentum neutrons and hard gamma photons (converted to IR photons) also involve the operation of many-body collective processes in condensed matter LENRs

surface area per unit time may be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \varpi_2 &\approx n_2 \Gamma_{(\tilde{e}^- p^+) \rightarrow n + \nu_e}, \\ \varpi_2 &\sim \left(\frac{10^{13} \text{ Hz}}{\text{cm}^2} \right) \times (\beta - \beta_0)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Significantly above threshold, say $\beta \sim 2\beta_0 \sim 5$, the estimated rate $\varpi_2 \sim 10^{13} \text{ Hz}/\text{cm}^2$ is sufficiently large so as to explain observed nuclear transmutations in chemical cells in terms of weak interaction transitions of ($\tilde{e}^- p^+$) pairs into pairs into neutrons and neutrinos and the subsequent absorption of these ultra low momentum neutrons by local nuclei.

It is worthy of note that the total cross section for the scattering of neutrons with momentum p may be written $\sigma_{tot} = (4\pi\hbar/p) \Im m A(p)$ wherein the forward scattering amplitude for neutrons is $A(p)$ [13]. In the ultra-low momentum limit $p \rightarrow 0$, the cross section for neutron absorption associated with a complex scattering length $b = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \Im m A(p)$ formally diverges. For a finite but large neutron wavelength λ , the mean free neutron absorption path length Λ corresponding to n_a absorbers per unit volume obeys

$$\Lambda^{-1} = n_a \sigma_{tot} \approx 2n\lambda b. \quad (11)$$

Numerically, for $n_a \sim 10^{22}/\text{cm}^3$ neutron absorbers per unit volume with an imaginary part of the scattering length $b \sim 10^{-13} \text{ cm}$ and with ultra-low momentum neutrons formed with a wavelength of $\lambda \sim 10^{-3} \text{ cm}$, a neutron will move on a length scale of $\Lambda \sim 10^{-6} \text{ cm}$ before being absorbed. The externally detectible neutron flux into the laboratory from the cathode is thereby negligible[12].

Similarly, there is a strong suppression of gamma-ray emission due to the absorption of such rays by the heavy surface electrons[13]. The mean free path of a photon in a metallic condensed matter system is related to the conductivity σ ; employing Maxwell's equations and the equations

$$\Lambda_\gamma^{-1} = \frac{\sigma}{c} = R_{vac} \sigma \approx 4\alpha \left(\frac{\pi}{3} \right)^{1/3} n^{2/3} \bar{l} \quad (12)$$

wherein n is the density per unit volume of heavy electrons on the cathode surface and \bar{l} is the heavy electron mean free path. For hard photon energies in the range $0.5 \text{ Megavolt} < (\hbar\omega_\gamma/e) < 10 \text{ Megavolt}$ we estimate $n^{2/3} \sim 10^{15}/\text{cm}^2$ and $\bar{l} \sim 10^{-6} \text{ cm}$ leading to the short gamma-ray mean free path $L_\gamma \sim 3.4 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}$. In estimating such a small mean free path for hard gamma photon, let us remind the reader of the inadequate nature of single electron single photon scattering when making estimates of photon mean free paths. For example,


Lattice Energy LLC

Ciuchi *et al.*'s preprint illustrates old vs. new paradigm

Their mistaken assumptions occurred because of few-body thinking

- ✓ In our October 2012 arXiv preprint response to Ciuchi *et al.* we stated that, “*In the model wave functions of Ciuchi et al. there are no metallic hydrides, there are no cathodes and there are no chemical batteries.*”
- ✓ Put differently, in our above statement we call readers' attention to fact that Ciuchi *et al.* totally omitted contributions of condensed matter many-body collective effects in their calculations; it isn't surprising that they got lower values for $e + p$ reaction rates
- ✓ BTW - batteries can and do explode and LENRs may be involved in an undetermined subset of such events; see Lattice's July 16, 2010, presentation on Lithium-batteries
- ✓ This type of vignette is not unexpected in the course of a difficult, gut-wrenching, long drawn-out 'play' that has happened many times in the long history of science, especially in the case of major paradigm shifts. Kuhn chronicled many examples of such sagas in his famous 1962 book, “*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*”
- ✓ Revolutions, scientific or otherwise, are rarely bloodless; LENRs are no exception to that rule. LENRs fatally gore long-standing sacred cows in many different fields and threaten the security of a myriad of entrenched scientific and commercial interests
- ✓ Ciuchi *et al.*'s manifestly obvious calculational errors may have occurred simply because they were unwittingly influenced by the old few-body conceptual paradigm

Lattice Energy LLC




SPASER device's electric fields (2003): surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s6/opfocus_v7_s6.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Condensed matter LENRs are neutron 'catalyzed'

Lethal neutron fluxes are not produced; Widom-Larsen explains why

- ✓ Not only is the W-L collective many-body conceptual paradigm crucial to truly understanding the astounding experimental fact of electroweak neutron production in condensed matter at \sim STP, it also provides a robust, logical explanation for the absence of lethal fluxes of energetic neutrons in experimental LENR systems; in other words, it also solves the so-called "dead graduate student problem" criticism that has been ballyhooed by an array of skeptics ever since 1989
- ✓ Specifically, a 'free' neutron at thermal energies or higher has a Q-M DeBroglie wavelength λ of ~ 2 Angstroms or less while passing through condensed matter; at this physical 'dimension' a free neutron will only be interacting with at most \sim two or three atoms locally at any given instant in time. Scattering, i.e., capture or absorption, of such a 'free' neutron is thus a few-body process with a corresponding mathematical description that should be used for accurate calculations of estimated reaction rates of such neutrons with atoms, i.e., estimating capture cross-sections
- ✓ By contrast, depending upon the physical dimensions of a many-body surface proton 'patch' in which it was created, the Q-M DeBroglie wavelength λ of a W-L ultra low momentum neutron (ULMN) can range from as little as two nanometers (20 Angstroms) up to perhaps as large as ~ 100 microns (1 million Angstroms). This happens to be a decidedly many-body, not a few-body, scattering process since a ULMN is interacting with large numbers of 'target' atoms at any given instant prior to its reacting and being captured. Calculations of ULMN capture cross-sections based on assuming it is a few-body scattering process will thus be erroneous and will systematically underestimate experimentally observed values; this is analogous to mistaken assumption of Ciuchi *et al.* in their calculations of lower $e + p$ reaction rates



Surface Plasmon Fields
Around Nanoparticles

Lattice Energy LLC

Condensed matter LENRs are neutron 'catalyzed'

Lethal neutron fluxes are not produced; Widom-Larsen explains why

In condensed matter LENRs, 'system' of collective interaction is a many-body surface 'patch' of N_p collectively oscillating protons that are electromagnetically coupled to many nearby collectively oscillating surface plasmon (SP) electrons N_e via local breakdown of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. After SP electron mass renormalization and neutron production via the weak $e + p$ reaction occur, the final state of such localized systems contains $(N_p - 1)$ protons, $(N_e - 1)$ SP electrons and according to the W-L theory, one freshly produced neutron. Such a system's final state might be *naively* pictured as containing an isolated free neutron at roughly thermal energies with a DeBroglie wavelength λ of ~ 2 Angstroms (2×10^{-8} cm) - typical for thermalized free neutrons in condensed matter. **Here that is not the case:** in a many-body collective system's final state, a particular proton, say number k , has been converted to a neutron. The resulting many-body state together with all the unconverted protons may be denoted by the neutron localized $|k\rangle$. However, neutrons produced by a many-body collective system are not created in a simple state. The Q-M wave function of such a neutron in a many-body patch of N_p identical protons is in fact a superposition of many N_p localized states, **best described by a delocalized band state as follows:**

$$|\psi\rangle \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_p}} \sum_{k=1}^N |k\rangle$$

Thus, the DeBroglie wavelength λ of ULM neutrons produced by a condensed matter collective LENR system must be comparable to the spatial dimensions of many-proton surface 'patches' in which they were produced. Wavelengths of such neutrons can be on the order of $\lambda \approx 3 \times 10^{-3}$ cm or larger; **ultra low momentum p of collectively created neutrons then follows directly from the time-honored, simple DeBroglie relation:**

$$p = \frac{h}{\lambda} = \frac{2\pi\hbar}{\lambda} = \frac{\hbar}{\tilde{\lambda}}$$

, given very large Q-M neutron wavelength λ

Lattice Energy LLC

Condensed matter LENRs are neutron 'catalyzed'

Lethal neutron fluxes are not produced; Widom-Larsen explains why

- ✓ Very unlike energetic neutrons produced in most nuclear reactions, collectively produced LENR neutrons are almost effectively 'standing still' at the moment of their creation in condensed matter. Since they are vastly below thermal energies (ultra low momentum), ULM neutrons have huge Q-M DeBroglie wavelengths and commensurately large capture cross-sections on any nearby nuclei; almost all will be locally captured; **few will be detectable as 'free' neutrons**
- ✓ For the vast majority of stable and unstable isotopes, a given atom's neutron capture cross-section (relative to measurements of cross-sections at thermal energies where $v = 2,200$ m/sec and the Q-M DeBroglie wavelength is ~ 2 Angstroms) is empirically related to $\sim 1/v$, where v is velocity of a neutron in m/sec. Since v is extremely small for ULM neutrons, their capture cross-sections on atomic nuclei will therefore be correspondingly larger. After being collectively created, almost all ULM neutrons will be locally captured before any scattering on local lattice atoms can elevate them to thermal kinetic energies; **per Prof. S. Lamoreaux (Yale) neutron thermalization would require ~ 0.1 to 0.2 msec, i.e. 10^{-4} sec., a long time on typical 10^{-16} - 10^{-19} sec. time-scale of nuclear and picosecond neutron capture reactions**

Ultra low momentum neutrons have enormous capture cross-sections on $1/v$ isotopes. For example, Lattice has estimated ULMN fission capture cross-section on U-235 at ~ 1 million barns and on Pu-239 at 49,000 barns (b), vs. ~ 586 b and ~ 752 b, respectively, for neutrons at thermal energies. An Argonne N.L. neutron capture expert estimated ULMN capture on He-4 at $\sim 20,000$ b vs. value of <1 b for thermal neutrons

By comparison, the highest known thermal capture cross section for any stable isotope is Gadolinium-157 at $\sim 49,000$ b. The highest measured cross-section for any unstable isotope is Xenon-135 at ~ 2.7 million b

Lattice Energy LLC



**Paradigm shift creates new,
important R&D opportunities**

SPASER device's electric fields (2003): surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s6/opfocus_v7_s6.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Many of these are identified in Lattice's online SlideShare documents

New ways of thinking can reveal promising areas of R&D:

- ✓ Slides to follow show 6 examples of new, potentially important areas of R&D opportunity that were identified by applying the WLT many-body collective paradigm
- ✓ Other potentially revolutionary technological possibilities and yet-to-be answered scientific questions are outlined in Lattice's public online documents found on SlideShare
- ✓ We believe that what is apparent so far has only just scratched the surface of total universe of opportunities that might be unearthed by exploiting and further elaborating the conceptual power of the new paradigm
- ✓ Many fruitful and potentially very important lines of inquiry await interested experimentalists and theoreticians
- ✓ Many more scientists studying these areas are needed!

W-L paradigm shift creates new domain of science & technology:

“Sometimes elements [of revolutionary technologies] cluster because they share a common theory ... What delineates a cluster of technologies is always some form of commonality, some shared and natural ability of components to work together. I will call such clusters - such bodies of technology - domains. A domain will be any cluster of components drawn from in order to form devices or methods, along with its collection of practices and knowledge, its rules of combination, and ... associated way of thinking.”

W. Brian Arthur, “*The Nature of Technology - What it is and how it evolves*,” pp. 70, Free Press (2009)

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Improve understanding of Lithium-based battery safety issues

(68 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/cfakepathlattice-energy-llc-len-rs-in-liion-battery-firesjuly-16-2010>

Lattice Energy LLC

Commercializing a Next-Generation Source of Safe Nuclear Energy

Low Energy Neutron Reactions (LENRs) in Advanced Batteries and Other Condensed Matter Environments

Could LENRs be involved in some Li-ion battery fires?

Local E-fields $>10^{11}$ V/m on nm - μ length-scales near fractal structures, sharp tips, and nanoparticles
If $e \rightarrow e^*$ and ULM neutrons are produced in such spots, what are implications for advanced batteries?

Lewis Larsen, President and CEO



Lichtenberg Figures - Electric Discharge

**"I have learned to use the word
'impossible' with the greatest
caution."**

Wernher von Braun



Lichtenberg Figures - Electric Discharge

July 16, 2010

Copyright 2010 Lattice Energy LLC All Rights Reserved

1

July 16, 2010

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Trigger LENRs in Nickel-Hydrogen resonant E-M cavities

(61 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llcnickelseed-lenr-networksapril-20-2011>

Commercializing a Next-Generation Source of Safe Nuclear Energy

Low Energy Nuclear Reactions (LENRs)

Experimental examples: gas-phase Nickel-seed Hydrogen systems and their measured transmutation products; 'hard' radiation is absent

What products might be found if Fe, Cr, Pd seeds were also present?

Technical Overview

Lewis Larsen, President and CEO
Lattice Energy LLC

April 20, 2011



April 20, 2011

"There are two possible outcomes: if the result confirms the hypothesis, then you've made a measurement. If the result is contrary to the hypothesis, then you've made a discovery."

Enrico Fermi



Copyright 2011, Lattice Energy LLC All Rights Reserved

1

April 20, 2011

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Possibility of transforming coal into CO₂-free LENR fuel

(60 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llccoal-as-a-clenr-co2-emissionless-fuelmarch-15-2012>

Lattice Energy LLC

Commercializing a Next-Generation Source of CLENR Energy

Clean Low Energy Neutron Reactions (CLENRs)

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), LENRs, and coal:
'Dirty coal' as a future source of CLENR fuels with zero CO₂ emissions?

Speculative possibilities about the potential future of coal and CLENR energy



Lewis Larsen, President and CEO

March 21, 2012

If CLENR technology could be developed and applied to use coal as 'seed' fuel source, transmutation of Carbon atoms would release > 10⁶ times more thermal energy without CO₂

"I have learned to use the word
'impossible' with the greatest
caution."

Wernher von Braun



March 21, 2012

Copyright 2012 Lattice Energy LLC All Rights Reserved

1

March 21, 2012

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Electroweak neutron production confirmed in lightning

(73 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llcnew-russian-data-supports-wlt-neutron-production-in-lightningapril-4-2012>

Commercializing a next-generation source of CLENR energy


Low Energy Nuclear Reactions (LENRs)

New neutron data consistent with WLS mechanism in lightning

Surprisingly large fluxes of low-energy neutrons well-correlated with thunderstorm EMF fluctuations

Technical Overview

Multiple Lightning Bolts




April 4, 2012

Lewis Larsen

President and CEO
Lattice Energy LLC
April 4, 2012


"It is of the highest importance in the art of detection to be able to recognize, out of a number of facts, which are incidental and which vital. Otherwise your energy and attention must be dissipated instead of being concentrated."

Sherlock Holmes, "The Reigate Squires" 1893



Copyright 2012, Lattice Energy LLC All Rights Reserved

Single Lightning Bolt



1

April 4, 2012

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Possibility of producing Gold via LENR transmutation

(66 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llc-lenr-transmutation-networks-can-produce-goldmay-19-2012>

Commercializing a next-generation source of valuable stable elements


Lattice Energy LLC

Low Energy Neutron Reactions (LENRs)

In theory, neutron-catalyzed LENR transmutations can produce Gold
Already observed experimentally; may also occur naturally in the earth

Might process be scalable and economic; if so, what are long-term implications for Gold price?

Example 1
Production of Gold: one possible path



Neutron-catalyzed transmutations

May 19, 2012

Technical Overview

Lewis Larsen

President and CEO
Lattice Energy LLC
May 19, 2012


*"Facts do not cease to exist
because they are ignored."*

Aldous Huxley in
"Proper Studies" 1927

Basic LENR transmutation reactions: $e^- + p^+ \rightarrow n + \nu_e$
 $n + (Z, A) \rightarrow (Z, A+1)_{\text{stable}} \text{ or } (Z, A+1)_{\text{unstable}}$
 $(Z, A+1)_{\text{unstable}} \rightarrow (Z+1, A+1)_{\text{stable or unstable}} + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$

Copyright 2012, Lattice Energy LLC All Rights Reserved

Example 2
Making Gold: another possible path



Neutron-catalyzed transmutations

1

May 19, 2012

Lattice Energy LLC

Paradigm shift creates new, important R&D opportunities

Possible new type of high-temperature superconductivity

(92 slides) <http://www.slideshare.net/lewisglarsen/lattice-energy-llc-high-temperature-superconductivity-in-patches-aug-23-2012>


Lattice Energy LLC

Commercializing a Next-Generation Source of Safe CO₂-free Energy

Low Energy Neutron Reactions (LENRs)

*Speculation: evanescent 'exotic' superconductivity
(some form of HTSC) in heavy-electron 'patches'?*

Tiny hint provided on pp. 2 in Sept. 10, 2005 arXiv:0509269 preprint, "...added heavy electrons produce an anomalously high surface conductivity at the LENR threshold"; i.e., perhaps μ -scale 'patches' temporarily behave like HTSC 'islands'



Lewis Larsen
President and CEO


August 23, 2012

lewisglarsen@gmail.com

1-312-861-0115

"I have learned to use the word
'impossible' with the greatest caution."

Wernher von Braun




August 23, 2012

Copyright 2012 Lattice Energy LLC All Rights Reserved

1

August 23, 2012

Lattice Energy LLC



SPASER device's electric fields (2003) - surface plasmon
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation
http://opfocus.org/content/v7/s5/opfocus_v7_s5.pdf

Lattice Energy LLC

New paradigm shifts in thinking about nucleosynthesis

Unlock vast array of new opportunities in science & technology

- ✓ For 100+ years, experimentalists around the world have been observing and reporting various inexplicable, anomalous LENR-related phenomena that have manifested themselves in a variety of different guises. These were not recognized as resulting from nuclear processes simply because strong neutron and/or gamma radiation signatures were not observed nor was there any significant production of radioactive isotopes. **For all that time, until the advent of the Widom-Larsen theory, LENRs were effectively 'hidden in plain sight'**
- ✓ Going beyond the few-body-process thinking that has dominated nuclear and particle physics for over 80 years, Widom & Larsen (2005) utilized a collective many-body paradigm integrated with modern electroweak theory under the 'umbrella' of the Standard Model to develop a foundational theory of LENRs that explains all of these previously reported experimental anomalies and weaves them into a causally interrelated, understandable whole
- ✓ Providing detailed calculations that are supported by abundant published experimental data from a variety of different fields, in eight theoretical publications to date and Lattice's SlideShare documents we have shown how electroweak neutron production can occur at substantial rates in condensed matter at ~macroscopic STP. **Prior to our theory, it had been near-universally assumed that such a process could *only* occur at substantial rates deep in the cores of stars during supernova explosions. However, according to our work, substantial amounts of neutron-catalyzed nucleosynthesis could potentially be occurring at far more varied locations in the Universe at much higher rates than anyone had ever previously suspected --- this is the first paradigm shift resulting from our theory**

Lattice Energy LLC

New paradigm shifts in thinking about nucleosynthesis

Unlock vast array of new opportunities in science & technology

- ✓ Ciuchi *et al.* (Sept. 2012) questioned the accuracy of our estimates of electroweak neutron production rates in condensed matter. In our response (Oct. 2012), we have shown how their assertion that our calculated reaction rates were too high was incorrect and that *their* rate calculations were erroneous because Ciuchi *et al.* had assumed, incorrectly, that the $e + p$ reaction in a condensed matter metallic hydride cell is a simple two-body process; it is not
- ✓ In 2012, it appears that the larger world of 'mainstream' science is finally awakening to the possibility that previously neglected weak interactions might be able to provide another new source of clean, CO₂-free energy. In fact, given their uniquely benign characteristics, **weak-interaction LENRs** could ultimately prove to be a vastly cleaner, 'greener,' much less expensive, **better power generation technology** than strong-interaction fission or fusion --- **this is a second paradigm shift and it offers the promise of a truly sustainable energy source for mankind**
- ✓ Nature being expansive with useful, energetically parsimonious mechanisms, it is becoming increasingly evident with time that **the collective many-body paradigm together with quantum effects such as entanglement** are subtly operating inside many natural processes and systems ranging from high-temperature superconductivity, to photosynthesis and enzyme catalysis, to nucleosynthesis in lightning, industrial processes, earth's crust, and maybe even in bacteria
- ✓ Using Santa Fe Institute economist Brian Arthur's terminology, **WLT and the many-body collective paradigm together open-up a new domain of science & technology** that is filled with opportunities for advancing our basic science knowledge as well as spawning entirely new commercial technologies that could potentially have great long-term societal impact and value

Lattice Energy LLC

“There is a ... reason the old [dominant conceptual paradigm] ... persists beyond its time, an economic one. Even if a novel principle *is* developed and does perform better than the old, adopting it may mean changing surrounding [economic, academic, and governmental] structures and organizations. This is expensive and for that reason may not happen ... another reason is psychological. The old principle lives on because practitioners are not comfortable with the vision – and promise – of the new. Origination is not just a new way of doing things, but a new way of *seeing* things ... And the new threatens ... to make the old expertise obsolete. Often in fact, some version of the new principle [paradigm] has been already touted or already exists and has been dismissed by standard practitioners, not necessarily because lack of imagination. But because it creates a cognitive dissonance, an emotional mismatch, between the potential of the new and the security [and serenity] of the old.”

W. Brian Arthur, pp. 139 in “*The Nature of Technology – What it is and how it evolves*” Free Press (2009)